

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

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

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

Various pagings.

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

SECOND SESSION—SIXTH PARLIAMENT.

51^o VICTORIÆ, 1888.

VOL. XXV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-THIRD DAY OF FEBRUARY TO THE
THIRTEENTH DAY OF APRIL, 1888.



OTTAWA:
PRINTED BY MACLEAN, ROGER & Co., WELLINGTON STREET.
1888.

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE 2nd SESSION OF THE SIXTH PARLIAMENT.

1888.

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

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

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

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

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

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

* Died 21st April, 1888.

† Died 27th February, 1888.

‡ Thos. P. Owens appointed 1st March, 1888.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

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

1888.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>ADDINGTON—John W. Bell.</p> <p>ALBERT—Richard Chapman Weldon.</p> <p>ALBERTA—Donald Watson Davis.</p> <p>ALGOMA—Simon J. Dawson.</p> <p>ANNAPOLIS—John B. Mills.</p> <p>ANTIGONISH—Hon. John S. D. Thompson.</p> <p>ARGENTEUIL—James C. Wilson.</p> <p>AS-SINIBOIA, East—William Dell Porley.</p> <p>ASSINIBOIA, West—Nicholas Flood Davin.</p> <p>BAGOY—Flavien Dupont.</p> <p>BEAUCOY—Joseph Godbout.</p> <p>BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.</p> <p>BELLECHASSE—Guillaume Amyot.</p> <p>BERTHIER—Cléophas Beausoleil.</p> <p>BONAVENTURE—Louis Joseph Riopel.</p> <p>BOTHWELL—Hon. David Mills.</p> <p>BRANT, N. Riding—James Somerville.</p> <p>BRANT, S. Riding—William Paterson.</p> <p>BROCKVILLE—John Fisher Wood.</p> <p>BROME—Sydney Arthur Fisher.</p> <p>BRUCE, E. Riding—Henry Cargill.</p> <p>BRUCE, N. Riding—Alexander McNeill.</p> <p>BRUCE, W. Riding—James Rowand.</p> <p>CAPE BRETON— { Hector F. McDougall.
 { David McKeen.</p> <p>CARDWELL—Hon. Thomas White.*</p> <p>CARLETON (N.B.)—Frederick Harding Hale.</p> <p>CARLETON (O.)—George Lemuel Dickinson.</p> <p>CARIBOO—James Reid.</p> <p>(HAMBLY)—Raymond Préfontaine.</p> <p>CHAMPLAIN—Hippolyte Montplaisir.</p> <p>CHARLEVOIX—Simon Cimar.</p> <p>CHARLOTTE—Arthur Hill Gillmor.</p> <p>CHATEAUGUAY—Edward Holton.</p> | <p>CHICOUTIMI and SAGUENAY—Paul Couture.</p> <p>COLCHESTER—Hon. Archibald Woodbury McLelan.</p> <p>COMPTON—Hon. John Henry Pope.</p> <p>CORNWALL and STORMONT—Darby Bergin.</p> <p>CUMBERLAND—Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, G.C.M.G.</p> <p>DIGBY—Herbert Ladd Jones.</p> <p>DORCHESTER—Honoré J. J. B. Chouinard.</p> <p>DRUMMOND and ARTHABASKA—Joseph Lavergno.</p> <p>DUNDAS—Charles Erastus Hickey.</p> <p>DURHAM, E. Riding—Henry Alfred Ward.</p> <p>DURHAM, W. Riding—Hon. Edward Blake.</p> <p>ELGIN, E. Riding—John H. Wilson.</p> <p>ELGIN, W. Riding—George Elliott Casey.</p> <p>ESSEX, N. Riding—James Colebrooke Patterson.</p> <p>ESSEX, S. Riding—James Brien.</p> <p>FRONTENAC—Hon. George Airey Kirkpatrick.</p> <p>GASPÉ—Louis Z. Joncas.</p> <p>GLENGARRY—Peter Purcell.</p> <p>GLOUCESTER—Kennedy F. Burns.</p> <p>GRENVILLE, S. Riding—Walter Shanly.</p> <p>GREY, E. Riding—Thomas S. Sproule.</p> <p>GREY, N. Riding—James Masson.</p> <p>GREY, S. Riding—George Landerkin.</p> <p>GUYSBOROUGH—John A. Kirk.</p> <p>HALDIMAND—Walter Humphries Montagu.</p> <p>HALIFAX— { Hon. Alfred G. Jones.
 { Thomas E. Kenny.</p> <p>HALTON—David Henderson.</p> <p>HAMILTON— { Adam Brown.
 { Alexander McKay.</p> <p>HANTS—Alfred Putnam.</p> <p>HASTINGS, E. Riding—Samuel Barton Burdett.</p> <p>HASTINGS, N. Riding—Hon. Mackenzie Bowell.</p> |
|--|--|

* Died 21st April, 1883.

HASTINGS, W. Riding — { Alexander Robertson.*
Henry Corby.

HOCHELAGA—Alphonse Desjardins.

HUNTINGDON—Julius Scriver.

HURON, E. Riding—Peter Macdonald.

HURON, S. Riding—John McMillan.

HURON, W. Riding—Robert Porter.

IBERVILLE—François Bécharé.

INVERNESS—Hugh Cameron.

JACQUES CARTIER—Désiré Girouard.

JOLIETTE—Edouard Guilbault.

KAMOURASKA—Alex. Dessaint.

KENT (N. B.)—Pierre Amand Landry.

KENT (O.)—Archibald Campbell.†

KING'S (N. B.)—Hon. George E. Foster.

KING'S (N. S.)—Frederick W. Borden.

KING'S (P. E. I.)— { Peter Adolphus McIntyre.
James Edwin Robertson.

KINGSTON—Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, G. C. B.

LAMBTON, E. Riding—George Moncrieff.

LAMBTON, W. Riding—James Frederick Lister.

LANARK, N. Riding—Joseph Jamieson.

LANARK, S. Riding—John Graham Haggart.

LAPRAIRIE—Cyrille Doyon.

L'ASSOMPTION—Joseph Gauthier.

LAVAL—Hon. Joseph Aldric Ouimet.

LEEDS and GRENVILLE, N. Riding—Chas. Fred. Ferguson.

LEEDS, S. Riding—George Taylor.

LENNOX—Uriah Wilson.

L'ÉVIS—Pierre Malcolm Guay.

LINCOLN and NIAGARA—John Charles Rykert.

LISGAR—Arthur Wellington Ross.

L'ISLET—Philippe Baby Casgrain.

LONDON—Hon. John Carling.

JOTBINIÈRE—Côme Isaïe Rinfret.

LUNENBURG—James Daniel Eisenhauer.

MARQUETTE—Robert Watson.

MASKINONGÉ—Charles Jérémie Coulombe.

MÉGANTIC—George Turcotte.

MIDDLESEX, E. Riding—Joseph Henry Marshall.

MIDDLESEX, N. Riding—Timothy Coughlin.

MIDDLESEX, S. Riding—James Armstrong.

MIDDLESEX, W. Riding—William Frederick Roome ‡

* Died on or about 29th February, 1888. Mr. Henry Corby returned by acclamation, 17th March; took seat 20th March and sat for remainder of Session.

† Elected at General Election, 1887; unseated during recess; re-elected 2nd May; took seat 18th May and sat for remainder of Session.

‡ Elected at General Election, 1887; unseated during recess; re-elected, 10th March; took seat 23rd March and sat for remainder of Session.

MISSISQUOI—George Clayer.*

MONCK—Arthur Boyle.

MONTCALM—Olaüs Thérien.

MONTMAGNY—P. Aug. Choquette.

MONTMORENCY—Charles Langeleier.

MONTREAL, Centre—John Joseph Curran.

MONTREAL, East—Charles Joseph Coursol.

MONTREAL, West—Sir Donald A. Smith, K. C. M. G.

MUSKOKA—William Edward O'Brien.

NAPIERVILLE—Louis Ste. Marie.

NEW WESTMINSTER—Donald Chisholm.

NICOLET—Athanasie Gaudet.†

NORFOLK, N. Riding—John Charlton.

NORFOLK, S. Riding—David Tisdale.

NORTHUMBERLAND (N. B.)—Hon. Peter Mitchell.

NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E. Riding—Edward Cochrane.

NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W. Riding—George Guillet.

ONTARIO, N. Riding—Frank Madill.

ONTARIO, S. Riding—William Smith.

ONTARIO, W. Riding—James David Edgar.

OTTAWA (City)— { William Goodhue Perley.
Honoré Robillard.

OTTAWA (County)—Alolzo Wright.

OXFORD, N. Riding—James Sutherland.

OXFORD, S. Riding—Hon. Sir R. J. Cartwright, K. C. M. G.

PEEL—William A. McCulla.

PERTH, N. Riding—Samuel Rollin Hesson.

PERTH, S. Riding—James Trow.

PETERBOROUGH, E. Riding—John Lang.

PETERBOROUGH, W. Riding—James Stevenson.

PICTOU— { Charles H. Tupper.
John McDougald.

PONTIAC—John Bryson.

PORTNEUF—Joseph E. A. De St. Georges.

PRESCOTT—Simon Labrosse.

PRINCE (P. E. I.)— { Stanislaus F. Perry.
James Yeo.

PRINCE EDWARD—John Milton Platt.‡

PROVENCHER—Joseph Royal.

QUEBEC, Centre—François Langelier.

QUEBEC, East—Hon. Wilfred Laurier.

QUEBEC, West—Hon. Thomas McGreevy.

QUEBEC (County)—Hon. Sir Adolphe P. Caron, K. C. M. G.

QUEEN'S (N. B.)—George F. Baird.

QUEEN'S (N. S.)—Joshua Newton Freeman.

QUEEN'S (P. E. I.)— { Louis Henry Davies.
William Welsh.

* Died 4th March, 1888.

† Died 29th April, 1888.

‡ Elected at General Election, 1887; unseated during recess; re-elected, 10th March, 1888; took seat 23rd March and sat for remainder of Session.

RENFREW, N. Riding —Peter White.	THREE RIVERS —Hon. Sir H. L. Langevin, K.C.M.G.
RENFREW, S. Riding —John Ferguson.	TORONTO, Centre —George Ralph R. Cockburn.
RESTIGOUCHE —George Moffat.	TORONTO, East —John Small.
RICHELIEU —Jean Baptiste Labelle.	TORONTO, West —Frederick Charles Denison, C.M.G.
RICHMOND (N.S.) —Edmund Power Flynn.	TWO MOUNTAINS —Jean Baptiste Daoust.
RICHMOND and WOLFE (Q.) —William Bullock Ives.	VANCOUVER ISLAND —David William Gordon.
RIMOUSKI —J. B. Romuald Fiset.	VAUDREUIL —Hugh McMillan.
ROUVILLE —George Auguste Gigault.	VERCHÈRES —Hon. Félix Geoffrion.
RUSSELL —William Cameron Edwards.*	VICTORIA (B.C.) — { Edgar Crow Baker. Edward Gawlor Prior.
ST. HYACINTHE —Michel E. Bernier.	VICTORIA (N.B.) —Hon. John Costigan.
ST. JOHN (N.B.) City —John V. Ellis.	VICTORIA (N.S.) —John Archibald McDonald.
ST. JOHN (N.B.) City and Co. — { Charles N. Skinner. Chas. Wesley Weldon.	VICTORIA (O.) N. Riding —John Augustus Barron.
ST. JOHN (Q.) —François Bourassa.	VICTORIA (O.) S. Riding —Adam Hudspeth.
ST. MAURICE —François Sévère L. Desaulniers.	WATERLOO, N. Riding —Isaac Erb Bowman.
SASKATCHEWAN —D. H. Macdowall.	WATERLOO, S. Riding —James Livingston.
SELKIRK —Thomas Mayne Daly.	WELLAND —John Ferguson.
SHEFFORD —Antoine Audet.	WELLINGTON, Centre Riding —Andrew Semple.
SHELBURNE —Gen. John Wimburn Laurie.	WELLINGTON, N. Riding —James McMullen.
SHERBROOKE —Robert Newton Hall.	WELLINGTON, S. Riding —James Innes.
SIMCOE, E. Riding —Herman Henry Cook.	WENTWORTH, N. Riding —Thomas Bain.
SIMCOE, N. Riding —Dalton McCarthy.	WENTWORTH, S. Riding —Franklin Wentworth Carpenter.
SIMCOE, S. Riding —Richard Tyrwhitt.	WESTMORELAND —Josiah Wood.
SOULANGES —James William Bain.	WINNIPEG —William Bain Scarth.
STANSTEAD —Charles C. Colby.	YALE —John Andrew Mara.
SUNBURY —Robert Duncan Wilmot, jun.	YAMASKA —Fabien Vanasse.
TÉMISCOUATA —Paul Etienne Grandbois.	YARMOUTH —John Lovitt.
TERREBONNE —Hon. J. A. Chapleau.	YORK (N.B.) —Thomas Temple.
	YORK (O.) E. Riding —Hon. Alexander Mackenzie.
	YORK (O.) N. Riding —William Mulock.
	YORK (O.) W. Riding —N. Clarke Wallace.

* Elected at General Election, 1867; unseated during recess; re-elected 7th May, 1868; took seat 14th May and sat for balance of Session.

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

BAKER, Mr. E. Crow (<i>Victoria, B.C.</i>)	INNES, Mr. James (<i>South Wellington</i>).
BÉCHARD, Mr. François (<i>Iberville</i>).	ROYAL, Mr. Joseph (<i>Provencher</i>).
CHARLTON, Mr. John (<i>North Norfolk</i>).	SCRIVER, Mr. Julius (<i>Huntingdon</i>).
COLBY, Mr. Charles C. (<i>Stanstead</i>).	SOMERVILLE, Mr. James (<i>West Bruce</i>).
DAVIN, Mr. N. F. (<i>West Assiniboia</i>).	TAYLOR, Mr. George (<i>South Leeds</i>).
DESJARDINS, Mr. Alphonse (<i>Hochelaga</i>).	TUPPER, Mr. Chas. H. (<i>Pictou</i>).
ELLIS, Mr. John V. (<i>St. John, N.B., City</i>).	WELDON, Mr. R. Chapman (<i>Albert</i>).

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

LIST OF PAIRS DURING THE SESSION.

On Mr. Mills' (Bothwell) amendment (respecting Canada Temperance Act) to motion to go into Committee of Supply, 6th March:—

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Mr. GRANDBOIS.	Mr. FISET.
Mr. LABELLE.	Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. McMULLEN.
Mr. TAYLOR.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. TUPPER.	Mr. MULLOCK.
Mr. SPROULE.	Mr. LISTER.

On Sir Richard Cartwright's proposed resolution (Reciprocity with the United States) and amendment of Mr. Foster, and amendment to amendment of Mr. Jones (Halifax) 6th April:—

Mr. COURSOL.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.
Mr. BERGIN.	Mr. PURCELL.
Hon. Mr. POPE.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Sir CHARLES TUPPER.	Mr. FLYNN.
Mr. MONCRIEFF.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. BRYSON.	Mr. COOK.
Mr. KENNY.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.
Sir DONALD A. SMITH.	Mr. LAVERGNE.

On Mr. Laurier's proposed resolution (respecting dismissal of certain French Translators), and amendment of Mr. Mills (Bothwell), and amendment to amendment of Sir John A. Macdonald, 11th April:—

Gen. LAURIE.	Mr. YEO.
Sir CHARLES TUPPER.	Hon. Mr. JONES (Halifax).
Mr. WELDON (Albert).	Mr. GILLMOR.
Mr. WRIGHT.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland).	Mr. FLYNN.
Mr. ROSS.	Mr. SCRIVER.
Mr. WARD.	Mr. SOMERVILLE.
Hon. Mr. POPE.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.

On Sir Charles Tupper's motion for second reading of Bill 101 respecting Subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Company, 19th April:—

Mr. AUDET.	Mr. BOURASSA.
Mr. MASSON.	Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).
Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).	Mr. MULLOCK.
Mr. DALY.	Mr. LISTER.
Mr. CORBY.	Mr. BURDETT.
Mr. KIRKPATRICK.	Mr. PREFONTAINE.

On Mr. Bergin's amendment (six months' hoist) to Mr. Hall's motion for third reading of Bill 54, incorporating the South-Western Railway Company, 20th April:—

Mr. BURDETT.	Mr. DALY.
--------------	-----------

On Sir Richard Cartwright's amendment (Public Debt) to motion of Sir Charles Tupper for Committee of Whole on Ways and Means, 1st May:—

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
Mr. RIOPEL.	Mr. PREFONTAINE.
Mr. RYKERT.	Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).
Mr. PATTERSON (Essex).	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.
Mr. IVES.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. McCARTHY.	Mr. BURDETT.
Hon. Mr. POPE.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds).	Mr. MULLOCK.
Mr. GIROUARD.	Mr. AMYOT.
Mr. VANASSE.	Mr. GODBOUT.
Mr. THERIEN.	Mr. GUAY.
Mr. McDONALD (Vic., N.S.).	Mr. SKINNER.
Mr. SCARTH.	Mr. CHOUINARD.

On Sir Charles Tupper's motion for House in Committee to consider proposed resolution respecting Canadian Pacific Railway (re Monopoly) and Mr. Laurier's amendment to same, 11th May:—

Mr. DENISON.	Mr. COOK.
Mr. McMILLAN (Vaudreuil).	Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).
Mr. CURRAN.	Mr. PREFONTAINE.
Mr. MARSHALL.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. TEMPLE.	Mr. HALE.
Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).	Mr. PURCELL.
Hon. Mr. POPE.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. McCARTHY.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.
Mr. HENDERSON.	Hon. Mr. MILLS.
Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Hon. Mr. CHAPLEAU.	Mr. MULLOCK.
Mr. IVES.	Mr. BERNIER.

On Mr. Barron's amendment (Issue of Writs) to Mr. Thompson's motion for third reading of Bill 89 to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 14th May:—

Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. STEVENSON.	Mr. COOK.
Mr. MOFFATT.	Mr. GEOFFRION.
Mr. WOOD (Brockville).	Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).
Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).	Mr. PURCELL.
Mr. McCARTHY.	Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.
Hon. Mr. CHAPLEAU.	Mr. MULLOCK.
Mr. IVES.	Mr. PREFONTAINE.
Mr. CORBY.	Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).
Mr. MASSON.	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. WRIGHT.	Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency).
Mr. AUDET.	Mr. FISET.

On Mr. Edgar's amendment to Mr. Thompson's motion for third reading of Bill 24 to amend and consolidate the Railway Act, 17th May:—

Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. DESAULNIERS.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. RYKERT.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. McDOUGALL (C. Breton).	Mr. McINTYRE.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. ROBERTSON.
Mr. BURNS.	Mr. ARMSTRONG.
Mr. TUPPER (Pictou).	Mr. FLYNN.
Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds).	Mr. MILLS.
Hon. Mr. POPE.	Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE.
Mr. WRIGHT.	Mr. PURCELL.
Mr. McCARTHY.	Mr. CASGRAIN.
Mr. IVEE.	Mr. CASEY.
Mr. LANDRY.	Mr. EDGAR.
Mr. MASSON.	Mr. WELSH.
Mr. MOFFATT.	Mr. CHOQUETTE.

On Sir Richard Cartwright's amendment (Walter Jones *re* Haldimand Election) to Sir Charles Tupper's motion for Committee of Supply, 17th May:—

(Same List of Pairs as the last.)

On Mr. Wilson's (Elgin) amendment (Mr. Richard Pope's appointment as Deputy Commissioner of Patents) to Mr. Carling's motion for third reading of Bill 38 to amend the Act respecting Patents of Inventions, 18th May:—

Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. DESAULNIERS.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. RYKERT.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. McDOUGALL (C. Breton).	Mr. McINTYRE.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. ROBERTSON.
Mr. TUPPER (Pictou).	Mr. FLYNN.
Mr. DALY.	Mr. LANGELIER.
Mr. PUTNAM.	Mr. EISENHAEUER (Quebec).
Mr. WELDON (Albert).	Mr. BORDEN.

On Mr. Watson's amendment (Voting by Ballot) to Mr. Thompson's motion for third reading of Bill 125 to amend the North-West Representation Act, 18th May:—

(Same List of Pairs as the last.)

On Mr. Mitchell's amendment (Duties on Flour, Cornmeal, &c.) to motion for Committee of Supply, 18th May:—

(Same List of Pairs as the last.)

On Mr. Laurier's amendment (Revision of Voters' Lists) to Mr. Chapleau's motion for third reading of Bill 117 to amend the Electoral Franchise Act, 19th May:—

Mr. TISDALE.	Mr. CHARLTON.
Mr. DESAULNIERS.	Mr. LAVERGNE.
Mr. RYKERT.	Mr. YEO.
Mr. McDOUGALL (C. Breton).	Mr. McINTYRE.
Mr. McKEEN.	Mr. ROBERTSON.
Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).	Mr. PERRY.
Mr. TUPPER (Pictou).	Mr. FLYNN.
Mr. WELDON (Albert).	Mr. BORDEN.
Mr. PUTNAM.	Mr. EISENHAEUER.
Mr. DALY.	Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).
Mr. McMILLAN.	Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency).
Mr. KENNY.	Mr. JONES.
Mr. MARSHALL.	Mr. CASEY.
Mr. J. A. McDONALD.	Mr. HALE.
Mr. JONCAS.	Mr. GUAY.
Mr. GUILBAULT.	Mr. FISET.
Mr. FREEMAN.	Mr. DESSAINT.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT.—51 VIC.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 23rd February, 1888.

THE PARLIAMENT, which had been prorogued from time to time, was now commanded to assemble on the 23rd day of February, 1888, for the Despatch of Business.

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

PRAYERS.

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

Mr. SPEAKER,

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned,

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House, that he had received from the Judges selected for the trial of Election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, certificates and reports relating to the Elections,—

- For the Electoral District of Yarmouth ;
- For the Electoral District of Colchester ;
- For the Electoral District of Cumberland ;
- For the Electoral District of the County of Haldimand ;
- For the Electoral District of Victoria (N.S.) ;
- For the Electoral District of Shelburne ;
- For the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Northumberland, Ont. ;
- For the Electoral District of the County of Kent, Ont. ;
- For the Electoral District of the County of Halton ;
- For the Electoral District of the County of Prince Edward ;
- For the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Middlesex ;
- For the Electoral District of Berthier ;
- For the Electoral District of Richelieu ;
- For the Electoral District of Champlain ;
- For the Electoral District of Chambly ;
- For the Electoral District of Chicoutimi ;
- For the Electoral District of Yamaska ;
- For the Electoral District of Richmond and Wolfe ;
- For the Electoral District of Queen's, N. S. ;
- For the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Durham ;
- For the Electoral District of the City of Kingston ;
- For the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Huron ;
- For the Electoral District of the County of Dundas ; and
- For the Electoral District of Gaspé.

VACANCIES.

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

Of HENRI JULES JOUBEAU DUQUESNAY, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Dorchester, by decease ;

Of SIMON XAVIER CIMON, Member for the Electoral District of Charlevoix, by decease ;

Of the Honorable EDWARD BLAKE, Member for the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Bruce, by resignation ;

Of GEORGE F. BAIRD, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Queen's, N. B., by resignation ;

Of NOAH SHAKESPEARE, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Victoria, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown ; and

Of the Right Honorable Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, G. C. B., Member for the Electoral District of the County of Carleton, by resignation.

He also informed the House that he had issued the several Warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new writs of election for the said electoral districts respectively.

NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of HERBERT LADD JONES, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Digby ;

Of JOHN FERGUSON, Esquire, for the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Renfrew ;

Of JAMES ROWAND, Esquire, for the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Bruce ;

Of SIMON CIMON, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Charlevoix ;

Of the Honorable ARCHIBALD WOODBURY McLELAN, for the Electoral District of Colchester ;

Of the Honorable Sir CHARLES TUPPER, G. C. M. G., for the Electoral District of Cumberland ;

Of JOHN LOVITT, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Yarmouth ;

Of JOHN ARCHIBALD McDONALD, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Victoria, N. S. ;

Of WALTER HUMPHRIES MONTAGUE, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Haldimand ;

Of JOHN WINBURNE LAURIE, Major-General, for the Electoral District of Shelburne ;

Of HONORÉ J. J. B. CHOUINARD, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Dorchester ;

Of EDWARD COCHRANE, Esquire, for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Northumberland ;

Of GEORGE F. BAIRD, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Queen's, N. B. ;

Of EDWARD GAWLOR PRIOR, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Victoria, B. O. ;

Of GEORGE LEMUEL DICKINSON, Esquire, for the Electoral District of the County of Carleton ; and

Of DAVID HENDERSON, Esquire, for the Electoral District of the County of Halton.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

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

HON. ARCHIBALD WOODBURY McLELAN, Member for the Electoral District of Colchester, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Hon. Mr. Thompson.

SIMON CIMON, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Charlevoix, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Hector Langevin.

GEORGE LEMUEL DICKINSON, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of the County of Carleton, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Shanly.

JOHN FERGUSON, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of the South Riding of the County of Renfrew, introduced by Hon. Mr. Bowell and Mr. Curran.

WALTER HUMPHRIES MONTAGUE, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of the County of Haldimand, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Hon. Mr. White.

EDWARD COCHRANE, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of the East Riding of the County of Northumberland, Ont., introduced by Hon. Mr. Bowell and Mr. Guillet.

HONORÉ J. J. B. CHOUNARD, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Dorchester, introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Amyot.

DAVID HENDERSON, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Halton, introduced by Mr. White (Cardwell) and Mr. Brown.

JOHN LOVITT, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Yarmouth, introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Flynn.

JAMES ROWAND, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of the West Riding of Bruce, introduced by Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Armstrong.

HERBERT LADD JONES, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Digby, introduced by Mr. McLelan and Mr. Mills (Annapolis).

JOHN ARCHIBALD McDONALD, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Victoria, N. S., introduced by Mr. Thompson and Mr. Cameron.

EDWARD GAWLOR PRIOR, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of the City of Victoria, B. C., introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Daly.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 1) respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It affords me much gratification to meet you once more at the commencement of the Parliamentary Session, and to congratulate you upon the general prosperity of the country.

Although the labors of the husbandman have not been rewarded in some portions of the Dominion by an adequate return, the harvest of last year has on the whole been plenteous, while in Manitoba and the North-West Territories it was one of remarkable abundance.

The negotiations between Her Majesty's Government and that of the United States for the adjustment of what is known as "The Fishery Question" have, I am pleased to inform you, resulted in a Treaty which will, I venture to hope, be considered by you as honorable and satisfactory to both nations.

The Treaty, with the papers and correspondence relating thereto, will be laid before you, and you will be invited to adopt a measure to give effect to its provisions.

The extension and development of our system of railways have not only rendered necessary additional safeguards for life and property, but have given greater frequency to questions in which the interests of rival companies are found to be in conflict, and to require authoritative adjustment. As further legislation appears to be needed for these purposes, a measure will be submitted to you for the consolidation and improvement of "The Railway Act."

Experience having shown that amendments are required to make the provisions of the Act respecting Elections of the Members of the House of Commons more effective and more convenient in their operation, you will be asked to consider a measure for the amendment of that Statute.

The Act respecting Controverted Elections may likewise require attention with a view to the removal of certain questions of interpretation which have arisen and which should be set at rest.

My Government has availed itself of the opportunity afforded by the recess to consider the numerous suggestions which have been made for improving the details of the Act respecting the Election Franchise, and

a measure will be submitted to you for the purpose of simplifying the law and greatly lessening the cost of its operation.

The growth of the North-West Territories renders expedient an improvement in the system of government and legislation affecting those portions of the Dominion, and a Bill for that purpose will be laid before you.

A Bill will be submitted to you to make a larger portion of the modern laws of England applicable to the Province of Manitoba and to the North-West Territories in regard to matters which are within the control of the Parliament of Canada, but which have not as yet been made the subject of Canadian legislation.

Among other measures, Bills will be presented to you relating to the Judiciary, to the Civil Service Act, and to the audit of the Public Accounts.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

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

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I commend these important subjects and all matters affecting the public interests which may be brought before you to your best consideration, and I feel assured that you will address yourselves to them with earnestness and assiduity.

Sir John A. Macdonald moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir John A. Macdonald moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 24th February, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, At the outset I must express my regret that from among the younger members

of the House, there has not been selected some one better able than myself to begin a discussion of the important matters which are referred to in His Excellency's Speech. I am not unmindful, however, that to hon. gentlemen who have in the past performed the duty which to-day has fallen to me, there has been extended an unusual degree of kindness and consideration; and, Sir, having sat for one Session in this House, and having listened to so many hon. gentlemen delivering able addresses from your right and from your left, I the more keenly appreciate the difficulty of the task which I have undertaken, and the need I have to ask that the indulgence so often extended to new members of this House may not be withheld on the present occasion. Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House will remember that, at the opening of last Session, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake)—whose absence to-day I regret on account of its cause—with that kindness and consideration which usually characterise him, was good enough to connect my name with the duties then so well performed by my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Porter). I must believe that only the hon. gentleman's absence to-day prevents him expressing the pleasure, which I am bound to suppose he would feel at my return to this House, and at my engaging to-day in the duty for which he selected me a year ago. Sir, I am well aware that to the members of this House, as well as to the people of all sections of this country, has come, with no considerable regret, the announcement that the gentleman who has administered the affairs of the country for the last four years is about to remove from our midst. Speaking where I do, I need not say that during his incumbency of his office, His Excellency has well performed the high duties that have devolved upon him, and that, whether in public or in private life, he has found a place warm and deep in the hearts of the Canadian people. Succeeding as he did a long list of illustrious Governors, His Excellency leaves us, having added one more brilliant name to the number of those eminent British statesmen who, throughout years, have performed great services for the Empire in this its western portion. In the still more important office to which the Imperial Government have, in their wisdom, called him, we can judge, from his eminent abilities and his long experience, that a noble career awaits him; and I think I can assure His Excellency that nowhere in the Empire will be found friends more anxious to applaud his winning of new honors and fresh laurels than among the people with whom he is soon to sever his connection. It will no doubt be urged, Sir, by hon. gentlemen who sit upon your left that the Speech from the Throne is barren in the mention of great matters, and that the legislation promised by the Government during this Session is not of the usual quantity or the usual quality; but, perhaps, the Government should be congratulated on the fact that the affairs of our country at the present time are so well ordered as to need very little interference from this Parliament. Some of the paragraphs of the Address, however, deal with matters with regard to which our information is explicit enough only to warrant a passing comment, while other paragraphs deal with subjects which may be more fittingly discussed in this Chamber during a later period of the Session. By reason of this, as well as by reason of my unwillingness to provoke a long discussion of these matters, I shall only detain the House a short time in dealing with a few matters mentioned in His Excellency's gracious Speech from the Throne. Sir, to gentlemen who have so recently been among their constituents will have occurred the desirability of certain changes in the Election, the Franchise, and the Controverted Election Acts, and, therefore, I need not anticipate what the proposed changes will be. With regard to the promised measures relating to the Civil Service Act, the application of English laws to Manitoba, the changes in the Judiciary Act, and the audit-

ing of the Public Accounts, I can only say that I suppose the necessity of those measures has been made manifest by the experience of the various Departments, and that they will be in the public interest. We are promised legislation with regard to the government of the North-West Territories. It will be remembered by this House that some time ago the Council of the North-West Territory was simply an advisory board appointed by the Government. At the present time that Council is partly elective and partly appointed, and I have no doubt the legislation which is promised this Session on that subject will be in the direction of extending to our fellow citizens in those Territories the rights of representative local government which we in the older Provinces enjoy. The fact that the Government feels warranted in bringing forward such legislation should be an evidence to us of the growing importance of those Territories, and the probability of their soon taking their places among the great Provinces of this Confederation. Then we are promised railway legislation. Hon. gentlemen will remember that some time ago Commissioners were appointed to take evidence with regard to the relations of the great railway corporations of this country to one another and to the general public. Those Commissioners have gleaned a large quantity of information on this very important matter, and the legislation which is to be laid before us this Session is, no doubt, the result of the representations made by that Commission to the Government. We are well aware, Sir, that evils have existed in connection with our railway system, evils which have become more apparent with the great extension of our railway interests, and which have injuriously affected the public interest, and I think the Government are to be commended for so speedily acting in the direction they have promised in the Speech from the Throne. At the opening of this House, last year, we were free to admit that the Province of Manitoba had suffered from a failure of its wheat crop, and that in consequence the people of that Province were not enjoying that measure of prosperity which we all wished they should enjoy. This year it gives me very great pleasure to be able to turn to my hon. friends representing Manitoba in this House, and congratulate them on the fact that this year their Province, though its soil is only as yet very partially tilled, is sending to the markets of the world 12,000,000 or 13,000,000 bushels of the best grain ever grown on American soil. Notwithstanding the very large amount of information which we have had from various sources with regard to our North-West Provinces and Territories, I think it will be admitted on every hand that we are only beginning to realise their immense wealth and value to this country. The enormous harvest which has been reaped in Manitoba during the past year, must surely convince us that we can form no adequate idea of the future possibilities of that Province—save this, Sir, that it gives us confidence that in a very short time it must become one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of our agricultural Provinces. And what shall I say of that vast territory lying between the Province of Manitoba and the Rocky Mountains? What can I say, Sir, except that we are only beginning to learn something of its immense richness? I understand that in the Upper House this Session a committee will be asked for to gather information with regard to the great Territories lying beyond the well-known fertile belt of the North-West—vast regions which are said to be capable of growing grain and rearing stock as extensively as the settled portions of the older Provinces. The only want I could find in that country, during a brief visit to it, was a want of population. It is true, standing here to-day we cannot say that our schemes for attracting immigration from older countries into this part of the American continent have been as successful as we would desire; we cannot say that we have secured as many of the immigrants coming to this continent as we could wish.

But there is this fact to be taken in conjunction with the one I have just mentioned. When we glance at the statistics, we find that 85 per cent. of our present population are native born, and it is a matter for congratulation, as an evidence of our self-reliance, that our great public works and general development are due, in a large measure, solely to our own native energy. At the present time the prospects, as regards immigration, are much more hopeful. Hon. gentlemen on both sides must admit that the evidence today shows, that very shortly, we shall have an immensely increased immigration. It is not for me to discuss now the reasons why we have not received what we consider would have been our proper share of the immigration to this continent; but I may mention one reason, the force of which hon. gentlemen opposite will appreciate. We know very well that the agents of American land companies, and railway companies, have been very energetic in the distribution of libels on the climate of our North-West, and to a considerable extent succeeded in inducing the people of other countries to put faith in the statements they so industriously circulated; but I am confident hon. gentlemen will agree with me that the events of the past year must have dissipated those false ideas and impressions. In all quarters sympathy has been expressed, and tears have been shed, because of the death and destruction that have followed in the wake of the blizzards which, during the past year, visited those very sections of the United States to which the tide of immigration was directed. But whilst death and destruction have followed in the wake of the blizzards in the American North-West, the people in our North-West have escaped these calamities; they have lived in comfort and safety, enjoying the result of their toil, and their thousands of cattle have been grazing in safety upon our plains. One of the important matters referred to in the Speech is the Fishery question, a question of great interest to the Canadian people. Our fishing industry is undoubtedly a very great industry, one in whose operations no less a sum than \$7,000,000 is invested and 60,000 of our population employed, and which yields an annual harvest to the Dominion reaching in the aggregate a score of a million dollars. An industry of this importance is one which commends itself to our protection on all occasions, and I think the action of the Government throughout the whole dispute with the United States, in defending what we regarded as our just rights, meets with the approval of our people, irrespective of party, from one end of the country to the other. The position of our Government in this whole matter was a difficult one. They were compelled by their duty, as the representatives of the Canadian people, to defend our rights; it was their duty as well to see that, if possible, no rupture of the cordial relations which hitherto existed between the two countries should be occasioned. The dispute was an irritating one, one which at no time increased those friendly relations, and at all times was liable to lead to rupture of the same. Last year we were pleased to learn that negotiations, with the view of settling the difficulty, had begun, and I am sure hon. gentlemen on both sides will express their pleasure at the successful termination of these negotiations. This is not just the time to discuss the details of the treaty agreed upon by the Commission. When the Bill for its ratification is brought before the House, I understand it will be accompanied by the correspondence and various papers bearing upon it, so that every facility will be given for a thorough discussion of its clauses and a thorough understanding of its provisions. I believe the treaty to be a fair and equitable settlement of a serious dispute between us and the United States. True, we may not have got all we wanted or demanded, but we could not expect to obtain everything. As I understand the functions of a Commission of that kind, it is organised for the purpose of arranging equivalents. We have had, it is true, very serious attacks on the treaty, but it is not the first treaty which has been attacked in this

Mr. MONTAGUE.

country. In 1871, the right hon. gentleman who leads this House, was most severely attacked with regard to the treaty which resulted from the negotiations in which he, as a British plenipotentiary, took part. A few years later on, hon. gentlemen will remember, he was also vilified for not having taken a humiliating position in order to secure the extension of that same treaty, for having accepted which he had been previously so violently attacked. In connection with the Fishery Treaty, it is, perhaps, satisfactory to know that the American Administration are also being attacked by the American fishermen for having completely given up the American contentions; the Gloucester fishermen are, to-day, holding indignation meetings and denouncing their Government for having, as they claim, completely surrendered the American rights, by endorsing this same treaty which our Government are condemned on this side for having endorsed. A treaty which is thus condemned on both sides, by a certain section of each people, we may conclude is a fair and equitable settlement of a most serious dispute, one that places in a fair position of rest the Treaty of 1818, concerning the interpretation of which so much difficulty has arisen. At the same time, we must express our belief and hope that, following in the wake of the treaty, we will have enlarged commercial relations with our neighbors. It is true that, in the search for a natural market, we do not find a natural market for all our products in the country further south; but, at the same time, we find there a natural market for a limited number of those products which it would be conducive to the best interests of the people of this country to cultivate. I trust, therefore, we will be successful in arranging for an extension of trade in this respect with our American friends. His Excellency has referred to the prosperity of the country. That, I think, is a matter upon which the Dominion, to-day, can be fairly congratulated. There are evidences of our prosperity in our own country, and there are evidences of that prosperity abroad. In visiting the various classes of our people, we must become convinced that we are enjoying a very widespread prosperity. If we visit our capitalists and our monetary institutions, we find that, with slight exceptions, they have enjoyed a prosperous year; if we visit our business men we find their credit unusually good and our manufacturers increasing their already extensive operations. We also find our artisans and laborers employed at rates of wages very much in advance of what was paid a few years ago. There is one fact to which I cannot help pointing, and that is the absence during this winter of the cries of want and misery we have so often heard during other winters from our cities. At the same time, we must regret that from abroad, from the cities of other countries, appeals for aid have come to our ears. At the present time, while, I understand, a million people are out of employment in Great Britain alone, hon. gentlemen on both sides must admit that in this country not very long willing hands wait for remunerative toil. The *Toronto Mail* was, I believe, correct a few months ago, when it said, if Canadians would only devote a little attention to the literature, so-called, of poverty in other countries, they would have a higher opinion of the condition of their own. It is true that since then the *Mail* has largely changed its sympathies, so far as the two political parties are concerned, but I would not suggest, for a moment, that the *Mail* was less honest in the expression of its opinions than it claims to be at present. Whilst I am dealing with this question, I might refer in words of commendation to the efforts which are being made by the Government for the extension of the trade of this country with various countries throughout the world. We all remember that last year we were congratulated upon the exhibit we made as a country at the Indian and Colonial Exhibition in London. We are glad to learn from our busi-

ness men in various sections of the country that the result of that exhibit was to bring them trade which they did not enjoy before. We have sent a Commissioner to the Colonies in the Pacific Ocean, and that Commissioner reports that the chances are fair for a very large trade with the Colonies in that part of the Empire. Hon. gentlemen will remember that, a few years ago, there was an exhibition in Sydney, N.S.W., our exhibit at which was the beginning of our trade with the Australasian continent. We learn that there is to be shortly an exhibition at Melbourne, and I have no doubt that our Government, always seeking to extend our trade, will endeavor to obtain an exhibit there which will result in extending our trade connections with Australia and bring about an interchange of trade between us and those our sister Colonies. Then, we have taken steps to seek out a country in the South American continent, the Argentine Republic, a great prosperous country with five millions of people, whose wealth lies in the 100,000,000 sheep and 50,000,000 cattle that feed upon its plains. We find that their imports amount to some \$90,000,000 of goods, \$50,000,000 worth of which could be supplied from the workshops and factories of Canada, and I think that the Government, in seeking to extend our trade with that Republic, will meet with the approval of the various sections of this country. When I was in the Pacific Province, I was glad to see, as one of the results of the completion of our Canadian Pacific Railway, the shipping of China and Japan resting in the beautiful harbor of the city of Vancouver, bringing the products of the Orient to this continent, and carrying away the lumber and timber from the wonderful forests of the Pacific coast and the agricultural products of our Canadian North-West. It is true that, owing to the nature of these peoples, we may not be able to cultivate that trade as rapidly as we would like, or as rapidly as we might expect otherwise, but I think we are none too hopeful when we say that only a few years must elapse before we shall supply a great portion of what those hundreds of millions of people consume in those two great Eastern Empires. Even now, as I speak, are being built, in the shipyards of the Clyde, steamers for the Pacific trade. I remember that, a few years ago, we congratulated ourselves upon having a line of steamships crossing the Atlantic Ocean. But to-day, Sir, the traveller may, from the ports of the old world, cross the Atlantic upon elegant Canadian steamers. He may flit across the continent in palace cars, over a railroad built by Canadian enterprise, and traversing from the Atlantic to the Pacific nothing but Canadian soil; and in the near future, in a few months, we hope that he will be able to continue his journey across the Pacific Ocean to the ports of China and Japan and the shores of the Island continent itself. A moment ago I incidentally mentioned the city of Vancouver. I must congratulate my hon. friend who comes from that district upon representing a constituency which contains the best evidence of Canadian energy and enterprise. A few years ago a great forest covered its site. Now, anyone who enters its limits will find a magnificent city with miles of well-paved streets, dozens of magnificent business blocks and innumerable well-built homes, having every evidence of culture and refinement. While I have been speaking of this general prosperity of the country, hon. gentlemen may say that I have not spoken of the prosperity of the farmers of Canada. I admit very freely that an effort has been made to discourage our agriculturists in this country, but let me ask in what way are our agriculturists not prosperous, and what agriculturists under the sun are more prosperous than the Canadian farmers at the present time? Let me refer to the condition of the farmers in two great countries at the present hour. The *New York Times*, which has not very marked sympathy with Canada, tells us that :

"The profit derived from American agriculture is now so small as to be unworthy of the slightest consideration."

And the position of farmers in the great mother country is such as to call from Her Majesty in Her Speech to the British Parliament, the following words:—

"I deeply regret that there has been no corresponding improvement observable in the condition of agriculture. I commend the interests of that great industry to your attentive care, hoping that means may be discovered to enable it to meet more effectively the difficulties under which it labors."

In view of the state of agriculture in England and in the United States, it is pleasing to hear one of the professors in the Agricultural College of the Province of Ontario stating that our farmers as a class are prosperous and are making money. But I need not quote the testimony of any particular gentleman as to that fact. Hon. gentlemen who represent agricultural constituencies will bear me out in what I say. It has been stated that our farmers are for the most part mortgage-burdened. I do not speak for the constituencies of those members who assert that the farmers are mortgage-burdened, but, having the honor to represent the county of Haldimand, an agricultural county, I emphatically deny that the farmers there are a mortgage-burdened community. Hon. gentlemen opposite who have visited that community during the past year—and I may say, by the way, that we have had a number of those visitors—will, I am sure, agree with me that they found there evidences of wealth and prosperity. I believe that what is true of Haldimand is also true of other constituencies in this Province. It is true that we have some mortgages, but the latest returns show us that throughout the Dominion we have mortgages only to the amount of \$31,798,288, which, if they were placed wholly on the farms of Ontario, would be only 9 per cent. of the value of the same. Take for a moment the figures in regard to ten States of the American Union, which show the following as the mortgages in those States:—

Ohio	\$ 761,000,000
Indiana.....	398,000,000
Illinois.....	620,000,000
Wisconsin.....	250,000,000
Michigan.....	350,000,000
Minnesota.....	175,000,000
Iowa.....	351,000,000
Nebraska.....	140,000,000
Kansas.....	200,000,000
Missouri.....	237,000,000
	<u>\$3,422,000,000</u>

That shows a total mortgage liability of \$3,422,000,000 on the whole value of the property of \$13,931,000,000, or an average of about 25 per cent. on the value of the farm properties in those ten States. The percentage in Ohio is 25, in Illinois it is 25 per cent., in Missouri it is 30 per cent., and so it ranges from 20 to 30 per cent. We have heard a great deal about Dakota. Sometimes some Canadian journals have lauded the condition of the farmers of Dakota. In that Territory they have a population of 600,000, and they have \$45,000,000 of mortgages, or \$75 for each individual and \$375 for each family, and that not on the rate of 6 or 7 per cent., but at the rate of 10 per cent. in almost every case almost every time. Then, take the State of Michigan, with which the Province of Ontario can be very fairly compared, and you find that they have farm property to the value of \$1,400,000,000, of which \$700,000,000 is encumbered, with mortgages to the amount of \$350,000,000, or 25 per cent. of the total value of the farm property in the State. But hon. gentlemen will say, perhaps, that we should take the State of New York, which may be more fairly compared with our own Province of Ontario. I shall not trouble you with the figures, but simply an expression contained in a report of the New York Department of Agriculture with regard to the State of New York. Let me read it all, because it

will have a favorable influence upon those gentlemen who think that in the State of New York the farmers are more prosperous than they are in our good Province of Ontario :

" On the whole, New York farmers are more in debt than they were ten years ago. There are a large number of farms which were purchased a few years ago and mortgaged, which now would not sell for more than the face of the mortgages, owing to the depreciation of the farming lands, which, on an average, is fully 33 per cent. in ten years. Probably one-third of the farms in the State would not sell for more than the cost of the buildings and other improvements, owing to the shrinkage."

Now, then, Sir, hon. gentlemen may say that this large sum of mortgages has been placed on the farms of various States of the Union for the purpose of making improvements, or of purchasing new land. Well, I will not give my own opinion upon that question, but I will give the opinion of the *New York Times*, which deals with that question, lately, in a long article. It says :

" The greater portion of the money represented by the faces of these mortgages has not been expended in improving farms, because the larger portion of the farms were equipped with buildings before the mortgages were laid. The money has been spent to enable the farmers to live. Ten States mortgaged for \$3,422,000,000, and twenty-eight States and eight Territories to hear from. We personally know that all the agricultural Territories are heavily mortgaged. The total of the farm mortgages of America undoubtedly closely approximates \$9,000,000,000."

Now, Sir, it may be said that whilst our farms are not as largely mortgaged as the farms of the United States, at the same time our people seem less able to meet their engagements, and the property taken by the mortgage societies is increasing. Well, let me say that the Erie and Huron Loan and Investment Society, whose headquarters are in London, Ont., report that the arrearages are to-day only 4 per cent. of the capital invested, and that they are 22 per cent. less than they were on the 21st January, 1887; that only two-thirds of the 1 per cent. on the capital employed comes back in property to the company; and the farmers of the vicinity have placed in their hands over one million of dollars for the purpose of investment. Then, Sir, taking the report of the various loan societies in this Province I see that, in 1880, the mortgages in default amounted to over 8 per cent. of the whole. In 1886 only 3½ per cent. of the whole. The foreclosed mortgages in 1880 amounted to 4 per cent. of the whole, and in 1886 only 1½ per cent. of the whole. From these facts it may easily be seen that the condition of our farmers, unlike their brethren of the Empire State, is growing more prosperous as the years pass by. Another fact, and I leave this matter, feeling certain, Sir, that I have demonstrated to this House that our agriculturists occupy a position which might well be envied by their fellow farmers in whatever country. In Ontario the value of mortgaged property in 1886 increased, as compared with 1883, by \$34,000,000, whilst the amount of mortgages only increased by \$12,000,000. Now, I have dealt with the evidences of prosperity at home, let me deal for a moment with the evidences abroad. Hon. gentlemen need not be told that our Provincial securities are high in the foreign markets, nor need they be told that Dominion bonds, which a few years ago were only worth 88, are to-day worth 103. Let me, however, refer for a moment to the decrease in the rate of interest which we are compelled to pay, and to compare that with the decrease in the interest paid by other colonies. Since 1869 the interest upon British consols £100, has decreased 6s., that upon India bonds 11s. 3d., upon Cape Colony bonds £1 5s. 9d., New South Wales £1 12s. 9d., Victoria £1 10s. 9d., whilst the interest upon Canadian bonds has decreased £1 19s. 9d. This state of facts calls forth from the *Toronto Globe*, a paper which is not in the habit of painting too bright a picture with regard to Canada, the following expression :—

" Thus not only has the credit of Canada risen more than that of any other colony, or than that even of England herself, but the credit of Canada actually stands to-day on the British market next to that of India, which is, to some extent, guaranteed by Britain."

Mr. MONTAGUE.

So, when we come to consider all these facts, we see that His Excellency is abundantly justified in congratulating us in this country upon the prosperity we enjoy. But I may be told that, notwithstanding our seeming prosperity, we have a great debt hanging over our heads which is bringing to us impending ruin. I can only say that, looking at the figures, with regard to our credit in the money markets of the world, the financial kings of those markets must have adopted the idea of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), when he presented to those people the silver lining of the shield, and explained, quite properly, that our public debt stood for the large amount of development that we have made and the large amount of public works which we have constructed in this country. Now, Sir, in face of all these facts, in face of the prosperity that we are enjoying, in face of the development that we have made in the few years since Confederation, we have no reason to be discouraged in the work we have undertaken, namely, to rear upon the foundations laid by the fathers, the framers of our Confederation, a great national superstructure, and I trust that, in this House, and at this hour, in view of our achievements in the past, are to be found none who would discourage us in the work we have undertaken. There was a time in this country when, under less favorable circumstances, the pioneers might have become discouraged in the struggle in which they were engaged, but they manfully continued the struggle, and the result of their labors is seen in the great heritage which we enjoy at the present time. I think, Sir, it ill becomes us, their successors, to weary in the struggle we have taken up, where they have dropped the implements of toil. It is, at the present time, encouraging to see that this feeling is widespread, and that everywhere there is a feeling of hopefulness, a feeling of confidence from end to end of the country. It is pleasant to know that among the younger members of our population is being developed a feeling of Canadian nationalism, and it is that feeling only which can assist us in fulfilling the great destiny which is reserved to us. This feeling should pervade all classes of our population. No matter what blood flows in our veins, we are Canadians; no matter to what country we look with pride as the home of our fathers, it is to this country that we owe first and last our devotion. No matter to what Province we may turn with loving thoughts of home, true patriotism will impel us to remember that we are citizens of a country stretching from the shores of one ocean and reaching to the shores of another. I say, Sir, if we are to fulfil our destiny, it can only be by this feeling increasing, by the fusion of the various parts into one great and harmonious whole; it can only be by the Provinces uniting one with the other, giving up the individual for the general weal; it can only be by section joining section, by sect vying with sect in loyalty to the Constitution under which we all enjoy the perfection of Christian liberty; it can only be by the representatives of the various nationalities which go to form our five millions of people joining their hearts and their hands in promoting the welfare of the land, upon whose hospitable shores all find a welcome to full, free citizenship, the enjoyment of political liberties and happy homes. Sir, I beg to thank hon. members on both sides of this House for the kindness and consideration they have extended to me, and to conclude by moving :

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

1. That we receive with much pleasure His Excellency's expression of gratification at meeting us once more at the commencement of the Parliamentary Session, and of congratulation upon the general prosperity of the country.

2. That we are glad to learn that, although the labors of the husbandman have not been rewarded in some portions of the Dominion by an adequate return, the harvest of last year has, on the whole, been

plenteous, while in Manitoba and the North-West Territories it was one of remarkable abundance.

3. That we are pleased to be informed that the negotiations between Her Majesty's Government and that of the United States for the adjustment of what is known as "The Fishery Question," have resulted in a Treaty which we venture to hope, with His Excellency, may be considered by us as honorable and satisfactory to both nations.

4. That we thank His Excellency for his assurance that the Treaty, with the papers and correspondence relating thereto, will be laid before us, and that any measure to give effect to its provisions will receive our careful consideration.

5. That we learn with interest that the extension and development of our system of railways have not only rendered necessary additional safeguards for life and property, but have given greater frequency to questions in which the interests of rival companies are found to be in conflict, and to require authoritative adjustment; and that as further legislation appears to be needed for these purposes, any measure submitted to us for the consolidation and improvement of "The Railway Act" will be carefully considered by us.

6. That we thank His Excellency for informing us that experience has shown that amendments are required to make the provisions of the Act respecting Elections of Members of the House of Commons more effective and more convenient in their operation, and that we will carefully consider any measure submitted to us for the amendment of that Statute.

7. That we will willingly consider any measure laid before us for the amendment of the Act respecting Controverted Elections, with a view to the removal of certain questions of interpretation which have arisen and which should be set at rest.

8. That we are pleased to learn that His Excellency's Government has availed itself of the opportunity afforded by the recess to consider the numerous suggestions which have been made for improving the details of the Act respecting the Electoral Franchise, and that any measure submitted to us for the purpose of simplifying the law and greatly lessening the cost of its operation, will receive our earnest attention.

9. That His Excellency having been pleased to inform us that the growth of the North-West Territories renders expedient an improvement in the system of government and legislation affecting that portion of the Dominion, any Bill for that purpose laid before us will be earnestly considered.

10. That we will carefully consider any Bill submitted to us to make a larger portion of the modern laws of England applicable to the Province of Manitoba, and to the North-West Territories, in regard to matters which are within the control of the Parliament of Canada, but which have not, as yet, been made the subject of Canadian legislation.

11. That His Excellency may rest assured that all measures laid before us, especially Bills relating to the Judiciary, to the Civil Service Act, and to the audit of the Public Accounts, will receive our earnest attention.

12. That we thank His Excellency for informing us that the Accounts for the past year will be laid before us, and that we shall respectfully consider the Estimates for the ensuing year; and that our thanks are due to His Excellency for the information that they have been prepared with a due regard to economy and the requirements of the public service.

13. That His Excellency may rest assured that these important subjects, and all matters affecting the public interests which may be brought before us, will receive our best consideration, and that we thank His Excellency for the expression of his confidence in our readiness to address ourselves to them with earnestness and assiduity.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, on rising to second the proposition of my hon. and eloquent friend, the member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), I cannot refrain from a certain feeling of apprehension which one naturally experiences on being called for the first time to take part in the debates of this House. Had I consulted only my incompetence to treat the important questions which will come up for deliberation during the present Session, I should assuredly have held myself aloof, but, aware that the spirit of indulgence animates all the members of this honorable House, I take heart at this knowledge and feel reassured by the kind welcome which you have just given me. I eagerly join my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) in his regret at the departure from among us of His Excellency the Governor General, and, in the name of the French Canadian population of the Dominion, I am certain that I echo their sentiments when I declare that this departure is viewed by them with sorrow. In summarising and discussing, with his usual eloquence and skill, the several paragraphs of the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has singularly lightened my task, and I have comparatively little to add to his remarks. It is the rule, Mr. Speaker, at the opening of a Session of this Parliament, in good years as in evil, in years of dearth as in the years of plenty, to hear those who are commissioned to propose the adoption of an Address in reply to the Speech of His Excellency, declare that peace and prosperity prevail

in our country, but there perhaps never was a time when such a declaration was better justified by facts than on this occasion. Our agriculture has not, in a long time, been more productive, our commerce more flourishing, and our industries more thrifty than they are at present. Thanks to the political system whose device is "Canada for Canadians," our manufacturers expand the range of their operations, employ a larger number of hands, enhance the case and contribute a more powerful argument in favor of the wisdom of that policy of protection which has created the wealth and strength of many other countries, and which assures the Canadian Confederation a brilliant future. There is further ground for congratulation, Mr. Speaker, in the intelligence that the sole cloud which darkened our political sky last year is on the eve of disappearing, if it has not already vanished out of sight. There is ground for trust, that the Imperial Parliament, the Congress of the United States, and the Parliament of Canada, will ratify the clauses of the treaty which has just been signed by the gentlemen charged with the duties of the Commission at Washington. The treaty which will be laid upon the Table of this House, probably to-day, for ratification, will furnish proof that the line of conduct, wise, prudent and energetic, followed by the Government, in pursuit of a satisfactory settlement of this knotty fisheries question, deserves the general approval of this House and of the country. The secrets of the future are unknown to me, but the action of the Government inspires me with confidence. I have reason to rest satisfied with the present condition of this question, and I have no doubt that they who assumed the burdensome mission of going to defend our cause at the Washington conference, made sure that, while sturdily guarding our naval interests, they screened us from conflicts detrimental to the general economy of our Confederation. I speak of the energetic defence of our naval interests, because, Mr. Speaker, whether viewed from the national standpoint, the standpoint of economy or the standpoint of business relations, the fisheries of Canada are of the highest importance. I do not hesitate to repeat before this House what I have already stated several times before, and do not apprehend that I shall be charged with exaggeration when I say that the Confederation of Canada is in possession of the richest and most extensive fishing fields of the whole world. As national domain, their value is priceless; as a ground of exploration thrown open to commerce and to the spirit of enterprise and industry, they are well nigh exhaustless, and further, furnish our people a plentiful and cheap food, easily accessible to all. If we examine the pages of history, Mr. Speaker, we find that, in all ages, the nations holding the sea coasts and the people dwelling by the sea, have understood the importance of their fisheries, and those who have worked them have become prosperous, and successful in war and traffic. We see that the most famous and prosperous nations are those who pursue navigation and the fisheries, and that the most prosperous are they who trace their origin from their fishermen. Tyre, Venice, Byzantium, and the Constantinople of to-day were celebrated among the cities of ancient times, and they owed their fame, their power, and their wealth, only to the fishermen who had pitched their tents either on the shores of the Adriatic Sea or on the Straits between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean. Who does not know the important part played by Holland, in Europe, during the sixteenth century? Who does recall the high deeds of renowned Dutch admirals in those days? And to whom is Holland indebted for this fame if not to her fishermen, who became great sailors, and to her fisheries which made her one of the richest nations on the globe? More recently we behold the English, the French, the Norwegians and the Spaniards take an active part in fisheries, with an ardor of rivalry, not

alone with the view of nourishment and trade, but especially to preserve the mastery of the seas. And this day, if Britain is the first naval nation in the world, if her commerce is the most outspread, its colonial possessions the vastest and the most important, does she not owe this almost incalculable wealth, according to the opinion of her most distinguished statesmen, to the importance of her fisheries which are the foundation of her present prosperity? And where does the English navy recruit its best sailors, if not among that hardy people, among those bold fishermen who, brought up, as it were, in a fishing-boat are, from infancy, accustomed to face with calm the perils of the ocean and to regard as their territory and their own property the several seas that are crossed by English men of war and merchantmen? And, Mr. Speaker, when we consider the thousands of miles of marine coasts which offer inexhaustible riches to our toil, the 100,000 seamen who, in our young country, are already directly or indirectly employed in the fisheries; when we witness the energy, hardihood and skill of our fishermen, as many of us have had personal opportunity of doing, I cannot help believing that the future, the future more especially of the Provinces of Nova Scotia, Quebec, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island—perhaps, in their whole extent, not as adapted to tilling as our western Provinces—depends in a great measure on the encouragement and protection which we will give our naval population, and that one of the chief sources of our national prosperity is to be found in the depths of the seas, whose value we may not have sufficiently known and appreciated. We are informed by the distinguished writer, Lacépède:

"The fisheries preceded the tillage of the field. It is proper to civilised peoples, and so far from being opposed to the progress of farming, to trade and manufactures, it increases the fruits of the latter.

"If in the beginning of societies, fishing afford men, still half savage, a sufficient and wholesome food, if it teaches them not to fear the danger of the deep, if it makes sailors of them, it gives to more advanced people plentiful harvests for the needs of the poor, varied tributes for the luxuries of the rich, choice preparations for commerce abroad, fertile composts for barren fields. It forces men to cross the seas, to brave the ice of the poles, to stand the fires of the equator, to struggle against storms, and it breeds experienced seamen, bold tradesmen and doughty warriors."

All nations that figure to-day at the head of progress, civilisation and commerce, and, in special, the British, the French, the Dutch, the Americans, the Norwegians and others, attribute and attach as much importance to the products of the sea as they do to the products of the land, and this importance is due not only to the immense riches which may be drawn from the depth of the sea, without visibly draining its supply, but because the fisheries are a school like to no other for a large number of solid men, schooled against danger, skilled in trade during times of peace, and among whom their country will always find valiant defenders in the day of national peril. Bounded on the north by the Arctic Ocean, on the east by the Atlantic Ocean, and on the west by the Pacific Ocean, Canada can boast, Mr. Speaker, of at least 10,000 miles of naval coast, bordered by waters rich in marketable fish of all kinds. It is to these splendid fisheries that our neighbors of the American Union desired to have access. They pretended to have, equally with ourselves, the right to draw from this well of richness. The fact that the Americans have always held, with steadfastness, to a common right and privilege of working these fisheries, the eagerness which they always manifested to obtain the enjoyments of these extensive and lucrative privileges, are so many proofs of the importance of their possession, and their manufacturing and commercial value. We owe a debt of acknowledgment, Mr. Speaker, to the present Government for having understood the importance and value of this national property, and having employed the means of defending it against the encroachments of our neighbors, without ceasing, however, to maintain the good

M. JONCAS.

understanding which should never cease to exist between two nations having identical interests to shield and shelter. Although our fisheries are far from having acquired, as yet, all the development which is within them, the yearly product which, in 1870, was only \$7,000,000, now rises almost to the sum of \$20,000,000. And yet, although the extensive organisation of our Department of Fisheries, and our mode of collecting statistical information are cited as models, our system, as indeed all those of the same sort elsewhere, is deficient in several respects, and one can easily understand that in a country vast and extensive as is Canada where every dweller on the sea-shore, or the lake shore—these lakes a real inland seas. Can, on stepping a few feet away from his door, draw food for his family, it is impossible for our statistical writers to make reports with mathematical accuracy. Thus these \$20,000,000, just mentioned, do not represent, so to speak, the value of the fish prepared for the market only. It would be necessary to add to this amount the value of the fish taken for local consumption, and even the fish taken in Canadian waters by foreign fishermen, especially of the neighboring republic. Thus, as was said by my hon. friend, the member for Northumberland, (Mr. Mitchell), when he presided, with equal talent and honor to himself and his country, over the destinies of the Department of Marine and Fisheries of Canada, whether we consider them from the standpoint of the extent, importance, and abundance of food which they afford, as from the point of view of their still greater value as resources susceptible of constantly increasing development and unlimited production, the fisheries of the Canadian coasts are a national property at once precious and enduring. These fisheries annually employ a capital of several millions of dollars, give occupation and the means of livelihood to hundreds of thousands of persons, favors the development of our commercial marine and our foreign trade, keeps ever in activity and ready for use a plucky and stalwart race of sailors, and for these reasons, they deserve our serious attention, an enlightened appreciation, and a protection commensurate with their value and their importance. And still, Mr. Speaker, while acknowledging their whole value and their importance, we should claim from the Government full protection for our fisheries. But we have not the right, however, to ask that greater interests should be sacrificed to this protection. Neither must we overlook the fact—indeed we should seriously consider it—that it is altogether in our interests to maintain, with the 60,000,000 inhabitants of the neighboring republic, the most friendly relations possible in all manner of commercial affairs. Neither must we forget that a continuation of the strained relations existing last year between the United States and Canada, might give rise to serious conflicts and work immense harm to the business of both countries. This has been properly understood by the members of the present Administration, who have surely a right, not only to the greetings, but also to the gratitude of the country. It is a clear case, Mr. Speaker, that to remove the uneasy feeling arising out of the interpretation of the Treaty of 1818, and reaching an understanding on a question which placed so many interests at stake, mutual concessions were imperative, but the debate on the clauses of the treaty which we shall be called upon to ratify, will show that we have not conceded too much; that we have yielded nothing of major importance, and that the complaints already put forth in certain quarters are not well founded. Representing in this House a county deeply interested in the protection of the fisheries, I should be the first to withdraw my support from the Government if I thought that they had sacrificed us in the Washington Commission; but I am happy to be able to proclaim my satisfaction and to state that the interests of my constituents have been guarded by this treaty which is dispel to develop the relations between the two countries and despite an element

of serious and dangerous conflict which might have brought on grave complications, and compromise the peace necessary to the advancement of our young country and the development of its immense resources. The revision and amendment of the laws relating to our railways, the Act concerning the Election of Members to the House of Commons, the Controverted Elections Act, the Civil Service Act, the Electoral Franchise Act, and the improvement in the system of Government in the North-West, are all important questions which will occupy our attention. The very considerable increase in the population of the Canadian North-West, and its rapid development will entail not only important amendments, but even an almost radical change in the existing laws in order to harmonise them with the new conditions into which the country has entered in late years. With respect to the laws affecting the election of members of this House, if experience has proved the need of modifying them, to render their administration more effective and easy, we should not be blind to the circumstance, Mr. Speaker, that several of the trials for the invalidation of elections, held during the recess, have brought to light a lamentable state of things, and I feel convinced that every member of the House will back the Government in its attempts to stay this flood of corruption which threatens to invade our electoral body and constitutes a real danger for the future of our Parliamentary institutions. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I beg to thank you and this House for the kind attention and the tokens of sympathy which you have been pleased to impart to me.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker: I am entrusted by Her Majesty's Opposition in this House to present the views of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House on the questions suggested by the Speech from the Throne. Before I proceed I am sure the House will bear with me if I pause to give expression to the inexpressible regret felt by the Opposition in this House, and largely shared, I am confident, by hon. gentlemen on the other side, that the seat of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) is still vacant by reason of ill-health. I am sure that everyone will agree with me that at any time Canada could ill afford to lose the services of one of views so broad and of abilities pre-eminent, and I am sure also that on the present occasion when so many important questions are looming up for discussion and determination, the absence of the hon. gentleman from his seat will be felt as a national calamity. It is a more pleasant duty to me, Sir, to offer to the mover and seconder of the Address my hearty congratulations, if they will accept them from me, on the very able manner in which they have discharged what is always a very difficult task. I am sorry to say, and perhaps I will not surprise them or any hon. member in this House, if I state at once that I cannot agree in everything they have said; but there is one thing upon which I can cordially agree with them, and it is one on which everybody, not only in this House but in the country at large, will agree with them, in the gracious tribute which both of those hon. gentlemen paid to His Excellency the Governor General. Lord Lansdowne came here with an illustrious name, made illustrious, not only by his own career but by preceding generations of statesmen, and if I were to characterise, according to my own judgment, what has been his career in this country, I would say that it has been characterised all through by eminent wisdom, and when he leaves us—I am sure I am speaking the feelings of every Canadian when I say this—wherever he goes and wherever he may be he will carry with him our esteem and affection, and our hope of ever-increasing success for himself. Now, Sir, the Speech promises us several measures of legislation, some of which I am sure may prove very useful; but I am rather sceptical, judging of the future by the past, that many of them will come to anything like practical legislation, or, if they do, that they will be put into force. Last year, upon a

similar occasion, the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government stated that he did not share the opinion once expressed by his former colleague, Sir George E. Cartier, who on one occasion stated that he never would be satisfied until the only measure brought down by the Government of the day would be the Supply Bill. But, Sir, while the hon. gentleman protested against that course, in my humble opinion he was doing indirectly the very thing against which he was protesting. For instance, last year the Speech from the Throne stated:

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

That statement was somewhat controverted by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), when reviewing the Speech—that is to say, he doubted the utility or expediency of establishing such a department, and the right hon. gentleman defended his measure, or rather his contemplated measure, with some warmth and vigor. The right hon. gentleman gave his reason for this new departure in the following language:—

"I was not prepared for the sneer of the hon. gentleman as to one of the modes which had been adopted by the Government for the development of the trade and commerce of the country. The hon. gentleman says he hopes there are some other steps to be taken than that of taking a new departure. The hon. gentleman must know that from year to year the different Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade of Canada have been representing to the different Governments of the country, have been petitioning for the establishment of such a department as is proposed, and for the appointment of a Minister specially charged with the interests of trade and the development of the commerce of the Dominion. I have evidence of this desire from every great city in Canada, and from every great commercial body formed for the purpose of aiding in the development of trade, and in obedience to this universal cry the Government have resolved to establish a department especially devoted to those subjects."

That measure was brought down, it was carried and is now on the Statute-book. But, Sir, I vainly look over the Treasury benches to see the Minister who is to take charge of trade and look after the interests of commerce. It would seem as if the Government, as soon as they had resolved to carry out the wishes of the trade and establish a department specially devoted to that purpose, had exhausted their energies. I will not make any odious comparisons, but I will say that in my opinion that the way of the Government seems to be paved with good intentions, but is deficient in good deeds. I ask, what can the matter be? Am I to suppose, I think I am forced to suppose, that the Government have come to the conclusion expressed by Mr. Blake, that the formation of the new department was inexpedient. If I must not believe that, what am I to believe? I would have to believe that this apparent desire to meet the wishes of trade and commerce was nothing else than a blind for the passing of a measure of patronage which might be kept for an emergency; or, perhaps, I would have to believe that the representations of the commercial bodies having once met with the consideration of the Government were returned to the pigeon-holes and there forgotten, and treated with no more respect than if they had come from Indians or Half-breeds. Again, upon the same occasion we were told in the Speech from the Throne:

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

But it turned out, when matters were developed, that the improvement so far as regards the Departments of Customs and Inland Revenue, was that the Minister of Customs and Minister of Inland Revenue were to be improved out of existence. I am glad to see, and I say it in all sincerity, that the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue have both their heads solid on their shoulders. But again I ask, what can the matter be?—what is the reason that, when, last year, it was in the public interest, that those hon.

gentlemen should be improved out of existence, they still are in existence? Are we to suppose again that on this occasion the public weal has been sacrificed for private convenience? There was another measure proposed: an improvement was to be made in the Department of Justice, an improvement which turned out to be the appointment of a Solicitor General. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that not the slightest word of objection was offered on this side of the House to that measure; on the contrary, it has been for a great many years the opinion on this side of the House that the appointment of such an officer was requisite in the public interest, and, indeed, this was one of the measures brought down by the Mackenzie Administration when they were in power. I am aware that the measure at that time, though it is now acknowledged to be in the public interest, was bitterly assailed, combined though it was with another measure, that is to say a measure for the suppression of the office of Receiver General, which would have made the new office cast no additional burdens on the revenue of the country. That measure was bitterly assailed and finally it was defeated, if I remember rightly, in the other House. But after ten years the Government took up those two measures, and I am glad to say that the Administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), who I am also sorry to say is kept away from his seat by ill-health, has received the fullest vindication at the hands of its own adversaries, those who opposed it with great vigor at that time; and I can add that this is not the only instance where the course and policy of the hon. gentleman has been vindicated, and the people are commencing to appreciate the value of the services which he gave to the country, and to realise that the most valuable public servant is not he who panders to popular prejudices, but he who seeks to carry out true principles, though they may fail to give him victory, but lead him into defeat. It was in the public interest last year that we should have a Solicitor General; yet this year we have no such officer. Again I ask, what can be the matter? The ministerial press told us, if I recollect correctly, and prominent supporters of the Government told us, that the right hon. gentleman was feeling the pulse of the constituencies to see whether the country was favorable to such an office; whether the pulse was responsive or not we do not know. But here is the fact, that three measures which were brought down last year in the public interest, and which were placed upon the Statute-book, are still inoperative. Again I ask, what can the matter be? If those measures were brought down simply as adornments of the Speech from the Throne, I prefer the frank statement of Sir George Cartier, who said that he would not be satisfied until the Speech from the Throne contained nothing but the Supply Bill; if, on the other hand, those measures were brought down in the public interest, the Government is censurable for not having acted upon them. Several measures which are to be brought down this year will certainly, if they are carried out, prove to be of interest and value to the country. The election law is unsatisfactory as it is, and ought to be amended, and I hope the first amendment which will be made to that law will be one depriving the Government of the power they have to-day of selecting the returning officers, and embodying the principle that the man who is to stand as umpire between contending parties should not be selected at the bidding of the candidate, as has often been the case in the past, but should be a permanent officer of the law, as in every other country. With regard to the Controverted Elections Act, we have certainly seen enough during the recess to convince us that it requires improvement, for we have found judges in Ontario, in Quebec and in New Brunswick differing from each other as to the proper interpretation of the Act, and it is time for us to try to settle by legislation the questions which jurisprudence has not been

Mr. LAURIER.

able to settle, with regard to the Franchise Act. That Act has certainly a very checkered career. It was passed in 1885, put in operation in 1886, suspended in 1887, and is to be amended in 1888; and I express the hope—I do not know whether it will be fulfilled or not—that it will be repealed in 1889. Sir, the more that Act is discussed, the more apparent I believe it will become that the principle advocated by the Opposition is the true principle, namely, that the franchise should be left to be fixed by the different Provinces, because the franchise is a complex question, the application of which must vary according to the education, the manners and the habits of the people of the different Provinces. With regard to the Fisheries Treaty, I think it is premature to discuss that question at this moment, and I am not going to express any opinion upon it just now. The Speech expresses the hope that the treaty will be found to be honorable and satisfactory to both nations. Well, Sir, I will only say that I hope it may, but I would not be led to that conclusion by a perusal of the blue-book which was issued by the Government, and the most admirable Minutes of Council which were prepared and sent to England in support of our contention as to the interpretation of the Treaty of 1818. The Speech affirmed the great prosperity of the country, and both the mover and the seconder of the Address have devoted the greatest portion of their remarks to an emphatic demonstration of that assertion. Sir, I have always marvelled at the resolute tenacity with which ministerial orators continue to affirm, in spite of the facts, that the country is prosperous. I make the completely contrary assertion—I say that to-day the country, far from being prosperous, is in the very reverse condition.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes. I say there never has been a time in the history of Canada when the agricultural classes, who form the bulk of this nation, have been in so depressed a condition as they are in to-day. The truth is, there is to-day a general feeling of discontent, and a desire for something to turn up which will remove the agricultural depression which exists. My hon. friend the member for Halimand (Mr. Montague) quoted statistics to prove that we are prosperous; but if we are, why is it that hundreds of Canadians are turning their backs on this prosperity? How is it that, day after day, hundreds and thousands of our people are leaving that prosperity to seek homes on the other side of the line? The permanent exodus from which this country is suffering is the best evidence that this prosperity, of which ministerial orators so frequently talk, exists only in their mouths; and against the boasting and self-glorification which we constantly hear from them, the 1,000,000 Canadians who are to-day living on the soil of the United States are a living protest. I can understand emigration from distressed Ireland, from over-populated England, from Scandinavia, and from Germany, where the people are crushed by the iron heel of a military despotism; but why is it, I ask, that this free country cannot keep its native population at home? The reason is not to be found in the country itself; it is as good a country as can be found under the sun; but the reason is in the vicious economical system which exists, and it cannot be found in anything else. It has been our aim for many years past to open to settlement the vast and fertile fields which we possess. We have sent agents to Europe who have not painted our country in the black colors in which the hon. member for Halton said it was painted by American agents. We have sent agents to Europe who have done their best to bring immigrants to this country, and to a certain extent they have succeeded. Immigrants have been brought here, but where are the settlers? Not only immigrants, but our own people are deserting in scores, and hundreds and thousands, and what can the cause be if it is not to be found

in the vicious economical system which we have followed for several years? By the fruits ye shall know the tree, and what are the fruits of this tree? Rings, monopolies and combinations, which increase the wealth of individuals at the expense of the community—rings and combinations by which greedy men secure by law from foreign competition, are holding the people of this country in their claws, and wringing from them—out of their bread, their fuel, their very necessaries of life—an unfair and illegitimate gain. That is the position of affairs, and that position cannot be long tolerated. I say it is the duty of the people of this country and of Parliament to apply themselves at once to the consideration of the condition of this country, and to take steps to put an end to that condition. We must go further—we must also do something to put an end to the emigration from the country; we must find the means of keeping in our own country our own population with which God has blessed us. It is not only general considerations of policy, but even financial reasons that should make us feel bound to take that course, because to-day we are saddled with financial liabilities which we have incurred under the expectation that we should have in the country not only our own population but a large influx of foreign population. It is a matter of history, which cannot be contradicted, that the people of this country would never have consented to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, had they been led to understand the cost of it would have to be defrayed by increased taxation. While they were willing to build the road, they always insisted that its construction, whether rapid or slow, should not anticipate, but should go on concomitant with our power of bearing taxation. They always insisted that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, whether rapid or gradual, should keep pace with the resources of the country. That condition was expressed in Parliament again and again. We find it expressed in the very first Act passed, the Act of 1872. In that Act it was provided:

“Whereas the House of Commons of Canada resolved during the said last Session that the said railway should be constructed and worked as a private enterprise and not by the Dominion Government, and that the public aid to be given to such undertaking should consist of such liberal grants of lands, and such subsidies, in money or otherwise, without increasing the present rate of taxation, as the Parliament of Canada should thereafter determine.”

Such was the very first, the initial step, taken in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Two years later, after a change of Government and also after a change of policy, when the Government undertook to build the railway themselves, they determined that it should be built exactly upon the same lines—that is to say, without increasing taxation. After reciting the history of the case, the resolution goes on to say:

“And whereas it is proper to make provision for the construction of the said work as rapidly as the same can be accomplished without further raising the rate of taxation.”

Two years later this feeling was so much ingrained in the minds of the people that it was thought proper, when a sum of money was required, to go on with the construction of the road, that is to say the preliminary work, to add the following rider to the proposition:

“While granting this sum, this House desires to record its view that the arrangements for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be such as the resources of the country will permit without increasing the existing rates of taxation.”

There cannot, therefore, be any doubt at all that the object of the Canadian people ever was to keep the cost of construction of the railway within the existing taxation of the country, and to prevent its being made an additional burden. To-day, however, despite this oft-reiterated desire, the people find themselves saddled with an enormous debt, and that in the teeth of these resolutions which still stand upon our Statute-books as the law of the land. Though this law has never been superseded, the resistance of the people was

overcome. And how? It was overcome by the delusive promises and by the fallacious statements that the rapid construction of the railway would bring such an influx of population into our territory that there would be no necessity to increase taxation. I beg the House to keep this fact well in mind: that one of the conditions under which the railway was built was the expectation of the people that its construction would bring so great an influx of population into our unsettled North-West, that the cost would not bear upon the people. That was the statement made by the right hon. gentleman himself. He stated, in 1880, after he had come back to power, that, for that year, he calculated the number of immigrants who would come in our North-West, would be 25,000; he calculated upon an increase of 25,000 for the following year, and so on until 1890. Here is the very language he made use of:

“Then we calculate that as 25,000 people will go in this year, we may add, each year, an increase of 5,000, so that we may expect 30,000 to go in next year. This is a very small percentage, if we look to the results from railway enterprise in the United States. We assume, therefore, an increase of 5,000 a year till 1890, and expect in that year 75,000 settlers in our North-West. I think that is a very moderate estimate. On those figures the estimate of the total cash revenue to be received for the lands by 1890, is \$38,593,000.”

Then he went on to say what would be the revenue not collected, and he estimated it for mortgages on pre-emptions \$16,430,000, mortgages on railway lands, \$16,272,000, making a total of \$71,395,000 upon which to put the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The calculation would have been perfectly right and legitimate had the expectations of the right hon. gentleman proved true. If we had received immigrants at the rate of 25,000 a year, if we had received something like these figures, nothing could be said against this policy now. If to-day, though we have not reached 1890, we could depend on something approaching those figures, the calculation of the hon. gentleman would have proved true, and the people would have not more taxation to bear than they had formerly. True the hon. gentleman was good enough to deduct from his estimate \$2,000,000 for expenses in collecting the \$72,000,000, leaving at least \$69,000,000 available cash to meet the liabilities incurred by the country in the construction of the road. Some time later, the then Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper) dilated upon the same idea. He did not altogether corroborate the figures of the right hon. gentleman—I do not mean to say that he at all controverted them—but he went on to another side of the argument, and said that the increase of population would, in all probability—not in all probability, but certainly—bring into the Treasury \$60,000,000 Customs revenue received from those immigrants. He said:

“But supposing the land does not give us that, we have an authority which hon. gentlemen will accept, that the Customs revenue from the people who will go into the country during the next ten years will furnish the interest on \$60,000,000.”

Well, the census of Manitoba, and the census of the North-West Territories have dispelled all those great expectations; and as to the sale of the lands, instead of receiving \$60,000,000 or \$70,000,000, we have received, from 1880 to 1886, just \$4,351,515.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is about as near as he generally gets.

Mr. LAURIER. That is not yet all received, because out of that we have to deduct \$3,500,000, for surveys and expenses connected with the surveys, which leaves the small amount of \$700,000 or \$800,000, and if from that we deduct the other expenses, we will find that absolutely nothing is left. So that of all the great expectations we were deluded with as to the \$70,000,000, which was to go into the Treasury to defray the taxation of the people, we have not yet received one cent nor can we depend upon receiving one cent. The result is that while it was contemplated

that the construction of the road would not increase the taxation of the country, while the wish of the people was that their taxation should not be increased, they have, to-day, to meet that extra taxation without any of the resources upon which they depended at that time to meet the liabilities. Now, this is an important matter. If we go on with our present population, if we keep on at the same figure, if, instead of increasing, our population is to continue leaving us by the scores and hundreds, the result cannot fail to be very serious. Should a commercial depression occur similar to that which took place some years ago, we would have to face the most serious crisis in our finances. The Speech goes on to deal with the good crop of Manitoba, and my hon. friend from Haldimand also dilated at some length on this subject. True, Manitoba, this year, has been blessed by a superabundant crop. But the blessing of God has been taken away by the hand of man. In what has the position of the people of Manitoba, to-day, with bountiful crops, been better than it was with the scanty crops of years past? Has it been better for their wheat to stand around the stations of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to be wasted by frost, by rain or by roving animals? The evils of monopoly, of which the people of Manitoba have been complaining for so many years, were never so apparent as they have been this year. In former years the monopoly worked to the injury of the people by the increase of prices, but this year the monopoly is sending to waste what it cannot carry. When the Canadian Pacific Railway contract was under discussion, it was felt that the monopoly clause was an evil, but it was distinctly provided that the monopoly was restricted to the Territories, and that it could not affect either the Province of Manitoba or the Province of Ontario, which were exempted by name. In the language of the First Minister, it was stated that they could not check Manitoba, that the legislative power was supreme in its sphere in each Province, and could not be interfered with; but afterwards, in violation of the pledge given to the country, Manitoba was checked and the monopoly was extended over the whole Province. That was not only a fault but a crime, and I say the conduct of the Government is beyond the expression of any adequate condemnation at this time. If we want to know how far the Government is guilty towards Manitoba, let us compare their own railway policy in other parts of the country with their policy in Manitoba. We have adopted a policy of subsidising railways. We have been subsidising all sorts of railways. We have made it part of our policy to subsidise all kinds of railways, from interprovincial lines, or international lines, down to small microscopical lines three miles long, and the reason which has been given has been that these lines were necessary for the development of the settlement of the country. Let me quote here the reason given by the Minister of Railways in introducing one of the Bills with which we have become so familiar. In 1886 he said:

"We find, particularly in the Province of Quebec, that this policy was necessary to restrict the emigration of our own people to the United States. It has been thrown to us across the House by the Opposition that we ought to do something to retain these people in this country, that we ought to be doing something further than building great lines of railway from one end to the other of the country."

So he admits that something must be done to keep our own people within our own limits. Then he says:

"The time is gone by when the country could be opened up by means of turnpike roads. What turnpike roads were to this country forty years ago, railways are to-day, so that there is no possibility of keeping our own people at home except by opening up the country by railways, so as to give them facilities for inter-communication."

Here the Government admit that railways are a necessity for the development of the country. The people of Manitoba are of the same mind with the hon. gentleman. They also believe that railways are a necessity to develop the settlement of the country. But what is the Govern-

Mr. LAURIER.

ment doing? While at one end of the country they subsidise railways with the idea that they will develop the settlement of the country, in Manitoba they crush every effort which is made by the people of that country to build railways for that purpose. Instances are not wanting in history where a tyrannical Government has wrung from the people the earnings obtained by their labor, but it was left for the Government of Canada to do its best and exert its power to crush and to stifle the energy and labor of the people of a Province. I think this is one of the worst forms of misgovernment which has ever been known in any country. When we have come to this point, when rings and combinations can take advantage of the law to oppress the people, when monopolies are protected by the direct interference of the Government, using and abusing the constitutional power given to them, when individuals are made wealthier at the expense of the community, when taxation has been unduly increased, and when the resources upon which we depended to meet the liability are dissipated, when our country is unable to retain its own population, I say the time has come for gentlemen on the other side to cease their boasting and self-glorification, and for the people of this country to open their eyes and say that a new departure must be made from the policy which we have been following for the last ten years. Further than this to-day I will not go. I have said that a change has become absolutely necessary to the well-being of this country. Further than that I will not go. I will follow the almost invariable practice of late years of not moving any amendment to the Address, and will wait for a future day to propose what, on this side of the House, we consider is necessary in the present condition of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As the hon. gentleman has announced that no amendment is to be moved, I may congratulate him on following out what, I think, is a very laudable practice in that regard, and it will not be necessary for me to occupy the time of the House very long in respect to his remarks. I congratulate him upon taking the position he now occupies, and upon the ability which he has displayed in his speech, which, instructive as it is in some parts, shows that he is going to fill that position worthily; and I hope and I believe that he and the leader for the present of the ministerial majority will preserve such relations as to the public business of the country as is usual in England and has been generally in Canada. While offering my sincere congratulations to the hon. gentleman on his appointment to the position he holds, I can agree with him that it is to be regretted on many accounts that the absence of Mr. Blake—we may use his name in his absence—has caused the hon. gentleman opposite to be elevated to his present position. Mr. Blake is a distinguished man, he is a man who would be a credit to any country, from his ability, from his eloquence and from his devotion to public affairs. We have not had the good fortune to agree in our political course from the time he entered Parliament, but I have at all times been ready to pay a just tribute to his great abilities and to the earnestness with which he has paid attention to public matters. I can also more than agree with the hon. gentleman and with my hon. friends behind me, in the regret which they have expressed as to the approaching departure of the present representative of the Sovereign in this country. He has won the hearts of the people of Canada, he has acted the part of a constitutional Governor; he has taken great interest in the development of the country, in all its material aspects and in the encouragement of the arts and mechanical development of the country, but more especially in literature, and all that tends to elevate a nation more than mere material prosperity. I, as having been his adviser during the whole of the period he has been in Canada, could speak much more strongly; I could attest to his devotion to

his duties, to the earnestness with which he addressed himself to every subject of public interest, and more than all, to the great ability with which that earnestness was directed. I am greatly relieved from the necessity of answering my hon. friend opposite by the speeches of the mover and second to-day. They have discussed all these subjects and pressed them upon the consideration of the House in a manner which must meet with the general approbation of the majority of this House, and, I believe, with the approbation of the people of this country. They have shown, in contrast with the despondent wail of my hon. friend, despondent for very many causes—a very natural despondency—they have stated their opinion that this is a happy, that this is a prosperous, country, and that this is a satisfied and contented people. Mr. Speaker, at first, when the hon. gentleman began to speak, I thought the millennium had come, since the measures that were to be submitted so completely met his views, that as he had to make a speech, he addressed himself to the Speech from the Throne of last year. He told us that we were full of good intentions but that we did not carry those good intentions into execution. Well, among the good intentions which he desired to be carried into effect, is, in the first place, the establishment of the Department of Trade and Commerce. I thought for a few moments that he approved of that, because we were to cut off the heads of the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Customs. We ought to have done that, and yet the hon. gentleman said he did not want to have it done. Therefore, instead of making it a matter of charge against us, he ought to have said—I did not observe that he did—that we had learned wisdom from the Opposition, that although numerically small, they were intellectually great, their judgments were great; and that, although armed with a greater numerical strength in this House, we had yielded to the arguments of the intellectual Opposition on the other side, and had reviewed our legislation. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, that is not exactly the case. The hon. gentleman will not dispute that, for many years, the different Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade have asked for a Department of Trade and Commerce; he will not dispute, I think, that the Government had a right, and were fully justified, in asking Parliament, in obedience to this general desire, to establish such bureau, to establish such department; and, therefore, the only charges he can bring against us is that we have not carried it out this year. Well, if the hon. gentleman will look at the Act he will see that the Government took, with the consent of Parliament, the power of judging when that department should be established. There is a little clause at the end of that Act which provides that it shall be brought into effect whenever His Excellency the Governor General shall proclaim that it ought to be brought into effect. One reason, perhaps—I merely suggest it to the hon. gentleman because I am not going to let him into the inner circle—I will suggest that one reason why the Department of Trade and Commerce has not yet been established, is that, though we have not a Minister of Trade and Commerce, yet the administration of the affairs was so good, the devotion to the matters of trade and commerce was so complete, that we have ceased to see the necessity of filling the new Department, and there has not been from one single Chamber of Commerce, from one single Mechanics' Institute, from one single body of workingmen, a request that that bureau should be brought into force at once. And so, Mr. Speaker, we have got liberty from the Boards of Trade and Commerce, the permission of the whole of the commercial and manufacturing bodies of Canada, to select our own time, to select our own opportunity for bringing that Act into force. The hon. gentleman would seem to be anxious—although he rather objected to the use of that phrase as applied to my hon. friends the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue—to have their heads cut off. Well, if he will look

at the Act he will find a little clause declaring that the Act shall not be brought into force until the necessity for it is proclaimed by the Governor General. Now, we believe ourselves to be a Government with considerable foresight, we like to look ahead, we do not go on from day to day, but we desire to forward the better organisation of the various departments of the Government when the necessity exists. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we could well dispense with my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. Although I say it in his presence, I believe that his administration of that Department has been so able, so earnest, and so zealous, that the whole body of the honest traders of this country would regret if that hon. gentleman gave up that position.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not much.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has protected the honest trader, he has put down the dishonest trader, he has not allowed the smuggler or the dishonest merchant—if he can be dignified by the name of merchant—to continue his practices; he has not allowed false invoices, he has not allowed false statements, he has followed with just punishment every effort to defraud the revenue; and the National Policy which the hon. gentleman now decries, although at one time he was a strong advocate of it, and the tariff regulations would have been of no value if it had not been protected by the action of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. He has met, I say, with general acceptance from the whole of the commercial classes of Canada, and until my hon. friend is disposed to apply otherwise his great abilities, there is no hurry for bringing that Act I speak of into operation. And so I say with respect to the Department of Inland Revenue, the revenue has been protected to the utmost extent, and the department most efficiently administered. The hon. gentleman speaks of the Solicitor Generalship that it was not brought into play. I dare say my hon. friend and colleague, the Minister of Justice, when the time comes, will be able to defend his course in refraining from filling that office. But the hon. gentleman is mistaken in his statement that the legislation is identical or equivalent to the proposition made years ago when Mr. Mackenzie was at the head of the Government. If the hon. gentleman will compare the two propositions he will find that they are not identical, and the objections taken then against that Bill do not apply to the Bill introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. On the whole, I cannot complain of the remarks of the hon. gentleman with respect to the Speech from the Throne. He says he thinks the election law requires amendment. We agree, therefore, as to the necessity of the action of the Government in that regard, and when the Bill comes down I hope we may get the assistance of the hon. gentleman in amending the Act, and that he may forget for a moment that he is the leader of the Opposition and play the role of a patriot.

Mr. LAURIER. If you will follow my suggestions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then the hon. gentleman objects to the manner of appointing revising officers and wants them to be officers holding fixed positions.

Mr. LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, and the revising officers be selected from among those appointed by the provincial authorities, men often bitterly hostile to the majority of this House, bitterly hostile to the Conservative party,—and the hon. gentleman is anxious for the appointment of men who will at all events give but a scanty measure of justice to Conservative candidates at the polls. The hon. gentleman would have those officials appointed; but the party to which he belongs in his own great Province of Quebec sometimes takes a different course. Look across

the River Ottawa. There is a sheriff and a registrar, and if I am not very much mistaken those officers are the officers who ought to perform the duties of returning officers, and yet I believe that those two officers were informed that they must decline to accept the office of returning officer under pain of dismissal by the Government of the day, so that the friends and supporters of the Government of the day might be appointed to fill them, and they did so of course. I would ask if there is not a sufficient justification as to the manner in which the present Government have exercised the power given to them by statutes to appoint returning officers in the fact that, although we have had an enormous crop of election petitions, although corruption and bribery have been charged against candidates on both sides, although a good many, some of whom were from the other side and of the party of purity, have been unseated, yet not one petition has alleged impropriety of conduct on the part of the returning officers chosen and selected by this Government. The hon. gentleman spoke about the Franchise Act, and he has said he hoped it will be repealed in 1889. Well, it may be repealed if the hon. gentleman is in power; but I think, to use Mr. Gladstone's celebrated phrase, that does not come within the limit of measurable possibilities. I am very glad the hon. gentleman and those who support him are about to adopt or have adopted, and will carry out, a judicious reticence respecting the Fishery Treaty. Of course, it would be premature to discuss it now, until the treaty itself and the papers are laid before the House; and even then, for reasons which will be obvious to leading members on the other side, a very considerable degree of caution with respect to the manner in which the discussion is carried on in the public interest should be observed. On that subject I hope to have an unofficial discussion with the hon. gentleman opposite. The hon. gentleman has endeavored to cast some degree of ridicule upon the prophecy which I ventured to make some years ago respecting the settlement of the North-West country. My estimates, although based on the reports of our various officers, I must admit have not been carried out. That they have not been carried out is in a very great degree due to the great earnestness, the great ability, and the great persistence with which hon. gentlemen opposite have expressed their views.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! Oh!

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but it is a laugh of the lip and is outward only. The hon. gentlemen know that to them is due the fact that the settlement of this country has been so long retarded.

Mr. LANDERKIN. By bad government we know it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says he knows it; it is well he knows something. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) has remarked the marvelous tenacity with which we proclaim the prosperity of this country. We proclaim it with considerable tenacity because we believe we are justified in doing so. But what is our tenacity compared with that of hon. gentlemen opposite, who from the time of Confederation down to this day, except during the five years when we enjoyed so much prosperity, when it was so much developed under the auspices of hon. gentlemen opposite, have kept up a constant wail about the miserable condition of this country, as to the wretched condition of the people, as to the increasing poverty and increasing dependence of our people. That doctrine has been proclaimed in this House, it has been proclaimed on public platforms, it has been stated in the Opposition press and on the hustings and everywhere, and yet the people of Canada are so utterly ignorant of their misery, so utterly blinded to their misfortunes and the wretchedness under which they suffer, that they discard all the prophecies of hon. gentlemen opposite and they venture,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

also unconscious of their doom as a victimised people—the victims being the people of Canada—to act as they did on the 22nd February last, as they did in 1882 and as they did in 1878, to support this party which persistently is ruining the country. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a free country. The people have a right to ruin themselves if they wish, and the people of Canada have, beyond a doubt, declared that ruin at our hands is preferable to prosperity at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. There is a difference of opinion as to what prosperity is, and as to what misfortune and calamity mean, and we happen to differ in opinion; the majority carries the day, and here we are governing the country. By the same token, referring to the elections on the 22nd of February last, there has been some elections since then; and, strange to say, such is the blindness of the people of Canada, although they have the advantage of common schools, of model schools, of high schools and of universities, and in fact every mode of instruction is afforded to the people, yet with all these advantages of education to bring them up to the right consideration of what the interests of Canada are, they deliberately prefer all this ruin at our hands than to take blessings from the hands of the hon. gentlemen and those who fight the battles behind them. Was it not enough to cause the hon. gentleman, if he felt called upon to use strong language, to use that language against the ignorance of the people who have decided in favor of the National Policy, who preferred a vicious economical system to a system of free trade, by which our industries and our trade would be thrown open to foreigners to compete against our own people? As I said a little while ago, the hon. gentleman was strongly in favor of the National Policy. The hon. gentleman's language is on record, and he spoke as strongly as I ever did, and a great deal more strongly in favor of it; and it has been cast up to me that I desired not an increased protection but only a readjustment. Well, I did say that we wanted a readjustment, and the readjustment was simply this: to increase the duty on articles we could manufacture ourselves, and take the duties off articles we could not manufacture or produce in this country. But the hon. gentleman was a protectionist of pure blood, and now, perhaps through the inevitable pressure of his political position, he is obliged to give up his old predilections and his own political opinions, and to declare that what he once said was an absolute requisite to the fiscal system of this country is a vicious economical policy. You know the story of the man in the lunatic asylum. I do not at all mean to say that my hon. friend is not in possession of all those great abilities and intellectual powers which have distinguished him since he has been in this House; I merely mention this story as an illustration. The man in the lunatic asylum was asked why he was there: "Well," he said, "it all arises from a difference of opinion; the people think I am mad, and I think all the people are mad, and the majority have carried it, and I am here." So my hon. friend thinks we have a vicious economical policy, the majority is against him, and he is there. The hon. gentleman also speaks about our wasteful expenditure in the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which he says was built far too fast and cost far too much money and, perhaps, too much land. Well, Sir, suppose the policy of the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member had been carried out, what would have been the position of affairs to-day? How would a crop of the North-West be got down to the sea-board? There have been about 12,500,000 bushels of wheat, or 400,000 tons, to be brought out of the North-West this year. Now, the water-stretches, with railways here and there, were promised to be capable of moving forty tons a day; so that to remove the whole of this season's crop would require 10,000,

days, or, taking the season of navigation, 66½ years. And, to-day, the people of the North-West are crying out against the monopoly, and are saying that half-a-dozen other railways should be built instead of one. Yet the hon. gentleman, in the face of these facts, in the face of the enormous agricultural development of the North-West, and in the face of the magnificent crop which has over-taxed all our means of transport, ventures to get up and impugn the policy of the Government in building so speedily the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman is a French Canadian and of French descent, and if it were not that he is so solid a Liberal, I would almost call him a Bourbon who remembers nothing and forgets nothing. Well, Mr. Speaker, having made these few imperfect remarks in answer to the hon. gentleman, I would simply say that, as we are commencing pleasantly, I hope we shall address ourselves to the business of the country with the same disposition. I have no doubt with the energy, the zeal, and the ability of the gentlemen on that side of the House, we shall be criticised, and we invite criticism, and more than that, we challenge criticism, and our challenge I have no doubt will be accepted by the hon. gentlemen. I have only to say let us have a fair field, and let the best man win.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman had continued to confine himself to the tone with which he commenced his remarks, I do not know that a single word further would have been said on this side of the House; but so far from doing that, the hon. gentleman has, within the last few minutes, assumed to lay on the shoulders of the Opposition the charge that we, forsooth, are responsible for the fact that, to-day, as my hon. friend truly said, not by tens, nor by scores, nor by hundreds or thousands, but by millions, the people of Canada, to whom Canada belongs, have found it impossible to maintain a home in Canada. Sir, we accept the challenge of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman, as we know, is much more prone to make calculations, such as those my hon. friend exposed a few minutes ago, than he is to state the real facts which he, as a prominent statesman of this country, ought to know. But if he wants to know what was the exact movement of population in the Province to which he and I belong, during the period from 1874 to 1879, when my hon. friend Mr. Mackenzie was responsible for the administration of the business of this country, and its movement during the last six or eight years, for which he and his policy are answerable, I can tell him in a few words. During the four or five years when Mr. Mackenzie presided over the destinies of this country, the agricultural population of the great Province of Ontario, of which alone we possess accurate statistics, increased just six times as fast as the returns show it has increased during the seven or eight years the hon. member for Kingston has been responsible for our affairs. Now, Sir, I do not want at present to inflict on the House minute statistics showing the movement of population, but I can tell this House that of some 440 rural municipalities in the Province of Ontario, scarcely twenty can be found in which during the seven or eight years that have elapsed since the hon. gentleman's return to power the total growth has equalled the natural increase of the population. Such a statement as that alone far more than bears out the contention of my hon. friend that, from whatever cause it may arise, whether partly from natural causes or partly from misgovernment on the part of those entrusted with the affairs of Canada, we are in a situation which no man who regards the real welfare of Canada can consider to be wholesome or healthy. During that interval, in spite of our remonstrances, in spite of the protest of those who knew what was going on, the hon. gentleman has persisted in the mischievous policy of expending very large sums of public money to bring into the country immigrants whom, when

they do come, he cannot keep here. Our census returns show that of these immigrants who have been brought in at an enormous expense, three out of four have gone to the United States. I say that these things were not caused, and the proof I have given is ample to show that they were in no respect caused, by the policy of my hon. friend, who, I am sorry to say, is unable to be present to-day. They have resulted, to a very great extent, from the mischievous policy which my hon. friend has rightly denounced, a policy of enormously increasing the debt and taxes of the country, at the very moment when the great country to the south of us is enormously reducing both. Time and again I have shown on the floor—and no man has yet been able truthfully to contradict my statements—that whereas the hon. gentleman entered office under circumstances which gave us an enormous advantage over the United States, the position of things to-day is that in Canada we have totally, utterly, absolutely reversed those advantages; and we are to-day, relatively to the United States, in just the same disadvantageous position as that in which they were relatively to us some twenty years ago. That, I suppose, is to be advanced as a proof of the marvellous foresight the hon. gentleman has just claimed for himself. The hon. gentleman is good enough to tell us that this is a free country, that we are free to ruin ourselves if we like. Well, that is pretty nearly the only freedom of those we formerly enjoyed which the hon. gentleman has left us. Canada is not a country to-day in which a man is free to buy or sell where he pleases, or free to build a railroad out of his own money. Canada is not a country in which those constitutional rights for which our forefathers fought and bled are any longer respected; and I say my hon. friend is strictly right when he says that such a gross and infamous tyranny as that which the hon. gentleman has been perpetrating on the people of Manitoba, has never been and would not be tolerated in any other country in the world possessing representative institutions. I defy the hon. gentleman and his friends to point out to me in any country under heaven, having representative institutions, another instance in which the Government have given a monopoly extending over 2,000 miles to a private corporation, and have impudently disallowed, contrary to all constitutional usage and precedent, contrary to the spirit and essence of our constitution, the right of the people of that Province, at their own cost and charge, without appealing to us for one penny of subsidy, to build a railroad in order to relieve themselves from that intolerable oppression. I wonder that the hon. gentleman, knowing, as he must have known, the facts with respect to this harvest in Manitoba, has asked to receive with pleasure His Excellency's assurances that the harvest of Manitoba and the North-West has been one of remarkable abundance. I advise the hon. gentleman to read the report of the Board of Trade of the city of Winnipeg on that subject. If he will read that report, made by men of every conceivable shade of politics in the Province, he will learn that while Providence has blessed the country with a most abundant harvest, the dog-in-the-manger policy, sanctioned and enforced by the hon. gentleman, has had the result that at hundreds of stations throughout the country, tens of thousands of bushels of the finest grain in the world are to-day lying rotting in the streets, unable to find a market. That is the direct result of the policy of the hon. gentleman. And if, as the temper displayed in the recent elections in Manitoba goes to show, the people there have become convinced that their only chance of redress lies in asserting their rights at any cost; the hon. gentleman has incurred a great and grave responsibility by persisting in the disallowance which we, on this side, endeavored in vain to remove during the course of last Session. I was amused to hear the hon. gentleman enter into a computation, which I do not take the trouble to

check, touching the amount of grain that can be transported by the water stretches in 66½ years. All I can say is he must have been thinking of the period which must elapse before the smallest fragment of his \$71,000,000 would be realised by the people of this country. I observe also that the hon. gentleman, and perhaps with some reason, alluded, not at very great length, but still rather pointedly, to the result of certain bye-elections which had taken place. I think that, considering the hon. gentleman has beside him two colleagues, at least, who have shared the fate of war, he might have considered their feelings before calling their attention to the results which sometimes flow from the indiscreet actions of agents and others engaged in elections. In the hon. gentleman's own case I observe that very recently—I suppose I will be pardoned for referring to what took place in the recess—he congratulates himself and his hearers, with good cause, on the fact that this time, at any rate, he was not found guilty of corrupt practices. Practice makes perfect. The hon. gentleman was caught twice, but I am bound to say that he was not caught for the third time. No doubt the hon. gentleman on that occasion was pardonably proud of the victory he had achieved. It was, no doubt, a remarkable one. Here is the hon. gentleman—whose constituent, by the by, I am, and I hope he will remember that fact if I have any application to make to him—here is the hon. gentleman, the Premier of the Dominion, with the power, the prestige, the influence of the position of Premier, returned to a seat which he had represented by great majorities for twenty-five or thirty years—he will correct me if I am wrong.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A good long time at any rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman, the Premier of Canada, succeeds in defeating an absent man by a majority of 12 in that constituency, which, six weeks before, had returned a friendly supporter of the hon. gentleman to the Local House by a majority of 180. It was a great victory, and he has very good ground to be very proud of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another reason why he should be proud of it. I, as I say, am a constituent of the hon. gentleman. I know something of the position of parties in the city of Kingston, and I notice a remarkable thing. There were about one hundred non-residents in Kingston. These are generally pretty well divided between the two parties and there is not much difficulty in knowing, as we are all aware, their opinion; and it must have been a comfort to the hon. gentleman to know that he owes his return to the fact that, while only ten of those non-residents voted for his opponent, fifty-one came from the ends of the earth to vote for him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, the hon. gentleman is quite right. It is a feather in his cap here. We had these men, we had these poor men, we had these men to whom days' wages were matters of great importance, these men to whom the price of a railway ticket there and back was of great importance; we had these men coming, I am told, from Texas, from Port Arthur, from Watertown, in the State of New York, from Rochester, from Chicago, from east and from west, from north and from south, all spurred by a noble ambition to sacrifice their time and their money and to vote for the hon. gentleman. There are few of us who could attract so much enthusiasm, and it was interesting to see how this hon. gentleman's friends acted in the role of good Samaritans, how they met these poor strangers at the railway stations, drove them to the polls, fed and lodged them, and, in accordance with scriptural precedent, lent them twopence, which I see by the record

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

means \$15 of Canadian currency, to pay their way. So the hon. gentleman is quite justified in demanding our congratulations, which I freely tender to him, on the marvellous victory he achieved on that occasion. Now, I have heard that the hon. gentleman is a changed man. I sincerely trust that is so, and I sincerely trust that, in regard to these several measures for the improvement of our Election Act, and for the improvement of the trial of controverted elections and other things which are promised us here, we are going at length and at last to have some substantial tokens of the right hon. gentleman's penitence; I trust that he will at once do away with the Gerrymander Act, even if he will not abolish the Franchise Bill. I am very sorry—I am afraid it is an instance of back-sliding on the part of the hon. gentleman—that he cannot see his way to deprive himself of the means which he has taken in certain counties, and notably the County of Queen's, N. B., to promote perfect impartiality in the returning officers by allowing the candidate supporting the Ministry of the day to select his own returning officer and his deputy returning officers too. The hon. gentleman dwelt at length on the power which was vested in those pernicious Local Governments, who do not seem, by the way, to share that confidence in the hon. gentleman which, he says, the people of Canada seem to entertain, to select permanent officers to discharge these duties. But my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) did not say anything about officers in the employment of the Local Governments. The right hon. gentleman chose, for his own purposes, to add to what my hon. friend said on that subject. What we ask is that we should have returning officers, and deputy returning officers, in whose action both sides could have some reasonable amount of confidence. The right hon. gentleman says that no complaints have been made as to the action of returning officers, but, while that may be true, it has been in the power of the candidate to nominate a score of deputy returning officers who are not likely to be over-scrupulous, as has been shown on several occasions, in the way in which they will promote the return of their patron for the time being. I agree with the right hon. gentleman in part that this is not a fit time, in fact that it is not possible for us now, to discuss the details of the Fishery Treaty, but I do not think that the hon. gentleman is entitled on that ground to expect that no attention should be called to the patent and apparent fact that, whatever may be said as to the merits of that treaty in itself, that treaty is hopelessly, utterly inconsistent with the position which was taken one bare year ago by the hon. gentleman himself, according to the Minutes brought down to us in the blue book which I have here in my desk; nor is he entitled to say that we are going out of the record when we call attention to the fact, whatever may be the merits or demerits of the question, that this treaty, as far as we are advised, has not settled anything. The hon. gentleman and his friends contended, no doubt with great force, for many things which they and we have always agreed were the real and absolute property of the people of Canada, and I can see on the face of it no sort of recognition of the things for which the hon. gentleman contended. I say that either the hon. gentlemen were most grossly in the wrong before, if this treaty be an honorable and satisfactory settlement; or, if they were right before, then I wonder how they, after having His Excellency's signature to these several Minutes which I have alluded to, can come down to us and venture to hope that the House will consider this an honorable and satisfactory settlement. Let them take their choice. One of two things has occurred: either they have most needlessly run frightful risks, have subjected this country to needless humiliation, or, failing that, it will be excessively difficult for them to explain why we should accept this as a just settlement of the claims which Canada has preferred. Nevertheless, in answer to the hon. gentleman's appeal, I do not propose to go further on that

subject at this moment, but I do hope and I do expect that the hon. gentleman will place the House at the earliest possible moment in full possession of all these facts and of all these papers to which he has alluded, and will at an early date give us an opportunity of having the fullest discussion on this most important question. I will say this for myself, that I am now, as I always have been, prepared to go as far as any man can possibly go in endeavoring to conciliate the good-will of the great nation beside us. I regard that as a matter of incalculable value to Canada, although I may differ extremely from the hon. gentleman in regard to the mode in which he has been attempting to obtain it. I am afraid that, when these matters come to be considered, the best that we can say will be that possibly out of this evil some good may come, and that possibly the people of Canada may at last find that it is necessary for them to assert their right, in all matters relating to their trade and commerce in North America, to manage their own affairs in the fullest extent. I believe, and I have good reason for believing, that, if that negotiation could have been entrusted wholly and entirely to Canadian hands, very much greater and better results would have accrued to us from such conduct than have resulted in the present instance. I fear that our cause was prejudged by some, at all events, of those to whom it was entrusted, long before they touched the shores of this continent, and that they had then made up their minds that no interests of ours should be allowed to interfere with the supposed interests of the parent country.

Mr. MITCHELL. I believe an agreement has been arrived at by the leaders of both sides to close this debate at 6 o'clock, and, therefore, although I would like to say something criticising some of the views of the right hon. gentleman and criticising also and differing from the views of the two gentlemen who have spoken on the Opposition side, time will not allow of it, because I do not want to prolong the discussion, especially as it would not be fair to discuss the terms of the treaty until we have some further information before us. I must thank the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) for the manner in which he referred to me in this connection, and I must congratulate both the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) and the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas) for the able way in which they performed the important duty of placing the views of the Government of the day before this House. I do not agree with the statement contained in the Speech that both nations will be satisfied with this treaty. I do not agree with that. The treaty does not strike me as being in the interest of Canada; I do not see that concessions are made to Canada. But as I said before, I would merely wish to put my statements on record as dissenting from the declaration of satisfaction which is affirmed in the Address, and which is supposed to represent the opinion of the whole House. I will make no further remarks on this subject than to thank the House for giving me an opportunity of setting myself right in reference to the discussion which may come up after the papers are laid upon the Table. There are a variety of other matters in this Speech to which I also take objection. I think that the reference to the increase of trade requires the most close examination at our hands, and that some steps ought to be taken which would lead to that result. But looking at the clock, it is impossible that we can deal with these subjects now, and I merely make these statements in order that it might not be said hereafter that I sat silent, and by my silence gave assent to the statements contained in the Queen's Speech with reference to this particular subject. There is another thing I want to say. I do not like these arrangements made by the leaders of the two great parties in this House, and although I am generally in pretty good accord in voting with the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, there were some statements made

by the hon. gentleman in my eye in relation to the railway policy of this Government, and also in relation to the National Policy, which I do not entirely agree with. Now, Sir, I will say in relation to the National Policy, that I was one who supported the right hon. gentleman in 1878, and was defeated on it. I also supported him in 1882, as an independent member, on his National Policy. But, Sir, the National Policy of 1878 is not the National Policy of to-day. When they put twenty-five per cent. on goods consumed in this country, is that to be compared with the duties which they impose to-day? I am credibly informed by some respectable merchants in Montreal that the present tariff amounts to 145 per cent. upon certain classes of goods. Is that the National Policy I supported in 1878 and 1882? No, Sir, it is not. I wish to put myself right upon that point. And then in relation to the railway policy, I differ somewhat from my hon. friend. I believe the policy pursued by the Government of the right hon. gentleman is correct in constructing a railway from one side of this continent to the other. I have supported them in that policy all through, but I must say in relation to some portions of their policy, it may be that we shall have to explain why it is that we cannot go on giving them complete support. Just one thing more. The right hon. gentleman has pointed out what he thinks has created the prosperity of this country. He has ventured to say that the reason why the North-West country is not as prosperous now as he claims it ought to be, lies at the door of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, who, as he says, have decried that country. Well, Sir, it may be that there is some blame attaching to them in that respect; it may be that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have too often condemned the measures which were proposed by the Government. But I tell the right hon. gentleman that the cause of the retarded settlement in the North-West during the past few years is the misgovernment and mismanagement of his Government, which led to a rebellion in which they spent \$7,000,000. That is the real cause why the country has been kept in a backward state for the past four or five years; and if the hon. gentleman had paid more attention to the administration and the conduct of the public business of that country, he would have prevented the rebellion, and we would not now have to deplore the unfavorable accounts of that country which are now going abroad and retarding immigration. But on all those subjects I shall take another opportunity of saying something during the progress of the Session.

Paragraphs 1 to 13, inclusive, agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That the said resolutions be referred to a Select Committee composed of Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Hector Langevin, and Messrs. Montague and Joncas, to prepare and report the draft of an Address in answer to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

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

SUPPLY.

Mr. BOWELL moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. BOWELL moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Mr. BOWELL moved :

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

REPORT.

Report, Returns and Statistics of the Inland Revenues of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1887.—(Mr. Costigan.)

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 6:10 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 27th February, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

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

Hon. Sir CHARLES TUPPER, G.O.M.G., Member for the Electoral District of Cumberland, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Hon. Mr. Thompson.

Major General JOHN WIMBURN LAURIE, Member for the Electoral District of Shelburne, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper.

REPORTS.

Report of the Minister of Justice as to Penitentiaries in Canada, for the year ended 30th June, 1887.—(Mr. Thompson.)

Annual Report of the Minister of Public Works, for the fiscal year 1886-87, on the works under his control.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

Annual Report of the Department of Militia and Defence of the Dominion of Canada, 31st December, 1887.—(Sir Adolphe Caron.)

The Public Accounts of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1887.—(Sir Charles Tupper)

Report of the Auditor General on Appropriation Accounts, for the year ended 30th June, 1887.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior, for the year 1887.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Tables of the Trade and Navigation of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1887, compiled from Official Returns.—(Mr. Bowell.)

Mr. MITCHELL.

CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That the certificate of the Honorable Mr. Justice Osler, dated the 17th day of November last, in the matter of the controverted election for the Electoral District of the County of Kent, in the Province of Ontario, which was laid before the House on the 23rd instant, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He said: This seat, as is known, was vacated on trial, and the judge's report is as follows:—

"That there is reason to believe that corrupt practices have prevailed extensively at the said election.

"I am not, however, of opinion (so far as I can form an opinion from anything which came before me on the trial) that the enquiry into the circumstances of the election has been rendered incomplete by the action of any of the parties to the petition, or that further enquiry as to whether corrupt practices have prevailed extensively is desirable, by which term I understand likely to prove useful or effectual."

If it had not been for the last portion of the certificate which I have just read there would not have been any doubt that a writ could not issue except by the House. The 48th clause of the Controverted Elections Act, Revised Statutes, is as follows:—

"When the judge, in his report on the trial of an election petition under this Act, states that corrupt practices have, or there is reason to believe that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed at the election to which the petition relates and that he is of the opinion that the enquiry into the circumstances of the election has been rendered incomplete by the action of any of the parties to the petition, and that further enquiry as to whether corrupt practices have extensively prevailed is desirable, no new writ shall issue for a new election in such case except by order of the House of Commons."

It would appear that in any of these cases the writ must be hung up until the House orders its issue. However, there has been a difference of opinion in the matter, and some authorities, and important authorities, state that under the construction of the whole of the clause in Chapter 9, read by the light of Chapter 10, which refers to the issue of commissions whenever the judge reports that the evidence has been incomplete, or that there is likely to have been some connivance between the parties, a Royal Commission can issue, and under that provision the Speaker cannot issue his writ without the assent of the House. It is under these circumstances that I make this motion.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the hon gentleman, under the circumstances, that as this is a motion which is somewhat obsolete, and that this is only the second instance I am aware of when a similar motion has come before the House, to let it stand until to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. LAURIER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. AMYOT moved first reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman might give us some idea of the nature of the Bill.

Mr. AMYOT. This Bill is the same as the one I presented last year, but it was too late in the Session to pass it through its various stages. Its object is to fix a uniform delay for the contestation of elections, and not to make the date depend on the publication of the return in the official Gazette.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPERVISION OF BANKS.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to adopt during this Session some measure for the better supervision of the Banks in the Dominion?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That subject is now occupying the attention of the Government.

Mr. INNES asked, Is it the intention of the Government, in view of the recent bank failures, to make any amendments to the General Banking Act this Session, or otherwise to have such legislation as will secure a more effective system of supervision and inspection for the chartered banks, more correct certified monthly returns, and generally for the better security of those whose money is invested in such institutions, as depositors or otherwise?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must give the same answer as I did to the previous question.

VESSELS WRECKED ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. DAWSON moved for:

Return showing the number of Canadian vessels lost or wrecked on the great lakes during the past season of navigation; also the number of lives lost in the case of each wreck; also a statement showing what, if any, steps have been taken to ascertain the cause of loss in each case.

He said: In making this motion I do not wish to put the Department to the trouble of giving any very lengthened report. All I should like to see would be a synopsis, something short, which would not occasion a very great deal of work in the Department, and still give the information required. Some years ago I drew attention to the great number of wrecks and losses that had occurred on the great lakes. Within a short time there had been no less than twelve large vessels lost, with a very large loss of life. In one case no less than 200 lives were lost, in another case 25 lives, in another five lives, in another 30 or 40 lives, and so on. The actual loss of life during that period could not be ascertained, but I believe that no less than 300 lives were lost in the waters of Algoma by the wreck of vessels. At that time I drew the attention of the Government to the necessity that existed for some mode of inspection, and I am happy to say that legislation took place which had a very good effect. Inspectors were appointed to examine the hulls. Before that there were only inspectors to examine the machinery. Hull inspectors were appointed, with the result that a great many of the unseaworthy vessels have been prevented from going out. But another set of circumstances has grown up since. The demand for vessels on the lakes for the last few years has been very great. The shipping on the lakes has largely increased, and the rates of freight have been so good that transportation has become remunerative where it scarcely paid at all before. The consequence is that a great many old hulks have been brought into use; vessels that had been for years under water have been raised and sent to the docks for repairs. While these vessels are being repaired, I think it is highly necessary that the hull inspector should examine them and see that they are well repaired and put in proper order. Now, Sir, as I understand, there are at this moment, in the docks and in the shipyards throughout Ontario—of course, I only speak of the lake marine, not of ocean vessels at all—there are now undergoing repairs in the various harbors and docks of Ontario, vessels that have been under water for years. The hull inspector was asked to visit them and make a report; he answered that he had no instructions to do so, and that no provision was made towards paying his expenses. Now, if I may be permitted to suggest a remedy, I think there should be some legislation which would prevent vessels from being sent out which were either overloaded or unseaworthy. The sending out of overloaded vessels is a common thing in Ontario. Old schooners are converted into barges, and these are put in tow of steamers, and the consequence is that when stormy weather comes on, they are cut loose from the steamers, and very often go to the bottom. Now, there was a case in

Ontario this year. A vessel called the *Oriental*, that was considered unseaworthy, was repaired to a certain extent so as just to be able to float. The register of this vessel was 375 tons. She was to be sent across the lake in tow of another vessel, loaded with 700 tons of coal, and, as the report is, she had only a few inches of what the sailors call "free board," that is, the space between the deck and the surface of the water. A storm came on, the steamer left her, and she cast anchor, as a matter of course, and soon went down with all on board. That is not a solitary case. There have been similar cases in Lake Superior. A vessel called the *Jane Hurlburt*, which was unseaworthy and had been used for carrying firewood, was sent out in tow of a steamer, in the fall of the year, to take a number of men down the lake coast. Encountering somewhat stormy weather, this vessel became unmanageable, as she had neither sail nor oar, nor a man on board who could manage her. When the storm came on, the captain of the steamer, in order to save his own vessel, cut the rope by which this vessel was attached to the steamer, and in a few minutes she went down with thirty people on board, all of them strangers in the country, poor navvies who were seeking for work. Sir, I could repeat a great many similar instances. The cause leading to all these accidents is the desire of making money by carrying freight, and these rotten old hulks are patched up and put in tow of old steamers. Now, a case occurred in Lake Superior this year. A vessel, or rather a barge, as those vessels are called, named the *Bessie Barwick*, was put in tow of a steamer, and a storm coming on, she was out adrift in Lake Superior, but, fortunately, she made the shore without loss of life. Again, we have the loss of the *California*, a Canadian vessel, in the Straits of Mackinaw. This vessel was evidently overloaded with wheat, and, in addition, carried no less than 700 barrels of pork as a deckload. Consequently, when she began to roll in the sea, the barrels of pork rolled to one side, and she reeled and sank. On that occasion I think some 13 or 14 lives were lost, and some were saved. I could repeat a good many more instances of the same kind, but what I wish to call attention to is that there should be some legislation which would enable the Government to appoint officials who would prevent vessels from going out either overloaded or in an unseaworthy condition. Now, I think that this duty might be performed at the different ports by Custom house officers. Any man can tell when a vessel is overloaded, and if the Custom house officer at any port saw a barge overloaded in tow of a steamer, he should have power to say, "You shall not go out in that condition and in this weather, because it is not safe. If there was some power of that sort given to the collectors of the different ports, I think the difficulty would be met; but at present the demand for vessels is so great that I am afraid that, during the coming season, unless something is done, the losses will be repeated on a far larger scale than hitherto. The Department of Marine has done a great deal for the lake navigation. We have had a hydrographic survey going on from year to year; rocks and shoals have been discovered which were never dreamed of, some of which, very probably, led to losses on former occasions. Perhaps the *Wabuno* struck on one of these rocks, and the *Asia* may have struck one of them. In the case of the *Wabuno*, not a single soul was saved; in that of the *Asia*, two got ashore. This hydrographic survey is doing an immense deal of good. I think, however, that the Department of Marine should take this matter up and provide means of inspecting vessels, as to how loaded, before they leave port, and should also give authority to someone at each and all of the different ports to prevent vessels from going out when in an unseaworthy condition, or too heavily laden. I may mention that in the United States they are no better off than we are. On the other side of the lakes a great many losses

have also occurred, and the matter has been brought before Congress by some of the representatives of the lake districts. As representing a lake district myself, I considered it my duty to bring this matter before Parliament. The losses on the other side have been even greater than on this side, and the representations I have referred to brought the matter forward with a view to obtaining legislation on the subject. It has been suggested that there should be line marks on the vessels, one for summer and one for fall, what is known as a Plimsoll line, that is, a line beyond which the vessel should not be loaded, one for the stormy weather in the fall and another for the summer season. I think if some such system were adopted, it would be the means of preventing the great loss of life that occurs; but, above all, let something be done to prevent these unseaworthy barges being towed by steamers, for they are sure to be cut adrift any moment a storm arises. That is the main thing to be provided against now, and if that were done I have no doubt the wants of navigation would be met.

Mr. FOSTER. The information for which the hon. gentleman has asked is now being printed or has been printed, in the report of the Department, which will be laid on the Table in a day or two. I suggest that the hon. gentleman allow his motion to stand until he sees that report, and if it does not include all the information desired, additional information will be brought down. I think, however, he will find everything required in the report.

Mr. DAWSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That a Special Committee of seven members be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees, ordered by the House on Thursday, the 23rd inst., and that Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Richard Cartwright and Messrs. McLellan, Howell, Laurier and Mills, do compose said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—THE FISHERIES TREATY.

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

Mr. LAURIER. May I ask the right hon. gentleman to explain why the Fisheries Treaty and papers have not yet been brought down; also when we may expect them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The papers are not yet complete.

Mr. LAURIER. Can we have them to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In a few days.

Mr. LAURIER. Nothing more precise than that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may be misinformed, but I saw it stated in an American newspaper that they had been presented to the Senate, protocols and all. Is that statement correct?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that that statement is not correct. I had a telegram from Mr. Bergae yesterday, saying that he expected to be able to send the final protocols to me in a day or two, that they would leave Washington to-morrow.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It is to be hoped they will improve by keeping.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We shall see.

Mr. DAWSON.

RETURN ORDERED.

Return showing the several sums of money paid in costs, counsel fees or otherwise, directly or indirectly, connected with the suit, "The St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Company vs. The Queen;" the party or parties to whom paid, the date of payment, and the several accounts paid, showing the full amounts paid and the dates of payments.—(Mr. McMullen.)

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 28th February, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD presented the Report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report lists of the Select Standing Committees for the present Session. He moved that the portion of the Report relating to the Committee on Standing Orders be adopted.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS.

Report of the Postmaster-General for the year 1887.—(Mr. McLellan.)

Report of the Secretary of State of Canada, for the year ended 31st December, 1887.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

DEBATES TRANSLATORS—QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to rise to a question of privilege. I am informed that you, Mr. Speaker, in the exercise of the power which you have assumed as Speaker of this House, have dismissed three of the translators of the Debates from the positions which they had received at the hands of the House. I may say at once, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to your decision, and in my humble judgment, that I have not the least doubt that you have exceeded your authority and invaded the privilege of this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman puts it, as I understand it, upon the ground that the Speaker has exceeded his authority?

Mr. LAURIER. Yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That will be a question of privilege. I have no doubt the Speaker will be quite ready to decide.

Mr. SPEAKER. The papers will be brought down to-morrow.

KENT (ONT.) CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir John A. Macdonald: That the certificate of the Honorable Mr. Justice Osler, dated the 17th day of November instant, in the matter of the controverted election for the Electoral District of the County of Kent in the Province of Ontario, which was laid before the House on the 23rd instant, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. LAURIER. I would call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to this matter again, and I believe that if he will take it into consideration once more, he will come to the conclusion that the writ ought to issue at once.

The general rule which is followed, and which is a matter of equity, is, that as soon as a vacancy occurs in the representation of the House, Mr. Speaker is to issue his warrant at once for a new election. The aim is to provide that no interregnum shall occur in the representation of this House. There is, however, an exception to this, and it is the only exception, so far as I am aware. If the vacancy occurs after the judgment of a court, and if the judge who has tried the petition, reports to the House that in his opinion there is cause to believe that extensive bribery and corrupt practices have prevailed, or that the enquiry has been rendered incomplete by the action of any of the parties to the petition, or that a further enquiry be desirable as to whether corrupt practices have extensively prevailed, then, in such a case, the Speaker has to withhold the issuing of a writ, and to await the action of the House, and under such circumstances the House alone is to order the issue of a new writ. Now, what is the reason of this exception? It is to be found in the subsequent Act, which is the "Act respecting enquiries into corrupt practices at Elections of Members of the House of Commons." This Act provides that whenever such a report as I have mentioned is made by a judge, that is to say, when a judge reports that, in his opinion, there have been extensive corrupt practices, or that the enquiry has been incomplete, and that it is desirable to have a further enquiry into the matter, then, upon an address, a Commission may issue further to investigate the matter, further to ascertain how far corrupt practices may have prevailed, and how far the electorate of the county has been affected by corruption, in order that the House, with the evidence before it, may judge whether extraordinary measures are necessitated. Now, in this case, it seems to me that the report made by the judge precludes the House from making any further enquiry. Now, although this matter may be, to a certain extent, left to the discretion of the House, although the statute does not say that, as soon as the judge has made such a report, the Commission is to issue, but the House itself is to say whether the Commission is to issue or not. Under all these circumstances great weight is to be attached to the opinion of the judge. So far as I have observed, whenever a judge has made such a report, if he made it simply in the language of the statute, adding nothing further, I would be disposed, for my part, to take the ruling of the judge and to say that under such circumstances the law and justice would be met by issuing a Commission just to ascertain how far corrupt practices have prevailed. But in this case the judge seems to have made a special report. He not only reported in the language of the statute, but he went beyond the language of the statute. The report made by the judge says:

"There is reason to believe that corrupt practices have prevailed extensively at the said election. I am not, however, of opinion (so far as I can form an opinion from anything which came before me on the trial) that the enquiry into the circumstances of the election has been rendered incomplete by the action of any of the parties to the petition, or that further enquiry as to whether corrupt practices have prevailed extensively is desirable, by which term I understand, likely to prove useful or effectual."

Now, it seems to me that in adding these words the judge has precluded that matter from going further, that is to say, his opinion can be accepted by this House and ought to be accepted by this House. He went further than the statute goes. I can understand that there might be some difficulty in the construction of this statute. It is not perhaps framed as happily as it might have been. These words added: "or that further enquiry as to whether corrupt practices have prevailed, is desirable," whether those terms apply only to a case when an enquiry has been prevented by the action of the parties, or whether they will also apply to this statute, that might perhaps be a subject for a argument and contention. But in this case, I think there is no ground for question. The

judge states that in this case, according to his opinion, not only further enquiry is not desirable, but he goes further and says that he does not believe that further enquiry would prove useful or effectual. Well, if in the opinion of the judge who tried the case, that there is no reason for further enquiry, that it would prove useless or ineffectual, I do not see that the House ought to go any further and order a new enquiry. The reference which was made by the right hon. gentleman was to ascertain whether, according to the terms of the statute, a Commission should issue. Now, if the writ is not to issue at present, if it is to be suspended, what can be the reason? Why should we delay the issuing of a writ and leave the county unrepresented, unless there is reason to suppose that a further enquiry may be necessary, in order to ascertain whether any extraordinary measure should be taken? But since the judge says that in his opinion no further enquiry is necessary, that it would prove useless and ineffectual, I think that under such circumstances we should accept his ruling and say that the writ shall issue, and that the county shall not be left unrepresented. We must remember that the judge said he had found certain parties guilty and had punished them, and that, after having exhausted the matter, he advises the House that it would be better to leave the matter where it is and to issue a new writ. We must remember that the judge has had this matter in hand, the trial seems to have been exhausted, nothing seems to have been left undone, all the circumstances must have been considered, the guilty parties seem to have been brought before him, and having all the facts and parties before him he says that, in his opinion, there is no occasion to go any further. I believe under such circumstances, were it not for the rider which the judge himself has placed in his report, I would be disposed to agree with the right hon. gentleman; but as there is such a rider the law may be allowed to take its course and the Speaker order the issue of the writ. If that rider were not in the report I would be glad to have agreed to the course suggested by the hon. gentleman, but as it is inserted there by the judge himself, the matter seems to be determined and a writ might issue at once without any further enquiry.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman, in discussing this question has to some extent misapprehended the reasons on which the motion has been founded. I think the hon. gentleman has been discussing it as if it were founded on a view of the practice in this case—as if it were proposed that the Committee on Privileges and Elections should be asked to consider the merits of this case of the riding of West Kent alone, and what should be done in regard to it. I think the object of the proposed reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections is somewhat wider than that. If it is not the first time this question has arisen, it is on very rare occasions that such a question does arise, and it is most important that Parliament should settle once for all what should be done when judges make a report like this in regard to the prevalence of corrupt practices at elections, and with this view the matter should be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I take a somewhat different view from the hon. gentleman, and without at all prejudging the conclusion which may be arrived at by the Committee on Privileges, I may put that view forward for the present as indicating what may be suggested in opposition to the hon. gentleman's line of argument, and it is this: The statute provides—and the hon. gentleman will indulge me in quoting it, because I am stating it from memory, and am only referring to those parts of the statute which may be pertinent to the present discussion—that when a judge reports the seat vacant, a writ may issue on the Speaker's warrant, except in two cases. One is the case in which a judge makes a report that corrupt practices have generally prevailed, and the other is the case in which he reports that

enquiry has been frustrated (I am paraphrasing the words of the Act, but I think I am not departing from the sense), and that some further enquiry is therefore necessary. I take it that in either of those two cases Parliament contemplated, in passing the Controverted Elections Act, that the hands of the Speaker should be stayed until the action of Parliament in regard to either of those questions was determined. In the first place because, if it be a case of corrupt practices having extensively prevailed, it is for Parliament to consider what remedy it will apply to that state of affairs in that constituency. It may overlook the fact that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed and order the writ to issue, as the hon. gentleman suggests it should do in this case. It may be, on the other hand, that the House will stay its hand and not order the writ to issue until a Bill has been introduced to disfranchise that constituency for a limited time, as has been done sometimes in the Imperial Parliament; or until a Royal Commission shall issue to ascertain to what extent corrupt practices have generally prevailed, in order that, if they have prevailed to an alarming extent, indicating a disposition in the county to frustrate the will of the constituency, a measure of disfranchisement may follow. So the object of having the judge report that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed may be, first, the introduction of a Bill for the disfranchising of the constituency on the judge's report, or second, the issue of a Commission of Enquiry to ascertain more fully than the judge has been able to do, in disposing of the petition which he had in hand, how far those corrupt practices have generally prevailed. In considering the report which the learned judge has sent in to this House we find, as the hon. gentleman has stated, that he has reported that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed. He has added, as the hon. gentleman has said, a rider stating that full enquiry has been made and no further enquiry is, in his opinion, necessary. I take it, that the judge's report in regard to further enquiry relates entirely to the enquiry before himself. It disposes of the second proposition put forward as an exception in the statute. The learned judge indicates that the trial of the election petition has proceeded without interruption before him, and he had all the evidence necessary to come to a conclusion, not only that the seat ought to be vacated, but to enable him to report that corrupt practices had generally prevailed at the election. But the rider which the judge has added can have no relation whatever to the enquiry which it is the right of this House to make as to how far corrupt practices have prevailed, and as to how far remedial legislation should be passed in regard to the constituency. It was entirely beyond the scope of the judge's enquiry to report in relation to any necessity for any further investigation, beyond those matters which were brought before him under the petition, and he certainly did not intend by that rider to intimate that there was no necessity for Parliament making any further enquiry, but that the writ should forthwith issue. That was a matter in reference to which he has no jurisdiction whatever, and I am sure he did not intend to suggest that. As a further illustration on the point, let me suggest to the House what the result would be of adopting, as a matter of course, the suggestion of the hon. gentleman that the writ should issue immediately on a report like this. It would entirely frustrate the operation of that portion of the section which makes exception of the case in which a judge reports that corrupt practices have generally prevailed. It would lead to this result: That when a judge reports that corrupt practices have generally prevailed, and that the enquiry before him has been conclusive as to the fact that corrupt practices have generally prevailed, that that fact is no longer in controversy, the provision of the statute that the issue of the writ shall be stayed by the report that corrupt practices have prevailed, is entirely frustrated. I do not mean

Mr. THOMPSON.

to say that the interpretation I have put forward is one that the House will adopt or the committee will adopt; but inasmuch as the statute is open to the construction and the report of the judge is a special one, I think it is but reasonable that the opinion of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which is in the habit of advising the House on questions referred to them, should be ascertained, so that in any such case the practice may be well understood. In this instance no inconvenience has been felt. The report of the judge was received but a short time before the opening of Parliament; but cases might assume much greater importance, if, shortly after prorogation, such a report was made and action was taken without the House having an opportunity to make enquiry or apply the remedy that Parliament, I think, intended should be in the hands of the House, whenever a judge reports that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed in a constituency.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think the action of the House is important in establishing a precedent which may probably be hereafter acted upon. If I understand the hon. gentleman correctly, he was of the opinion that the matter should be sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, because there was some doubtful point of law arising in regard to the statute. I understand that such is not now his desire, and I have failed to ascertain from the speech of the Minister of Justice exactly what were the reasons for proposing to refer it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. If the position taken was that the law was doubtful and that the House had a right to be advised by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, composed, as it is, almost entirely of lawyers, I think it was one that ought to be approved and adopted. The practice has been laid down lately by the British Parliament. I take it, that, under our statute, if a judge reports simply that there have been corrupt practices prevailing in the election, or that he has reason to believe that there have been corrupt practices prevailing, then it is the duty of those in charge of the proceedings of this House to propose, not that the House shall act on that report, for there is no evidence before it under which to act, but their duty is, and it is the practice in the British Parliament for the Attorney General to move for a Royal Commission to take evidence on the statement of the judge and report to the House, on which report a Bill is brought in to disfranchise the constituency, or other action is taken by the House. Here, if the learned judge had confined himself to reporting in compliance with the statute, that he had reason to believe that corrupt practices prevailed extensively, I take it that the hon. gentleman could not have referred it to the Elections Committee. There would have been nothing to refer. His course then would have been, in accordance with English precedents, to have moved for the issue of a Royal Commission. The House might, or might not, have assented to his proposition; that would have been a matter entirely in their discretion. In some cases they did accept the notice of the law officers of the Crown, and the Royal Commission issued. In other cases they did not accept it. The Act is, no doubt, defective in some respects, for the House had not the material to enable it to form a proper judgment. In this case I assume that both sides of the House will agree that it is important for the House to act promptly—that if an enquiry ought to be made, it should be made at an early date; and if we have anything on the record to lead us to the conclusion that an enquiry is unnecessary, we ought to have the writ issued without delay. It seems to me we have something on the record. After stating that there is reason to believe that corrupt practices have prevailed, the judge expresses the opinion that further enquiry as to whether corrupt practices have prevailed extensively is not necessary in the public interest. Well, the judge is the only person capable of forming an opinion on

that subject, for he is the only one who has the evidence before him, and therefore at his suggestion it would be proper for the Government to issue the writ. That opinion of the judge appears to be strengthened by statements in other parts of his report. It appears that only two voters were proved to have been guilty of corrupt practices, of whom one has been punished, and proceedings against the other are now pending. In these circumstances, in the face of the judge's advice to the House that, in his opinion, any further enquiry would be useless; in the absence of any statements from a responsible Minister that he has information justifying any further enquiry, and there being no legal question on which the Committee on Privileges and Elections should be called to pronounce, it seems to me that the more liberal and straightforward course for the House to take would be to order that the writ do issue at once. If the judge had not given us the information he has, I for one would have been inclined to favor the adoption of the English practice as the only proper one, namely, that a Royal Commission should issue, so that when we had the evidence before us we could form our own opinion as to whether the constituency should be disfranchised or not. The judge's opinion is not exactly limited as the Minister of Justice stated. It is as follows:—

"I am not, however, of opinion (so far as I can form an opinion from anything which came before me on the trial) that the enquiry into the circumstances of the election has been rendered incomplete by the action of any of the parties to the petition, or that further enquiry as to whether corrupt practices have prevailed extensively is desirable, by which term I understand likely to prove useful or effectual."

In the absence of other information, I think we ought to accept the judge's opinion, and if we do there is no other course open to us but to issue the writ. It seems to me, therefore, that the reference to the committee will only cause delay, incur a precedent which may not be desirable, and not be productive of any good.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand, from the hon. gentleman's speech, as well as from the speech of my hon. friend from Quebec, that they agree that the matter is a matter for the House and not for the Speaker.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is to say, the warrant could not issue from the Speaker on the report, but it was an action for the House. If that is the case, the House has to deal with the matter. I contend, as I have always contended, that the House ought not in any case to interfere when a point of law is raised, without the advice of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which is a body specially chosen from the legal experts on both sides of the House to advise the House in all such cases. I think it is of very great importance that the rule should be invariable, that when any question of this kind comes before the House, on which there can be any doubt whatever, the House should get the assistance of the standing committee which it has appointed for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not understand, from the observations which have been made on either side of the House, that there is any matter in doubt. The judge has reported that, in his opinion, corrupt practices have extensively prevailed in the constituency. That was sufficient to prevent you issuing the writ immediately. But what is the question at law? Upon what does the House seek advice? I fancy the hon. gentleman does not propose, under any circumstances, to disfranchise the constituency. We are not exactly in the position of England in that respect. Each Province is entitled to a certain representation under our constitution. This Parliament has no right to alter the proportions of that representation, and if the hon. gentleman were to propose to disfranchise the constituency on account of corrupt practices, he would have to find another constituency in the Province of Ontario, to which the right

of representation should be, for the time, given. Now, I think that is a very grave question, and it is one which ought not to be raised upon such a report as has been made in this case. If the hon. gentleman thinks that corrupt practices have prevailed extensively in a constituency, and that an investigation should be had for the purpose of ascertaining the extent of those corrupt practices, and meting out punishment, under the law, to those who do not appear to have been adjudged at the trial, that is a matter which can be attended to after the writ has issued quite as well as before. It is wholly independent of the issue of the writ. It is not necessary that the issue of the writ should be delayed for the purpose of pursuing that investigation. The only occasion for delaying the issue of the writ is where corrupt practices have been carried on to such a serious extent as to warrant the House in recommending the withdrawal of the representation from the particular constituency. Now, I have no doubt the First Minister and the Minister of Justice have examined the evidence in this case. I apprehend that they would not, upon the mere recommendation of the judge, without looking at the evidence supporting that opinion, have proposed so grave a course of procedure as that recommended to the House. I venture to say that no election trial has taken place in the Province of Ontario—I do not know what has been the case elsewhere—not even that in which the First Minister was held to have conducted his election in Kingston fairly, in which fewer corrupt practices have been disclosed than in the very election trial which Judge Osler here reports. There may have been something in the conduct of the witnesses who came before the judge, to give him the impression that corrupt practices extensively prevailed; but I think that has not been disclosed in the evidence taken at the trial. The hon. gentleman does not for one moment seriously entertain the idea of disfranchising the constituency. There is then no reason whatever why the issuing of the writ should be further delayed. The writ may be issued at once, and if the hon. gentleman thinks that it is necessary—if these parties that the judge may have had in his mind have been guilty of corrupt practices, and ought to have been punished—then he can proceed with that enquiry under the statute, without reference to any delay in issuing the writ.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not want to have further enquiry, because the judge has stated it is not advisable to have further enquiry. The hon. gentleman volunteers the statement that this constituency has been exceptionally pure, to use a phrase used elsewhere. Is he not rather bringing a serious charge against Judge Osler, who says it has not been exceptionally pure, but that corrupt practices have prevailed there. The hon. gentleman says there is a difference between our constitution and the English constitution, in that every Province here has the right to be represented by so many members. I thought Scotland had a right to have so many members, and Ireland and England; and yet this statute has been passed giving power to suspend an election in any one of the three kingdoms, without the charge being brought that either England, or Ireland, or Scotland, as the case may be, was disfranchised, or the proportion of representation altered.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the Parliament of the United Kingdom cannot change the proportion, whether the Parliament of the United Kingdom is not supreme, and whether this Parliament is supreme to change the constitution and determine that representation shall be other than by population?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not the question. The question is this: Each of the three kingdoms has the right to be represented, of course, in a certain proportion; and until our law is altered by the Imperial power, by the

power that has the right to alter it, each Province has the right to a certain number of representatives. While the election law of England exists, providing for the number of representatives in each of the kingdoms, that proportion must be observed; yet in England, again and again, when corrupt practices have been shown, as in Sudbury, St. Albans, and very many other constituencies, the constituencies have been hung up.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is a local change.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Now there is no necessity for a delay like this. The committee will be struck tomorrow, they can meet in a day or two and decide this important question. It is a very important question, looking upon it as I do.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the question?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question is, what is the consequence here of the report made by the judge?

Motion agreed to, on a division.

CANADIAN FISHING VESSELS.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether Canadian fishing vessels are required to report, enter or clear when putting into Canadian ports or harbors for shelter or repairing damages? 2. Whether Canadian fishing vessels, when in any Canadian bay or harbor for the purposes of shelter or repairing damages, of purchasing wood, or of obtaining water, are liable for harbor dues, tonnage dues, buoy dues, light dues or other similar dues?

Mr. FOSTER. Canadian fishing vessels are required to report, enter or clear when they put into Canadian ports or harbors for shelter or repairing damages, provided they require to communicate with the shore or remain over twenty-four hours. When they merely run in and remain at anchor for a few hours, they are not required to report. All fishing vessels are exempt from sick mariners dues. They have, however, the option of paying them and securing the benefits of the fund. Harbor masters' dues are, by Chapter 86, Revised Statutes, exacted at ports proclaimed under the Act, from all vessels entering and discharging or taking in cargo, ballast, stores wood or water. These would not, therefore, be legally required from Canadian fishing vessels in for shelter and repairs, and in practice are seldom exacted from any Canadian fishing vessels. In Halifax, harbor masters' dues are not paid by any vessels under twenty tons, nor by coasting vessels, which include fishing vessels. At Pictou and Sydney, harbor dues are, by Acts of Parliament, exacted from all vessels over forty tons register; whether, in practice, fishing vessels are exempt when over forty tons cannot be stated without correspondence with the harbor masters of these ports. All vessels under eighty tons are exempted from compulsory pilotage dues by the general Act. Pilotage authorities have, in addition, the power to make other exemptions with consent of the Governor in Council, and have generally exempted fishing vessels. No tonnage, light or buoy dues are collected in Canada.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, a copy of a despatch, dated 19th July, 1887, from the Right Honorable Sir Henry Holland, Secretary of State for the Colonies, conveying the thanks of Her Majesty for the joint Address of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, offering their sincere congratulations on the completion of the fiftieth year of Her reign.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 28th February, 1888.

ADJOURNMENT—THE TARIFF—COMBINES.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the House adjourns I would call the attention of the Finance Minister and the First Minister to the fact that I observe in the *Montreal Gazette* of Tuesday, February 28th, the statement that they are authorised to announce to all and sundry that no change whatever would be made in the tariff. It may be very convenient indeed that such an announcement should be made, but it strikes me as slightly contrary to custom that any organ, however zealous a supporter of the hon. gentleman, should be authorised to speak in authoritative terms as to such a very important question. I think it would have been better that such a statement had been made in answer to a question put by one of the hon. gentleman's supporters in this House; but are we to understand that from this time forth the *Montreal Gazette* practically supplants the *Canada Gazette* for the purpose of giving general information, and most important general information this undoubtedly is?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that, so far as I am concerned, the statement that has been made has not my authority. I was asked by a gentleman connected with the press, whether it was expected that there would be any material modifications of the tariff this Session, and I said I hoped it would not be necessary to open the tariff at all, but it was simply an expression of opinion in answer to an enquiry, and I thought it was of some advantage that the statement should go to the country, because it would prevent a great many deputations and parties coming to Ottawa, at great trouble and expense to themselves, visiting the capital, when I thought it was not likely to be attended with the result they anticipated; but there was no intention to say more than to express my personal impression and hope that it would not be necessary to open the tariff at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Was this an assurance to the sugar combine of Montreal?

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to find that the Government have taken a new way of communicating to the public their intentions with regard to public policy. There is a great deal of interest felt now in what are called the combines. In Montreal there are a number of combines now, and I see by this morning's paper that there is a new combine, a combine of wringers, that is, proprietors of washing machines. In Montreal we have a cotton combine, a flour combine, a sugar combine, a rubber combine, a shirt-makers' combine, and an undertakers' combine. We cannot even get buried on moderate terms now, though, no doubt, the Government would like to bury some of us. Though it may be proper for the Government to send this statement through the press, I think it would not be wise to follow that as a principle hereafter, because it is very unwise and very unfair to lay down an absolute statement that there shall not be any changes in the tariff. Some of these combines may make claims for the services which they have rendered to the Government within the last two years, and the Government may be hampered in dealing with their claims by a statement of this kind. I think it would not be wise for the Government to adopt that course in order to inform the public of their intentions. I was rather sorry to hear the Finance Minister say that he had given this as a sort of authoritative statement. At first he said he had not made an authoritative statement on the subject, but afterwards he said something which meant that it was an authoritative statement. If he is going to give this sort of information to the press, let him give it to all the papers; let him give it to the *Herald*, the true organ of public opinion.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 29th February, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

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

GEORGE F. BAIRD, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Queen's, N.B., introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and the Hon. Mr. Foster.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS presented the First Report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the Debates of this House. He said: With the leave of the House I move that this report be now adopted. It is desirable that no delay should occur in the arrangements for the reporting and publishing of the Debates. These are only preliminary arrangements, and ought to be adopted immediately in order that the work may go on.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think, before we adopt that report, we ought to know what it is.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It has just been read.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it should lie upon the Table of the House, in order that we may have an opportunity of studying it.

Mr. DESJARDINS. There is nothing in it but the appointment of a reporter to succeed Mr. Eyvel, and a recommendation of the same arrangements that we have made the last two years, because the Government printing establishment is not yet in operation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think it had better stand over.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That the report of the Special Committee appointed to strike the Select Standing Committees be adopted.

He said: With the consent of the House, I propose to strike from the Committee on Agriculture the name of the Minister of Militia, and insert the name of Mr. Gigault.

Mr. LAURIER. I would at the same time propose that the name of Mr. Langelier (Montmorency) be substituted for that of Mr. Chouinard.

Motion agreed to; said committees being composed as follows:—

No. 1.—ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Amyot,	Girouard,	McIntyre,
Barron,	Hall,	Mills (Bothwell),
Beausoleil,	Hudspeth,	Moncreiff,
Blake,	Ives,	Mulock,
Caron,	Kirkpatrick,	Patterson (Essex),
Casgrain,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Préfontaine,
Chapleau,	Langelier (Quebec),	Prior,
Colby,	Langevin,	Riopel,
Costigan,	Laurier,	Royal,
Curran,	Lister,	Temple,
Davies,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Thompson,
Dessaulniers,	Mackenzie,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Desjardins,	McCarthy,	Weldon (Albert), and
Edgar,	McDonald (Victoria),	Weldon (St. John).—42.

4

No. 2.—ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Ferguson (Renfrew),	McIntyre,
Audet,	Freeman,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Cameron,	Guillet,	Putnam,
Coughlin,	Hale,	Royal,
Couture,	Hesson,	Ste. Marie,
Daly,	Labrosse,	Tyrwhitt,
Daoust,	Lang,	Ward, and
De St. Georges,	Livingston,	Yeo.—25.
Doyon,		

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

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

Messieurs

Amyot,	Fisher,	Mulock,
Armstrong,	Foster,	Patterson (Essex),
Bain (Soulanges),	Gaudet,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Perley (Ottawa),
Baird,	Gillmor,	Perry,
Barron,	Girouard,	Pope,
Beausoleil,	Godbout,	Porter,
Béchar,	Gordon,	Préfontaine,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Prior,
Bergin,	Guay,	Purocell,
Bernier,	Guilbault,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Haggart,	Riopel,
Borden,	Hale,	Robillard,
Bourassa,	Hall,	Ross,
Bowell,	Hesson,	Royal,
Bowman,	Hickey,	Rykert,
Boyle,	Henderson,	Scarth,
Brien,	Holton,	Scriven,
Brown,	Hudspeth,	Shanly,
Bryson,	Innes,	Skinner,
Burdett,	Ives,	Small,
Burns,	Joncas,	Smith (Montreal),
Cameron,	Jones (Halifax),	Smith (Ontario),
Cargill,	Kenny,	Sproule,
Carling,	Kirkpatrick,	Stevenson,
Caron,	Labelle,	Sutherland,
Cartwright,	Landerkin,	Taylor,
Casey,	Landry,	Temple,
Casgrain,	Langelier (Quebec),	Thérien,
Chapleau,	Langevin,	Thompson,
Charlton,	Laurie,	Tisdale,
Choquette,	Laurier,	Trow,
Chouinard,	Lavergne,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Cimon,	Lister,	Tupper (Pictou),
Clayes,	Livingston,	Tyrwhitt,
Cockburn,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Vanasse,
Colby,	Mackenzie,	Wallace,
Cook,	McCarthy,	Ward,
Costigan,	McCulla,	Watson,
Coursol,	McDougald (Pictou),	Weldon (Albert),
Couture,	McDougall (U. Breton),	Weldon (St. John),
Curran,	McGreevy,	White (Cardwell),
Daly,	McIntyre,	White (Renfrew),
Davis,	McKay,	Wilmot,
Davis,	McKeen,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson (Elgin),
De St. Georges,	McMullen,	Wilson (Lennox),
Desjardins,	Madill,	Wood (Brockville),
Dessaint,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Edgar,	Mills (Bothwell),	Wright, and
Ferguson (Leeds & Gr.),	Mitchell,	Yeo.—155.
Ferguson (Welland),	Montague,	

No. 4.—ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs

Amyot,	Eisenhauer,	McKay,
Armstrong,	Ellis,	McMillan (Huron),
Audet,	Geoffrion,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Barrow,	Gillmor,	Madill,
Bell,	Girouard,	Mara,
Borden,	Guilbault,	Marshall,
Bourassa,	Hale,	Moffatt,
Brien,	Hickey,	Moncreiff,
Burdett,	Holton,	Montague,
Carpenter,	Ives,	Montplaisir,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Mulock,
Casey,	Jones (Digby),	Reid,
Chisholm,	Kenny,	Robillard,
Choquette,	Labelle,	Rowand,
Chouinard,	Labrosse,	Scriven,
Ochrane,	Landry,	Small,
Costigan,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Sproule,

Coulombe,	Langelier (Quebec),	Tupper (Picton),
Coursol,	Laurie,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Lavergne,	Ward,
Daoust,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Davin,	McOulla,	Weldon (Albert),
Denison,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Weldon (St. John),
Dickinson,	McGreevy,	Wilson (Argenteuil), and
Edgar,	McIntyre,	Wright.—75.

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

No. 5.—ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs

Bain (Wentworth),	Gaudet,	Paterson (Brant),
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Patterson (Essex),
Brien,	Gillmor,	Perry,
Burdett,	Gordon,	Porter,
Casgrain,	Jones (Digby),	Rinfret,
Clayes,	Landerkin,	Robertson (King's),
Coughlin,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Smith (Montreal),
Coulombe,	Lavergne,	Stevenson,
Denison,	Macdowall,	Sutherland,
De St. Georges,	McKeen,	Thérien,
Dessaint,	Marshall,	Turcot,
Dupont,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wilmot,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gr.),	Moffat,	Wilson (Lennox), and
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Montplaisir,	Wood (Brockville).—44.
Ferguson (Welland),	O'Brien,	

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

No. 6.—ON PRINTING.

Messieurs

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

No. 7.—ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Grandbois,	Perley (Ottawa),
Baker,	Hesson,	Pope,
Baird,	Hickey,	Rinfret,
Béchar,	Holton,	Riopel,
Bergeron,	Jones (Halifax),	Rykert,
Bergin,	Langelier (Québec),	Scarth,
Blake,	Lister,	Scriven,
Bowell,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Smith (Ontario),
Carling,	Macdonald (Huron),	Somerville,
Cartwright,	MacKenzie,	Taylor,
Chapleau,	McCarthy,	Tupper (Cumberland),
Charlton,	McDougald (Picton),	Tupper (Picton),
Colby,	McLelan,	Wallace,
Coatigan,	McMullen,	Welsh,
Coursol,	Madill,	White (Cardwell),
Davies,	Mitchell,	White (Renfrew),
Ellis,	Moncreiff,	Wood (Brockville), and
Foster,	Mulock,	Wood (Westmoreland)—55.
Gillmor,		

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

No. 8.—ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs

Baker,	Guilbault,	Moncreiff,
Beausoleil,	Guillet,	O'Brien,
Béchar,	Haggart,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Hall,	Perley (Ottawa),
Blake,	Hesson,	Préfontaine,
Borden,	Henderson,	Parcell,
Bowell,	Holton,	Reid,
Bowman,	Ives,	Riopel,
Boyle,	Jamieson,	Royal,
Brown,	Joncas,	Rykert,
Bryson,	Jones (Halifax),	Scarth,
Burns,	Kenny,	Scriven,
Cameron,	Kirk,	Shanley,
Cargill,	Kirkpatrick,	Shanley,
Cartwright,	Labelle,	Skinner,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Smith (Montreal),
Cimon,	Landry,	Sutherland,
Clayes,	Lang,	Temple,
Cochrane,	Langelier (Quebec),	Thérien,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Thompson,
Cook,	Lovitt,	Tisdale,
Coursol,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper (Cumberland),
Curran,	Macdonald (Huron),	Turcot,

Davies,	Macdowall,	Vanasse,
Dawson,	MacKenzie,	Wallace,
Desjardins,	McCarthy,	Weldon (Albert),
Dickinson,	McDonald (Victoria),	Weldon (St. John),
Dupont,	McDougald (Picton),	Welsh,
Eisenhauer,	McGreevy,	White (Cardwell),
Ellis,	McLelan,	White (Renfrew),
Fiset,	McNeill,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Flynn,	Mara,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Freeman,	Masson,	Wright, and
Gigault,	Mills (Bothwell),	Yeo.—104.
Gironard,	Mitchell,	

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

No. 9.—ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Dickinson,	Mara,
Audet,	Doyon,	Marshall,
Bain (Soulanges),	Eisenhauer,	Masson,
Bain (Wentworth),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Mitchell,
Baker,	Ferguson (Renfrew),	Montague,
Béchar,	Ferguson (Welland),	Montplaisir,
Béchar,	Fiset,	Paterson (Brant),
Bell,	Fisher,	Perley (Ottawa),
Bernier,	Flynn,	Perry,
Bourassa,	Gaudet,	Platt,
Bowman,	Gigault,	Pope,
Bryson,	Godbout,	Robertson,
Burdett,	Grandbois,	Ross,
Burns,	Guay,	Rowand,
Cameron,	Guilbault,	Royal,
Carling,	Guillet,	Ste. Marie,
Carpenter,	Hesson,	Semple,
Chapleau,	Innes,	Smith (Ontario),
Chisholm,	Joncas,	Sproule,
Chicquette,	Jones (Digby),	Stevenson,
Cimon,	Kirk,	Sutherland,
Cochrane,	Labrosse,	Taylor,
Colby,	Landry,	Trow,
Coughlin,	Lang,	Tyrwhitt,
Couture,	Laurie,	Watson,
Daoust,	Livingston,	White (Renfrew),
Davin,	Macdonald (Huron),	Wilson (Elgin),
Davis,	McMillan (Huron),	Wilson (Lennox),
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wright, and
Desaulniers,	McNeill,	Yeo.—91.
Dessaint,		

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

REPORT.

Report of the Royal Commission on Railways.—(Mr. Pope.)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to ask the Minister of Agriculture, if the report of his department has been brought down, or when he expects to bring it down.

Mr. CARLING. The report of the department of Agriculture is made up to the end of the year, and it will be laid on the Table in about two weeks.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to make a suggestion to the First Minister. He may have observed that I have given notice of a motion to discuss the trade relations between this country and the United States. Now, it has been represented to me by several members, including some members on the other side of the House, that, in dealing with a motion of this kind, it would be convenient that we should name some definite day on which it might be taken up, and I think it would also be convenient and suit the convenience of the hon. gentlemen, as well as ours, that when once begun the discussion should proceed with and be disposed of *de die in diem*. It is obvious that it cannot be disposed of in a single evening, in all probability, and it will be very inconvenient, as the hon. gentleman is

aware, to throw it over for three or four days. I do not propose to move in the matter now, but I would suggest, if convenient to the First Minister and to the House, that we might name Wednesday of next week for the discussion, and then proceed with it *de die in diem*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection. I quite agree that this is a very important subject, and should be discussed *de die in diem* until the whole matter is disposed of. I have no objection to name Wednesday, which will be a very good day, because Wednesday and Thursday belong to the House and not to the Government; with this reservation, that if the protocols are not ready to be sent down, it will be postponed until the House is in possession of all the papers on the fishery question.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he would like to have the discussion postponed if the protocols are not ready?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, and on these terms Wednesday would be a very good day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps, then, the First Minister will be able to ascertain to-morrow whether they will be ready or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They will be forwarded to Sir Charles Tupper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Otherwise it would be inconvenient to name a day, and then have to adjourn the debate indefinitely.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be known in time.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, an approved Minute of Council, appointing the Right Honorable Sir John Macdonald, G.C.B., President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, the Honorable Sir Hector Langevin, K.C.M.G., Minister of Public Works, the Honorable Sir Charles Tupper, G.C.M.G., Minister of Finance, and the Honorable Mr. Costigan, Minister of Inland Revenue, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons, as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the Act, Chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intitled: "An Act respecting the House of Commons."

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 28th February, 1888.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 3) to protect the owners of certain bottles and other vessels therein mentioned.—(Mr. Denison.)

PRESCOTT AND RUSSELL DISTRICT JUDICIARY.

Mr. LABROSSE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint, at an early day, a Judge for the Judicial District of the Counties of Prescott and Russell, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Judge Daniels, which occurred last spring?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is the intention of the Government to make that appointment at an early date.

ELECTORAL LISTS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, What is the total amount paid, up to date, for the preparation, revision, &c., of the voters' lists, since the coming into force of the Electoral Franchise Act; and what is the amount claimed for salaries, disbursements, &c., by revising officers, and not yet paid?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This question should rather have been made in the form of an address. I may say to the hon. member that in the report which will shortly be published on the expenses and the impressions of these electoral lists, a portion of the information asked for will be found. But the item is a considerable one, and I think the hon. member would do better to give notice for an address. At all events, he will have his answer in a report which will be laid before the House within two or three days.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I should like to learn from the hon. Minister if the amount of sums claimed and not yet paid will appear in this report?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF DORCHESTER.

Mr. AMYOT asked, On what date was the warrant of the Speaker of the House of Commons issued and transmitted to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the election of a member for the electoral district of Dorchester, in the place of the late H. Duchesnay?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The order of the Speaker was emanated on the 23rd August, and received in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery the following day.

MONTREAL HARBOR.

Mr. DESJARDINS (for Mr. CURRAN) asked, Is it the intention of the Government during the present Session to take measures to relieve the harbor of Montreal of the charge of interest on the cost of deepening the channel of Lake St. Peter?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In reply to the hon. member, I may state that this question is under the present consideration of the Government.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, What is the total amount of the receipts and of the expenditure of the Intercolonial Railway during the last four fiscal years?

Mr. POPE. In 1883-4 the earnings of the road were \$2,353,647.26, and the working expenses, \$2,344,579.09; in 1884-5 the earnings were \$2,368,153.65 and the working expenses, \$2,411,477.91; in 1885-6 the earnings were \$2,383,200.77 and the working expenses, \$2,489,243.61; in 1886-7 the earnings were \$2,596,009.83, and the working expenses, \$2,828,115.58.

COMMISSIONERS ON INDIAN LANDS NEAR CAYUGA.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, 1. At what date Walter Jones and ———Glenroy were appointed Commissioners to value improvements and report on titles to certain Indian lands occupied by squatters in the vicinity of Cayuga? 2. Whether said appointment was made by Order in Council or by the Department of Indian Affairs? 3. Whether a circular was issued by the said Department during the month of October, 1887, to the occupants of said lands, advising them of said appointment and of the duties of the said Commissioners?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In obedience to repeated requests for the settlement of this question Messrs. Walter Jones and Robert Glenny were appointed on the 15th October, 1887, to inspect and value certain Indian lands occupied by squatters in the town lot of Cayuga which had been surveyed by Mr. Decew, P.L.S., in the year 1883. The appointment of these gentlemen was made by the Department of Indian Affairs. A circular was issued by the said department on the 28th October, 1887, to the occu-

pants of the said lands, advising them of the appointment of Messrs. Walter Jones and Robert Glenny and of the duties assigned to them in connection with the inspection and valuation of the said lands, and informing each of the squatters that if his title to the improvements made on the land is found to be correct, he would have an opportunity of purchasing such land as he occupied.

CAYUGA POST OFFICE

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, 1. Whether a lot of land was purchased in the village of Cayuga as a site for a post office, and if so, what was agreed to be paid for same? 2. What is the estimated cost of erecting a post office in the said village of Cayuga?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A lot was purchased for \$450. A contract has been given for the erection of the buildings, the amount of the contract being \$7,874.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND STEAM COMMUNICATION.

Mr. PERRY asked, Have the Dominion Government taken any steps towards carrying out the suggestions of Earl Granville, contained in his despatch to Lord Lansdowne, dated March 30th, 1886, on the subject of carrying out the terms of Confederation on the part of the Federal Government with the Province of Prince Edward Island, with respect to continuous efficient steam communication with the main land?

Mr. FOSTER. The Dominion Government are taking, from time to time, steps towards carrying out the suggestions of Earl Granville, contained in his despatch to Lord Lansdowne, dated March 30th, 1886, on the subject of carrying out the terms of Confederation on the part of the Federal Government with the Province of Prince Edward Island, with respect to continuous efficient steam communication with the main land?

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for:

Return, in the form used in the Statements usually published in the *Gazette*, of the Exports and Imports from the 1st day of July, 1887, to the 1st day of March, 1889, distinguishing the products of Canada and those of other countries.

He said: I have no objection, if it will facilitate the matter, to the Minister of Customs producing this return, minus British Columbia, as is very often done.

Mr. BOWELL. Very well.

TRADE COMBINATIONS.

Mr. WALLACE moved:

That a Select Committee be appointed to examine into the nature, extent and effect of certain combinations said to exist with reference to the purchase and sale in Canada of any foreign or Canadian products, with power to send for persons, papers and records.

And further, with power to examine persons called before the committee on oath.

Said committee to consist of Messrs. Bain (Soulanges), Bain (Wentworth), Béchard, Boyle, Casgrain, Daly, Flynn, Gillmor, Guillet, Grandbois, Landry, McDougald (Pictou), McKay, Paterson (Brant), Wood (Westmoreland), and the mover.

He said: The question that I have to submit to the consideration of the House to-day is one of very considerable importance. The question of the nature and the extent of the various combines in this country demands at the hands of this Parliament the fullest investigation, not only because it affects the issue as to whether the people are to pay higher prices for manufactured articles and other products under the influence of these com-

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

binés and trusts, but also because in it are involved the important interests of public morality and personal freedom of action. Certain combinations of persons engaged in the same lines of trade and business are necessary and proper for the legitimate conduct of their affairs; and on this point the Chicago Board of Trade has passed a resolution defining the fundamental principles common to Exchanges, and of Boards of Trade, which resolution I will take the liberty of reading to the House. The resolution declares the purposes of such associations to be:

"To maintain a commercial exchange; to promote uniformity in the customs and usages of merchants; to inculcate principles of justice and equity in trade; to facilitate the speedy adjustment of business disputes; to acquire and disseminate valuable commercial and economic information; and generally to secure to its members the benefits of co-operation in the furtherance of their legitimate pursuits."

These are the lines laid down, not, perhaps, in so many words, but generally by the Boards of Trade of this country, and also may be considered the lines upon which manufacturing industries may combine legitimately. We are told that various Boards of Trade, that combinations of various kinds of manufacturing industries, have gone further than this. We are told that they have combined to regulate prices, and not only to regulate the prices at which the manufacturers shall sell, but also the prices at which the dealers are bound to sell. We have here the evidence of a Montreal firm, Lightbound, Ralston & Co., who refused to join the sugar combine, and who made the following statement, and it is an important one, as showing that this not only affects the manufacturers but the dealers:—

"The Wholesale Grocers' Guild succeeded last September in getting the refiners committed to an arrangement whereby firms whose names were not on the list had to pay rather more than $\frac{1}{4}$ cent per lb. on yellow, and nearly $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per lb. on white sugars, more than members of the Guild were paying, and at the same time, with every 100 barrels of granulated had to purchase 200 barrels of yellow sugar, whether in want of the latter or not."

The effect of which was virtually to drive all those out of the business who were not members of this Grocers' Guild. I have here a copy of the agreement which is said to have been signed by this Grocers' Guild, of which I will read two clauses:

"We, the subscribers to this agreement, hereby covenant and agree for ourselves and with each other to faithfully and honorably perform and carry out the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth for the regulation and sale of all graded sugars.

"Any firm or individual belonging to this association who shall sell the articles stipulated, or allow them to be sold, for less than the price fixed by the committee, shall be reported to the committee of arbitration, and upon conviction of that fact to the satisfaction of the committee, said member shall be expelled from the association by a majority of the votes at any regular meeting, a vote of censure shall be placed upon the records and reported to all the manufacturers of the article in question."

Now, I think the effect of that would be to simply drive those men who do not conform to this cast-iron regulation out of the business. I think it is a most extraordinary proceeding, because it interferes with the freedom of trade, which is the right of men dealing in any article in this country. We know also, or we hear, that these combines are working in other directions. We know that in the article of coal, an article of most vital importance, more particularly to the inhabitants of cities, a ring has been in operation for many years, and that to the disadvantage of the people of this country. I have here a statement compiled by a New York paper, showing the cost of a ton of coal, the cost of handling a ton of coal, the amount of royalties to be paid, and, allowing for large profits, more than 25 per cent. for every one handling it, and showing that coal can be delivered in New York for \$3.49 per ton. Estimating the same ratio of expenses, it would cost a little more, say, in the city of Toronto, but, in the calculation which I have here, and the details of which I will not trouble the House with, I find that the rates of freight are three-fourths of a cent

per ton per mile, which is a larger amount than the Canadian Pacific Railway charges for the transport of wheat from Winnipeg to Montreal, and we know by experience that coal can be carried on our railroads at a much cheaper rate than wheat, in the proportion of three to five. It will cost \$3 for the same weight of coal and \$5 for the same weight of wheat. Thus, allowing a profit of not less than 25 per cent. to every one handling it, and more than that in many cases, coal could be sold in Toronto for \$4 per ton, while to-day the price is not less than \$7 a ton, and I believe more. Some have said that a scarcity of coal occurs, but such is not the case, because the coal miners have to shut down three months out of the twelve in the year, so that the production shall not be too great, so that the supply of coal on hand shall not be too large. They work nine months in the year to produce all the coal necessary for the wants of the United States, Canada and their other markets. I regard these combinations, applied not only to the manufacturers but to the dealers, as being of the most dangerous kind, and I think the Parliament of Canada should deal with and examine into them, as I propose this committee shall do, and report to Parliament in regard to the matter. We hear that there are combinations not only in sugar and in coal, but in many other articles. A combine is in existence to-day for oatmeal, for biscuits, for confectionery, for coal oil; and the financial success which has attended the operations of the combine and trusts already formed will naturally encourage other manufacturers and producers to go into this sort of arrangement from which there seems to be so much profit. We know further that many articles produced in England, which are not produced in this country, or not to any extent, or not of the same quality as those produced in the old country, are sold in Canada according to prices regulated in England. The manufacturer in England sells at a certain price, and he compels the Canadian dealer to sell those articles at not less than a certain figure. I think it should be the duty of this committee, if it should be the wish of the House to appoint it, to investigate these matters also. Some persons have said that the remedy for this state of affairs is to abolish the duties on these articles. I see that some newspapers have taken the ground that the remedy for the sugar combine is to abolish the duties on sugar. I do not agree with that proposition. I think the National Policy is calculated to stand on its own merits. I think that this country can abolish and destroy the combines without destroying the efficacy of the National Policy. Last year, the duty on coal was abolished, but, instead of the combine ceasing to have its influence and power, though we have free coal in Canada, of the kind commonly consumed in our houses, that combine is more powerful to-day than it was last year when there was a duty upon it, showing that the effect of the National Policy, the effect of the duties, has nothing to do with the combines which are formed. I would prefer to have the duty on an article, because we would control, if we can control, and I think we can, those matters more effectively in our own hands, in regard to articles produced in this country. We have precedents for the course we propose to be taken. In the United States, where those trusts and combines are more powerful than they are in Canada, we find that, in the State Legislature at Albany, they have introduced a Bill for the suppression of those combines. I have a copy of that Bill, and it deals most effectively with this question. After the House of Commons have investigated this matter, if necessary, if we cannot accomplish our purpose in any other way—and perhaps we cannot—we can follow the example set by the United States in this matter by bringing in a Bill which will have the effect of destroying and making illegal all these combines, which not only raise the prices to the people of

Canada; but interfere with the trade of the country and are an excrescence on the National Policy.

Mr. EDGAR. If the House and the country required any evidence of the evil nature of combines, I think they will find it in the rather painful effort made by the mover of this resolution, to combine in one speech and in one motion a defence of the policy of protection with an attack upon combines. Now, Sir, when I saw this motion upon the paper I certainly thought a new era was dawning for this country, and that hon. gentlemen opposite, who have so long supported the policy of protection in all its features, had begun to see some new light upon the subject, and were yielding to the influence of public opinion, and were going, themselves, to strike the first blow against the policy of protection.

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, no.

Mr. EDGAR. Well, so far as the hon. gentleman's attack upon combines among trades went, I entirely agree with him and I entirely agree with his motion, so far as it goes; but, surely, he is not going as far as the country will require, when he leaves out of his motion combines among the manufacturers. Certainly we want to investigate the results of combines among importers and people who buy and sell. They may be all right—I do not say whether they are right or wrong; but certainly affairs have come to a pass when an investigation should take place as to whether they are right or wrong, and if wrong, some remedy should be found. When I saw this motion, I concluded that we had arrived at the third and last stage of the system of protection. The first stage, we know, was very pleasant for the manufacturers, at least. They had the market to themselves, and they made money, of course, at the expense of the consumers. Well, that lasted a while, until it became apparent to people who had money to invest that there were splendid opportunities for making money by going into some of these protected industries. Then everybody rushed in who could get a chance, and what the result was before long, in this country, is a matter of history. These highly protected industries were nearly all overdone, and the manufacturers in their turn suffered loss. Well, for a short time the consumers reaped the benefit of that, and the advocates of a high tariff told the country: "There you see, you are getting competition; that is what we promised you, you are getting competition, and you are getting cheap goods." As a result of this competition among the manufacturers the third stage of the protective system at last came on, namely, combines among manufacturers to protect themselves against the public. A great deal too much capital had been thrown into these protected industries, they were being worked at a loss, and the third stage has now arrived, that is to say, combines among the manufacturers against the people. Now, we see that exactly the same thing has occurred in the United States. It is true that it took a longer time to manifest itself there, the country being so large that it was more difficult to form combinations of all the persons engaged in the different industries. The new Morrill Tariff came into force in April, 1865, and it was not until the last year or two that these combines have been formed. It took more than 20 years for the interests who were suffering from the competition that naturally came about, to protect themselves by combines. But in Canada, being a much smaller country, we have reached the third stage much more rapidly, and we have caught up to the United States, although we have only been eight or nine years under a high protective tariff. Now, having met here to-day, we ought to try, in a statesmanlike manner, to find a remedy for the evils that exist. Not only at Albany, in the Legislature of the State of New York, as the hon. gentleman says, but in the

Congress of the United States, committees have been formed to investigate this subject during the present Session. Now, I do not deny, Sir, that combines may exist without protection; in the case of anthracite coal, for instance, to which the hon. gentleman referred, a combination does exist in the United States, although the anthracite coal is not protected in that country. The reason for that is this: There is not a tariff protection, there is not an artificial protection, there is not a statutory protection on anthracite coal, but there is a protection by nature, because the United States is the only country in the world that produces that particular kind of coal, and therefore all they have to do in the case of this natural production is to make a combination. It might be just the same in Canada, in case maple sugar was not produced in the Northern States. We could form, without any protection on maple sugar, a combination here among the people who would buy it up or produce it, and no artificial tariff protection would be necessary to make a combination in a case of that kind. The case of anthracite coal being the subject of a combination is, I dare say, a very bad one, and one that should be looked into and put a stop to if we can do so. The article of anthracite coal being a subject of combination in Canada as well as the United States, arises from the fact that it is not produced anywhere else than in the United States, and it is the American combination that creates a subordinate combination—a small donkey engine to work out their larger scheme in Canada. It has nothing to do with the tariff either one way or the other. I quite agree with the hon. member that there are combines, or combinations or organisations, that are perfectly lawful and perfectly legitimate. The combinations among workingmen to maintain their own rights, the rights of labor, are, in my judgment, at all events, perfectly right and perfectly legitimate, so long as they keep within the bounds of the law. Then, trade associations are continually making combinations of a very proper character to assist one another in their mutual interests. But when combinations are accompanied by monopolies, there, I think, is the distinction and there is where we ought to interfere, whatever the remedy may be. My impression is that in regard to all those combinations in Canada which occur in articles which are protected by a high tariff, the simple and only radical remedy is to remove those duties and let in foreign competition, and that will kill the combination at once. Other combinations that are not protected by the high tariff may require special legislation, and I dare say this committee will discover it. Public opinion has been aroused very strongly in the United States on this subject. In Congress a committee was appointed this very Session, very much of the same character as the committee proposed, to enquire into and report upon the action of trusts and combines. Perhaps trusts and combines are more dangerous to the community in the United States than they have yet become here; at all events they have had more influence upon the public men and the politicians there than they appear to have had here. I did hope to hear my hon. friend say that, if it were the fact, that the protective tariff renders those combines possible, he would go against the tariff. I hope yet to hear some hon. gentleman opposite make this statement, although my hon. friend has not done so. I will take the liberty of showing the House how some republican protectionists in the Congress of the United States, in the House of Representatives at all events, have taken ground above party on this question, and while they affirm themselves to be adherents of a policy of protection, they say that if it has had the effect, which is attributed to it by the public in the United States to-day, of fostering those combines, they will go for a reduction of duties. Mr. Mason, of Chicago, is an active republican protectionist. He introduced the first resolution on the subject in Congress in January, and it was referred

Mr. EDGAR.

to the Committee on Manufactures, which brought in a recommendation to the House with a more comprehensive resolution of the same character. In the debate that took place on the 26th January upon the latter resolution, Mr. Mason used these words:

"There are some industrious and energetic men in this country who would like to have a corner upon sunshine, and levy a tariff, of a thousand dollars each, on every ray of foreign sunlight."

Then he was asked by Mr. Nelson of Minnesota:

"Have you any doubt in your own mind that the tariff laws indirectly co-operate to aid these trusts?"

Mr. Mason, in reply, said:

"I will say, in response to the gentleman from Minnesota, that I have no doubt there is a class of trusts and a class of men who take advantage of the tariff laws. We, who believe in a higher protective tariff, think there should be some way to avoid taking advantage of the laws and perverting them from their proper purpose. But so far as I am concerned, expressing also, I believe, the sentiments of the people of my district, I presume if there is a proper way of meeting the difficulty this committee can report a proper Bill, but if there is no way to protect the people from these exactions of trusts except the revision of the tariff, so far as I am concerned, I am ready to vote for that now."

I sincerely hope that before the discussion in the country upon this question of combines is finished, we shall find members willing to acknowledge the error, just as Mr. Mason has done as representing his district, which means Chicago, and that they will come forward and say that if it is necessary to remove those duties to prevent combines, they will do so. It is impossible to deny that the feeling in this country against these combines is general, and it is not confined to one set of political thinkers or one class of men. I could quote a very strong article in the *New York Herald of Monday last*, headed: "Trusts worse than Slavery," in which the trusts are attacked in a most vigorous manner. I do not say that the *New York Herald* is an infallible authority, but I do say this, that, like the *London Times*, it tries to go with public opinion, and it may be fairly taken on any great question as representing the public opinion of the day. But we do not require to go to New York to find strong language in the independent press against combines. There is a newspaper published in Montreal, which certainly is not a Liberal paper, it prides itself on being an independent paper, but I have always thought that the *Montreal Star* was more Conservative than Liberal.

Mr. MITCHELL. I beg your pardon.

Mr. EDGAR. I didn't say the *Herald*; I would not venture to quote the language of that organ of public opinion, the *Herald*, when the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is here himself. However, I would like to read to the House a short article from the *Montreal daily Star*, published on the 14th inst., on this subject, and I would commend it to the attention of my hon. friends opposite. It is headed, "The Combines," and is as follows:—

"The question of the suppression of 'the combines' is not merely a question of the whole nation paying a cent or two a pound more for its sugar than it need pay. It is the growth of the 'combine' system that we have to fear. The rapid development of the trade trusts in the United States and the financial success of the trusts in Canada is alarming. Soon every article, the manufacture of which requires the investment of large capital, will be controlled by a trust in the United States, and the spectacle of Canadian commercial corporations earning more than the amount of their whole capital in a single year must prove very tempting to those manufacturers in Canada who have not yet formed 'combines.' The abolition of the protective duties on the articles controlled by the Canadian 'combines,' at the earliest possible day, has become an imperative necessity. The friends of the National Policy must see that this is necessary. The only possible alternative is free trade; and of the two evils, free trade or 'combines' protected at the expense of the nation, we prefer free trade. We believe that under the peculiar conditions which prevail in Canada protection is absolutely necessary to the development of the country—"

So you see this is a protectionist organ.

"—but protection for the benefit of 'combines,' protection to make wealthy monopolists more wealthy, is impossible in a free country.

While 'combines' are protected, the National Policy is in danger. There is another danger to be feared from these gigantic trade monopolies: they constitute a menace to our political freedom."

I would particularly commend that to the attention of the hon. gentleman opposite,—

"They can afford to make liberal contributions to campaign funds out of their enormous profits, in return for the protection afforded them by law."

That is not in the United States, Sir, it is in Canada,—

"In the interests of political morality as well as in the interests of the Canadian consumer, the 'combines' must go."

Now, Sir, I have no doubt that the hon. mover of this motion does not desire to shut out from his committee enquiry into combines which we are told exist among manufacturers, and I dare say the hon. gentleman will accept an amendment which I offer to his resolution, in order to make the investigation include such combines. I also think that the object which he has in moving his resolution, and which I am sure the whole House will have in supporting it, would be promoted by his adding a provision that the committee, in addition to examining into the subject, should suggest to the House what, if any, changes in the law seem to be necessary in the public interest. I am sure he cannot want this committee simply to be an examining committee without any authority or direction from the House to make practical suggestions. In the States they call such committees "smelling committees," and I am sure he does not want this to be a committee simply to smell out grievances and leave them there, but he wants it to suggest some remedy. I have a strong conviction myself that the only real remedy for combines which are protected by a high tariff, is to reduce the duty. But there may be some combines which are not affected by the tariff and which would require some other remedies, and I have no doubt we would all be glad to know what they are. Therefore, in order to include manufacturing combines, I move:

That the said resolution be amended by adding after the word "sale" in the third line thereof, the words, "or manufacture and sale."

Mr. GUILLET. Having seen this resolution before it was moved, and having had some conversation with the mover of it, I am sure he fully intended that the enquiry should cover all combinations, whether those of manufacturers or others, and, therefore, I presume there will be no objection on his part to the amendment. The hon. member who has spoken last might have spared us the ebullition of feeling which, on every occasion on which the question of the National Policy arises, is displayed by the other side of the House. But I suppose we ought not to complain that those gentlemen feel so sore about the National Policy. A little boy once said to his mother: "Mother, I wish you would make sister stop crying every time I strike her with a club." It would be equally unreasonable for us to complain of those gentlemen becoming indignant every time they feel that club. It is well known that the advocates of the National Policy in this House and in the country intended not only that it should stimulate manufactures, but also that it should promote competition in the country; and the patriotic object of this resolution is to see that any attempt which may be made to destroy competition should be prevented. I do not think the people would be willing to see the National Policy wiped out. There are evils incident to every progressive movement and to every reform, as has been well shown by writers on progressive government and political economy, and it is necessary to watch these evils. It is necessary that the friends of the National Policy should discover what these incidental evils are, in order to see that the people of Canada shall not lose the great blessings that have been brought to them by that policy. I say we would be no better off if we removed protection and exposed ourselves to greater combinations which we could not

get rid of, whereas now we have only to deal with combinations which we can get rid of. What was said in a report to the British House of Commons? The laboring classes are very little aware of the extent to which they are often indebted for being employed at all, to the capitalists, and of the immense losses which their employers voluntarily incur in order to destroy foreign competition and keep possession of foreign markets. Instances are well known of employers having carried on their works at a loss of £300,000 or £400,000 in order to meet and crush foreign competition. These large capitalists are the great instruments of warfare against competing capitalists in foreign countries. "It is the duty of English manufacturers," says Lord Brougham, "to crush foreign industries in their cradle." To such influences as these would our infant industries be exposed were it not for protection, and were protection removed ruin would soon overtake them. There are other ways of curing the evils, which are of lesser moment as compared with the blessings that have flowed from the National Policy, than by destroying that policy itself. The people, though in some cases unjustly alarmed by exaggerated reports, are not opposed to the National Policy. All they require is that where evils exist, they should be remedied by the strong hand of the law. Modern writers have admitted that the most advanced civilisations are subject to these evils, and that by legislation we must prevent combinations and conspiracies against the individual freedom of the trader. The enquiry we propose to make is not in the interests of the manufacturer, but in the interests of the people, and I trust the Government will grant this committee. I am sure it will result in good; I am sure the result of its deliberations will be to check the evils that may have arisen, if they are such as they have been represented to be, but we know that grave exaggerations and misrepresentations have been made on this subject. I do not think the evils are as extensive as they are represented to be, but, such as they are, this committee will discover them and apply the remedy. Even in the days of free trade, even in that period which is called by comparison the free trade period of Canada, there were rings. There were coal oil rings, and salt rings, and other rings under the administration of the gentlemen opposite, so that these evils cannot be attributed to a protective tariff. In those days of free trade, rings existed which raised the prices of necessaries of life, and yet they were not taken hold of and suppressed by the Government then in power. I will not take up the time of the House by any further remarks in seconding this resolution. It would only prejudice the case to enter into any attack on these combinations, before they have any opportunity of representing their side of the question. They may show that they are not guilty of the charges so recklessly made; and I trust that when the enquiry is made, we will be able to show, by most satisfactory evidence to the House, that we have put the merits of this question on a footing that will enable the House to deal with it in an intelligent manner.

Mr. LISTER. The motion made by the hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution is a timely motion indeed, but I would say to him what has been often said before of men who seek to occupy antagonistic positions, that he cannot chew meal and whistle at the same time. He cannot condemn the combine and at the same time attempt to sustain the so-called National Policy or high tariff policy of this Administration. So far as the combines are concerned or the trusts, they are the natural and inevitable outcome of a high protective tariff, but before I enter into the question at any great length, I desire to say to the hon. gentleman and the Government, that it is ungenerous and ungrateful on their part to make this attack upon the manufacturers of the country. Does not the hon. gentle-

man remember that it is largely owing to the influence of these manufacturers that he probably holds his seat to day? Does he not remember the celebrated meeting that took place in 1882, in the Queen's Hotel, at which the First Minister presided? Does he not remember how numerous that meeting was attended, and has he forgotten the almost historic words of his right hon. leader, when the latter reminded the manufacturers that he was the monkey in the tree shaking the acorns and they were the hogs below eating it, and that they had to come down, and they did come down? What was the result? Why, in 1882, it is an open secret, which men who profess to know anything of politics in this country will not deny, that the manufacturers subscribed liberally to the election fund. Immediately after the elections, at the next Session, had we not the spectacle of these corridors filled with deputations of manufacturers from all over, and do we not know that at the solicitation of those men the Government were forced to increase the burdensome duties they had already put on the people. When it was proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite to inaugurate a system of high taxation in this country, contrary to the teachings of every eminent authority in the world on political economy, when they pretended they could make something out of nothing, when they pretended they could bring about prosperity by high taxation, did we not tell them the effect would be to wring from the consumers of the country a large portion of their earnings, to their detriment. We were answered with the statement that the result of the policy would be to bring about competition, and that the products of the factory would be lessened instead of increased in price. How has it turned out? We told those hon gentlemen then that, as soon as the manufacturers found they were not manufacturing at a profit, they would combine for the purpose of keeping up prices, and that the result would be disastrous. The policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite invited the investment of millions of money of the people of this country in manufactures, and the result was that when the times which we predicted did come, those men came back to this Parliament, and last Session we had the manufacturers again from all parts of the country seeking the reward for what they had paid out in the elections of 1882. The manufacturers as they had met in Toronto, met again in 1887, and we know the First Minister told them they would have to subscribe, and they did subscribe, to the election fund. Last Session, in consequence of this, the Minister of Finance introduced Tariff resolutions largely adding to the burdens of the people, and now, when the hon. gentleman who moves this resolution, remembers the past, does it not strike him that he is acting in a rather ungenerous and ungrateful manner towards the men who have done so much for him. He tells us we must legislate against these manufacturers, these combines and trusts. His simplicity is refreshing. Does he think these men are going to be suppressed by any legislation that can take place in this House? Does he not know that the true remedy for this great and crying evil is to reduce taxation, so that competition will come into play, and these men be compelled to sell at proper prices? These combinations have become a natural burden and a disgrace, and the Government and their supporters will yet have to answer to the people for permitting such a state of things to exist. Look at it. We have in this country, under this tariff, sugar combinations selling sugar to the people at double or nearly double the price at which it can be obtained in other countries. We have iron combinations, we have cotton combinations, we have rubber goods combinations, we have twine combinations, compelling the farmers of this country to pay over \$200,000 more for the twine they use in harvesting their harvest than they otherwise would. All these combinations are existing to-day, taking millions of dollars every year out of the people and creating a class of mono-

Mr. LISTER.

polists who are becoming enormously wealthy at the cost of the people of this country; and, as their wealth increases, so do these combinations increase; and the result could not be otherwise than to have the state of affairs in the business world such as we have never witnessed before. Hon. gentlemen may talk about the times we have to-day, about the favorable condition of things and the prosperity of the country, but no man who goes through this country to-day, no man who knows anything about the affairs of Canada to-day will say that the statements made by those hon. gentlemen are at all supported by facts. This has been a Government of monopolies from first to last. They have created railway monopolies, they have created monopolies in everything that is manufactured in Canada to-day, and they are grinding out of the great body of consumers the last farthing for the purpose of enriching these men. It is a startling thing to learn that one factory in one of the Lower Provinces should have been able in one year to make a profit to the extent of its whole capital, to pay an enormous dividend, and to pay all the liabilities which were against it; that another should have been able to make a profit of \$100,000; and we have the fact that the little Magog factory in the Province of Quebec required and obtained for the purpose of starting and supporting it an enormous duty on print goods, so that every old lady throughout the country must pay a larger price on the print goods she has to wear than she otherwise would. It is time that such a state of things as that was stopped, and it is time that the Government should take the matter in hand by offering the true remedy—which is not to prosecute these men for doing what the law permits, because those prosecutions are never successful—but which is to reduce the tariff of this country, and then these matters will regulate themselves.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is one characteristic of the present Administration that, whenever an evil is apparent in the country that can be remedied by legislation, they are prepared to come forward and effect that legislation, and this present proposal will, I am sure, be endorsed by the people of this country. I was not a little surprised to hear the rule laid down by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), when he said that "these rings are the natural outcome of a high protective tariff." That hon. gentleman must surely forget that one of the worst rings we have ever experienced in this country was at a time when we had only a 17½ per cent. tariff—I mean the coal oil ring, and I might add the salt ring, and other rings which were just as bad as any we have to-day. I think that hon. gentleman has fallen sadly from grace in the last few months. If my memory is not at fault, I think last year he supported the Government very strongly when they proposed to keep up the duty on coal oil.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken as to the position I took on the coal oil duty. I said that as long as this pernicious system existed—

Mr. MITCHELL. You wanted a share in the plunder.

Mr. SPROULE. When the gentleman's own interests were at stake, he was ready to defend the action of the Government; he was classed at that time among those bloated aristocrats and manufacturers, because he was engaged in the trade.

Mr. LISTER. I am not engaged in the trade.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LISTER. I have a right to correct the hon. gentleman. I am not engaged in that trade; I never was; and, if all your statements are as true as that, it is very easy to estimate their value.

Mr. SPROULE. All I can say is that I was informed at the time by some of his own friends that he was engaged

in the trade, and that was why he was defending that duty, and I thought they were reliable men. Of course I am satisfied to accept the hon. gentleman's explanation; but, instead of making an attack on the National Policy, he should commend those hon. gentlemen who are proposing this means to remedy a grievance which exists in this country. It is yet in its inception, and the time to stop an evil is when it is not great in magnitude. I think the appointment of this committee will be a warning to those who propose to go into these combines, and it may have the effect of preventing these enormous evils from growing. An investigation of this kind will show how far this country is suffering from the combines. If there is no harm in them, there will be no need to provide a remedy, but if they are an evil, it is characteristic of this Government to provide a remedy. To say that combines are due to the National Policy is to say that which is not borne out by facts. What has a high tariff to do with it when in some cases there is no duty at all; such, for instance, as the combine in the trade to regulate the price of anthracite coal? Now on this there is no duty. This is one of the things that spring up under either a high or low tariff, when the people can combine for the purpose of advancing their own interests. We might refer to various lines. Take the lines of coffins and fixtures in reference to funerals and burial affairs, and we are credibly informed that the cost could be reduced one-half but for the fact that these injurious combines exist at the present time. I think it is right that a committee should be appointed on the subject so as to get the information we need on this matter. If the evils are of the magnitude represented, then the sooner the remedy is applied the better. The member for York (Mr. Wallace), and the hon. gentleman who supported him, are deserving of credit for coming forward at this early stage and endeavoring to elicit correct information on the subject so as to obtain a remedy if the evils are as great as they are represented to be to-day.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) was a little too previous in his denial of the statement of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule). I read that, last year, in response to the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), he denies that the foreign oil is better than the Canadian oil, and he says:

"I say that the oil manufactured here is equal to any petroleum oil manufactured in the world. We know perfectly well, as far as the United States are concerned, that the whole oil interest of the United States is practically controlled by the Standard Oil Company, and we know that they have been bringing oil into this country to sell at a less price than the cost of producing it, in order to get the control of this market. It would be against the interest of this large industry to do what my hon. friend suggests.

"Mr. MITCHELL. Is not 100 per cent. enough?

"Mr. LISTER. One hundred per cent.? The moment you strangle that industry you will get the price put up at once."

That is the remedy for these combines that he proposes now. Last year, he said, "Abolish the duty and the price will go up at once." The hon. member further said:

"The people of Canada are, to-day, getting their oil much cheaper than they ever did before. If my hon. friend from the sea thinks he will be able to get it much cheaper, perhaps he would for a time, but the moment the Standard Oil Company came here he would have to pay a higher price, and to put the trade restrictions which my hon. friend proposes here would be to give them an advantage of at least 15 or 20 per cent. more. So long as this is the policy of the Government, that industry—the oil industry—ought to be protected and preserved against the United States as any other in the country. If free trade is to be the order of the day, that interest must go with the rest, unable to exist without a high rate of duty; but if protection is to rule, that industry, which is a Canadian industry, a purely native one, an industry belonging purely to Canada, should be looked after as well as any other."

That was the view last year of the hon. gentleman for West Lambton (Mr. Lister.)

Mr. LISTER. That is my view this year.

Mr. WALLACE. He said, also, that the combines and National Policy must go together. Well, I say, too, Mr.

Speaker, that the combines must go, if they are found to be injurious to the interests of the country, but I say the National Policy must stay. These gentlemen went before the country a year ago, and told almost every constituency, at least in Ontario, that the National Policy was a dead issue, that they did not propose to deal with it, that the policy of protection had been adopted by the country; and their leader, Mr. Blake, in his Malvern speech, reiterated the same doctrine for the Reform party. But as soon as they came back to Parliament they renewed their old animosity against the National Policy and tried to make it responsible for every ill that flesh is heir to. The hon. gentleman said again that the products of manufacture had increased in price on account of the National Policy. Well, Sir, I have said and I repeat it again, that the National Policy has reduced the price of everything manufactured in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! Oh!

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, I can go over a list of a hundred articles in common use in this country, cotton goods, woollen goods, iron goods, agricultural implements—everything that is consumed by the farmers, by the artisans, by all classes of the people, and I can demonstrate, one after the other, that all these articles are reduced in price on account of the National Policy. Why, take cotton alone. Ten years ago seven and a half million pounds of raw cotton was brought into this country and manufactured, while to-day exactly four times that quantity is manufactured here. More than that, the price of raw cotton ten years ago was almost precisely what it is to-day. What are the facts with reference to the manufacture of cotton. The quality is twice as good as it was then, and the price is 30 to 40 per cent. less than it was then. It is exactly the same with all other goods. But, Sir, the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) by his remarks, has given us to understand, what we all knew before, that his object is not to investigate this matter, but to have a fling at the National Policy. He asks: Why do we not investigate the doings of the manufacturers? Well, if he had read over the motion as carefully as he might have done, he would have found that it covers an investigation into the products of manufacturers as well as the products brought into the country, whether raw material or manufactured articles. The resolution says:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to examine into the nature and extent and effect of certain combinations said to exist with reference to the purchase and sale, in Canada, of any foreign or Canadian products.

That, I presume, will include everything manufactured in Canada—to enquire fully into the sale, because we do not enquire how they manufacture their goods, the object is to enquire how they sell them, under what conditions they sell them after they manufacture them. Now, Sir, I state again, what I said before, that the moment we took the duty off coal in this country, it came more directly under the operation of a combine in the United States. The hon. gentleman told us that the combine in the United States regulated the price here. Now, I deny that. I have the evidence of a dealer in coal in the city of Ottawa, who tells me to-day that he can sell coal at any figure he chooses. The combination as to the sale of it is made outside of Canada, and he has the privilege of selling coal at \$4 a ton, if he chooses. There is no restriction in the purchase price in Canada. And so we find that the great evil in regard to coal, is the fact that the dealers in Canada have combines in each of the cities to raise the price, and keep it at a price which is extortionate to those who require to buy. Further, he said that we should have power to do something. Now, I am informed by Dr. Wilson, the Law Clerk of the House, that the resolution as it stands now, carries full power to investigate all things connected with this matter. So far as the amendment is concerned, it is a harmless one. It says, "or

manufacture and sale," after the word "sale." If it will ease the mind of my hon. friend, I have no objection to incorporate that in the resolution, but it does not make the resolution go any further than it does now.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is a little unfortunate that this great subject should come up at this stage. For my own part, I did not intend to discuss it, and would not have done so, although the hon. gentleman would not accept the suggestion I made. I told him I thought we had better accept the resolution at this stage without further discussion; but he has gone on and has brought up my name in connection with the motion I made last year in relation to coal oil. Now, Sir, I am going to support the motion for a committee to enquire into this motion of combines. I believe it is a crying and a growing evil, and the hon. gentleman in my eye never said a truer thing than that we should endeavor to kill it before it got too powerful. We should scotch the snake before it got too big and powerful. But, Sir, it has already acquired great power. It is a well known fact that in the city of Montreal, and I suppose it is the same in Toronto and Quebec, and the cities west, almost every man who has money to invest, seeing the enormous protection the duties have given to all the great industries, and enormous duties put upon the chief articles of consumption in this country, such as cotton, sugar, woollens, and boots and shoes,—these capitalists have invested their money in these stock companies; and the effect is that you can scarcely find four out of five of the people who have money to invest, who have not put in it into some of these stock companies that have been paying such large returns. Now, Sir, I have seen this evil growing, and when the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution attempts to justify protection as it stands to-day, or the National Policy, as he chooses to call it—when he seeks a justification for these enormous profits that have been paid, and finds fault with the hon. gentleman in relation to the oil question, because he protected the interest of his constituents, I want to say that I did oppose the enormous duty which the people of the country are paying for oil, which I tell him to-day is about 125 per cent. I opposed it, but the hon. gentleman, while opposing the National Policy, sustained the continuance of the duty on oil. Why? Because it is one of the great industries of his county, and he took the ground that if we are to have high duties, if it is the policy of this country to have duties ranging from 10 to 150 per cent, his constituents might just as well have the benefit of it as not, and if I had been in his place I would have done the same thing. But I happen to live in a constituency which has none of these great national industries which are protected, nor any of those great manufactures which have been fostered and encouraged to an abnormal extent. Sir, I say I am a National Policy man to-day, as that policy was declared in 1878, when the maximum was declared to be 25 per cent, ranging from 2½ to 5, 10, 15, and up to 25. Well, Sir, if it had staid at that, I would have been satisfied with it, but it has been going on until it has reached from 90 to 145 per cent. Hon. gentlemen who supported it as I did, have felt that they have been drifting into an extreme protection which they never contemplated when they started. I, for one, never contemplated such enormous duties as have been placed upon many articles of common consumption. For what was the National Policy adopted? What was the argument used on every platform in the country from Cape Breton to Victoria to induce the people to support the National Policy? It was this:—it was my own argument, and it was used by others,—That we should like free trade with the United States if we could get it, but failing to get it we would endeavor to keep our own pastures for our own cattle, and protect the infant industries of the country against the powerful industries of the neighboring republic.

Mr. WALLACE.

But there is no one who dreamed when the fight was waged in 1878 that if the United States were ready to come in and open their markets to us we would have refused to reciprocate and open our markets to them. The position has changed from a maximum protection of 25 per cent. to one amounting, in some instances, to 145 per cent., as I was informed by a gentleman of the utmost reliability, a leading merchant in Montreal, the other day, that it had reached in some instances. With respect to coal the mover of the motion has used the words: "up to the time coal became free." Why coal is not free. Three-fourths of the coal used in Montreal is coal from Nova Scotia, which is protected to the extent of fifty cents a ton. Does the hon. gentleman say that is free coal? It is a tax on the industries of Canada.

Mr. HESSON. It applies to coal used for manufactures only.

Mr. MITCHELL. Get out; you do not know anything about it. You are talking about what you do not know. Three-fourths of the coal used in Montreal is soft coal, not hard coal.

Mr. HESSON. It is soft coal that is taxed.

Mr. MITCHELL. You had better talk about something you know about. The Government have taken off the duty on hard coal. Why? It suited the west to take off the duty on hard coal. They left the duty on soft coal, which affects the whole eastern portion of the Dominion. Was it right, fair, or just? A few words with respect to the question of oil, to which the hon. gentleman has referred. If I were in the position of the hon. gentleman, representing a constituency in which a great oil industry existed, a natural industry of the country, while the policy of protection prevails in regard to the different industries to such an enormous extent as the policy of this Government has extended, I would have supported a duty on oil as a protection to my own people. But there is another question that comes up in relation to this oil matter, and, I dare say, it may not please the hon. gentleman that I should refer to it. It is this: It is not only the duty on oil, but this Government maintains a system in dealing with this oil question, which presses even more hardly than any other matter you may name. I will tell you what it is. They allow the native producer to transport oil in bulk; they prevent the foreign importer from transporting oil otherwise than in barrels, and the consequence is that it nearly doubles the duty upon the oil consumers of the country. That is a state of things which should not be permitted. I brought this matter before the House last year, and it was stated that it could not be considered that year, but the Government seemed to hint that another year it would be considered. I did not get at the bottom of it then, but I have got at the bottom of it since. A delegation came down from the west, and some of the strong supporters of the Administration were upon that delegation, strong powerful oil men whose influence pervades several western constituencies. They came here and said: "If that motion is carried, if that view is entertained by this Government, it will practically take away all our profits in oil, as it would permit foreign oil to be imported in bulk," while the present system adds 50 per cent. to the cost by compelling the importers to transport it in barrels. I am not going into the question further on such a motion as that now before the House. I do not think it is the right time or the right way to accomplish what we are aiming at; but I will tell the mover of the motion that if he really desires to put a stop to combines and prevent the evil effects which they exert, and the enormous tax they impose on the people who are the consumers and wearers of the manufactures made in this country, and which are enormously protected, the proper way is to reduce the tariff down to reasonable protec-

tion, such a protection as will enable those industries to exist. A better way still is to let the Government take hold of this question in earnest; let them say to the Government of the United States: "We desire to deal with you, a people of 65,000,000; we are willing to come in; we simply put on these duties to protect the little industries we possess, and if you are willing to come to terms with us we will throw down the bars, and let you in and adopt a reasonable tariff." That is the true way to kill the combines. I must admit that the appointment of a committee may be beneficial, if it is honestly carried out, and impartial witnesses on both sides are brought before it, and the examination taken and given to the public, so that the public may be let into the secrets, not only of the combines but of the men who desire their repression. If that is done it will do some good, but the true course to pursue is to reduce the tariff, to bring it down to what is reasonable and just, to reasonable protection for our manufactures and our people. That is what should be done, and if that course were adopted it would result in benefit to Canada. I trust the Finance Minister, whose ability no one doubts, who has pursued a course in relation to this tariff which, if followed by any one else, would not have been carried, and who more than any other man is responsible for this tariff which is upon us, will take this matter into his serious consideration. I do not say this out of any ill-feeling to him, for he knows that I feel friendly to him and like to see him occupy the position he does occupy—for I cannot occupy it myself—and I trust he will take it into his serious consideration and endeavor to prevent those great combines from getting a hold, not only on the country alone, but on the Government of the country—I fear they have it now, I fear the combinations had to give such subscriptions that they have a hold upon the Administration, and if it is so, poor unfortunate Canada, I pity you! I hope it is not so, I trust they are not yet too powerful, and that the hon. gentleman, whose great ability every one admits, will put a stop to the combines which are growing and surrounding and grappling every one of us.

Mr. McNEILL. I have been somewhat amused by the remedy which the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat proposes we should adopt to meet these terrible combines. The hon. gentleman proposes we should hand ourselves over to the tender mercies of the gigantic combines of the United States, over which we can have no control whatsoever, and that is the plan which he would adopt to benefit the people of this country. It seems to me that we have a control over the combines in Canada, that we have no control whatever over the combines of the United States, and that about the most gigantic blunder we could possibly make would be to adopt the policy suggested by the hon. gentleman.

Amendment (Mr. Edgar) agreed to.

On the motion as amended,

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have great pleasure, of course, in supporting the resolution for the appointment of the committee. I think it is desirable that this question should be enquired into. Facts may be brought to light which are not known at present, and perhaps distinctions will be perceived which are not now apparent. I simply rise for the purpose of saying that my hon. friend opposite had not consulted me before he put my name on the committee, and as I do not desire to act upon it, I would ask that he would substitute the name of Mr. Fisher for mine.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I think it is plain from the range the debate has taken that this is a matter which has engaged the attention of parties on both sides of the House; but I would suggest to the hon. mover of this motion, that he has overlooked a very important, though not numerous,

political party in the formation of the committee. I refer to the third party, and I would suggest to him whether he ought not to put the name of the leader of that party, the hon. member for Northumberland, on the committee. Aside from that, I think there is no doubt that the hon. member would be of immense advantage to the committee from his familiarity with the modes in which these combines have operated.

Mr. MITCHELL. If you want that, you had better put the hon. Premier on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He knows too much.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I may suggest to him further that my hon. friend from West Ontario, who has a similar motion on the paper, should also be added to the committee. If the hon. gentleman wishes to balance either of those names by adding the name of another gentleman from that side of the House, I am sure we shall be perfectly satisfied. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to allow my name to be withdrawn in order that the name of either of these gentlemen may be substituted for it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I must decline serving. It is not customary to impose a duty of that kind on the leader of a party.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. This motion seems to be approved of unanimously by the House. References have been made to the discussion which took place last Session on the oil question, both by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). Unfortunately, at the time of the discussion last Session, in which I was particularly interested, I happened to be absent from the House. The hon. member for Northumberland has spoken about a strong deputation of wealthy oil men who, he said, came here last Session seeking further protection against American oil. I can assure that hon. gentleman that he is mistaken. That deputation, which consisted of both oil manufacturers and oil producers, did not come here for that purpose, but for an entirely different purpose. During the last few years great scientific progress has been made in connection with the manufacture of oil, and to-day and for some time past we have been able to produce as fine a quality of oil as can be manufactured in the United States. The scientific knowledge that we have gained has enabled us wholly to remove the imperfections and impurities that were formerly in it, and this result has been largely due to the combination that has existed in the oil trade. I may say that there is no combination at the present time, and there has not been any this year nor for months before. During the time the combination existed last year, no high price was charged for oil; the oil was sold in the market simply at a fair and reasonable manufacturer's profit. But let me tell this House and the people of Canada that to that very combination they are largely indebted for the high quality of oil that they are burning. It gave the oil manufacturers opportunity and time to employ skilled chemists and to thoroughly ascertain the character of the impurities in the oil. And let me tell the hon. member for Northumberland that the object of the deputation which came here last Session was to ask for legislation regulating the burning and other qualities of our Canadian oil, so that the people of Canada could feel fully assured that every gallon of oil they burned would pass inspection as well in respect to its burning quality as to its safety.

Mr. MITCHELL. What did they say as to the transport of foreign oil in bulk?

Mr. MONCRIEFF. That was no part of their object at all. For the hon. gentleman to say that it makes a difference of 50 per cent. in the price of oil, whether it comes in bulk or in barrels from the United States, is perfect nonsense.

The price of oil coming in barrels from the United States is to-day 23 cents a gallon. Do you mean to tell me that if it came in bulk it would be worth only 11 cents? It may be said of the hon. member who makes such a statement that he is in the position the same hon. gentleman a little while ago said another was in—that “he does not know anything about it.” I have a right to refer to what the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has said on the question. We both come from the county of Lambton, which is divided in its oil interests, the one-half being in the east and the other half in the west. It would be almost impossible, at present, to estimate the amount of capital invested in that industry. If I should tell hon. gentlemen that \$5,000,000 would not touch it, they might say I exaggerated, but if they doubled that amount they would come nearer the truth. I mean the amount invested in the mineral lands, all the machinery involved, all the appliances for pumping, and also the appliances for manufacture, most of which are in the county of Lambton. A year ago, in my absence, the hon. member for West Lambton nobly defended this industry, and I read with great pleasure his remarks. Both his friends and opponents spoke well of him, and if the hon. gentlemen were only as good a protectionist in other respects as he is in the oil question, he would be a valuable addition to our party. I find that, on the floor to-night, hon. gentlemen opposite take the same position they have taken all through the campaign on the National Policy. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) says that if he were in West Lambton he would support the oil industry. There is no oil in his district, he says, and no particular industry that requires protection, but I have no doubt if there was any industry in his county that required fostering, the hon. gentleman would be willing to sacrifice it for the benefit of the rest of Canada. I do not desire to take up further the time of the House, because I do not think that this is the proper time to discuss the subject. But, as I said a moment ago, it seems to be the policy of hon. gentlemen on the other side that when any particular county has a particular industry which requires to be fostered, the representative of that county, though in opposition, is a good Conservative so far as that particular industry is concerned. On this side, however, hon. gentlemen take a broader view, and whether any supporter of the Government has in his county an industry that wants fostering or not, he looks at the question from a higher standpoint. We lay aside that selfish nature which crops out in hon. gentlemen opposite, and if they would only lay aside their spirit of partisanship, if every one of them would fight for the general benefit of Canada instead of for his “two-penny-ha-penny,” so to speak, municipality, we would be in a better position to-day, financially, than we are; our country would be benefited and every industry would have the support of the whole country at its back.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By inadvertence my hon. friend has named sixteen on the committee. That cannot be done without the suspension of the Rule. I move that the rule limiting the number to sixteen be suspended by the House.

Motion agreed to, and Rule 78 suspended accordingly.

INSTRUCTIONS TO LAND AGENTS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return giving copy of instructions to Dominion land agents in Manitoba and the North-West, regarding instructions furnished to intending settlers free of charge, and a copy of instructions as to information for which a fee is imposed, &c.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I have enquired of the officers of the Department as to these instructions, and they are unable to understand what the hon. gentleman really desires. I think if he would allow his motion to drop and

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

consult me on the point, I would give every possible information, to enable him to prepare another motion, if necessary. No instructions, such as those asked for, have been issued.

Mr. McMULLEN. A case has come under my notice in which an intending settler, who applied to the Dominion land agent for information with regard to certain sections, was told that, on the payment of a certain amount, he would be given the information. He objected to paying the amount asked, and wrote to the department to ascertain whether the Dominion land agent had acted according to instructions. The department replied that in order to procure the information he required, he would have to comply with the demand of the land agent. My object is to find out what fees the land agents have the right to exact before giving the information that would enable intending settlers to make selections of sites. In some cases large sums are extorted, whether done by the sanction of the department or not, I am not prepared to say. I have the letter of the department telling the party in question that if he wants to become a settler and secure information regarding the lands on which he wishes to settle he will have to comply with the land agent's terms. The terms were very exorbitant. I shall be happy to call at the office of the hon. Minister and obtain any information he can give. But I think it is unfair that people seeking to become settlers in a section of this Dominion, which we are anxious to see settled rapidly, should be prevented from doing so by agents who endeavor to extort exorbitant fees.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I can only assure the hon. gentleman that no such instructions as he refers to are given to agents. The instructions are to give every information. There may be a letter such as the hon. gentleman refers to as to the exaction of fees, but, if he means to say that the letter tells the settler that he has to pay certain fees for his information, I think the hon. gentleman must be mistaken as to the terms of it. If a municipal council, for instance, requires to get certain plans or information as to conditions of lands, they have to pay and that goes to the department, but, when an intending settler applies for information, the instructions are to give every information without any fee of any kind. There are no returns which can be brought down in the terms of this motion, and, if the hon. gentleman will see me afterwards, I will be glad to give him every information as to the mode in which our affairs in this respect are carried on in the North-West.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can only say that my information is that a man wrote to the agent for information in regard to lands open to settlement in Townships 17, 18, 19 and 19 A, in Ranges 7, 8 and 9 in Alberta. The answer sent to him was that, on the remittance of \$21.50, he would receive the information he required from the agent. He then wrote to the department at Ottawa, and I have here the letter which he received in reply, dated the 11th July, 1887:

“Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 27th ultimo, I beg to inform you that, if you desire to be furnished by the local agent of Dominion lands, with the information you require, you will have to pay the fees demanded by that officer.

“I am, Sir,

“Your obedient servant,

“P. B. DOUGLASS,

“Assistant Secretary.”

That is the letter. The demand was made, and if the hon. gentleman challenges the correctness of my statement, I will write and get the letter from the Dominion lands agent making the demand for \$21.50.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not challenge the statement of the hon. gentleman, but as far as appears from the

letter he has read, this seems to be the case of a gentleman who goes to the agent and wants information as to all the land open for settlement in nine or ten townships. In that case, he does not stand in the position of an ordinary settler, but more in the position of a speculator. That is not the position taken by an intending settler. If everyone who asks for that sort of information was to get it, the agents would not be able to get on with their office business. That is not a case of information required by an ordinary settler.

Mr. LAURIER. I think the House would like to be informed if that answer was given in accordance with any instructions given by the department or not.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I cannot answer that now.

Mr. LAURIER. If that letter is written under instructions given by the department, then they are the instructions which my hon. friend demands in this motion, and they should be laid before the House. If it was not written under such instructions, then it seems to me to be a clear case of malfeasance in office, and requires the intervention of the Government.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Oh, no.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, it is one of two things. If that exorbitant sum was demanded, according to instructions from the department, that is one thing; if it was not under such instructions, it is another thing; but it either was or was not. If it was, those instructions are the very information my hon. friend demands. If, on the contrary, this letter was written under any instructions of that kind, then I say it is a clear case of malfeasance of office, and it is a case for the intervention of the hon. Minister. But I understand that he says that there are no such instructions, that the letter has not been written under any instructions given to the officer, and, therefore, if the papers do not exist, they cannot come down; but if that is so, I call the attention of the hon. Minister to that officer.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not state that the letter was written without any instructions. I have stated nothing of the kind. I say there is certain information given to settlers in the ordinary acceptance of the term, because it is understood that intending settlers are to get such information, but, if a person wants to get information as to unoccupied sections in several townships, that is not the kind of information that an ordinary settler wants, and for that a charge is generally made. Of course, I do not know the particulars of this case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I could quite understand that, if this should prove to be an application for a minute detailed description such as that given by the Canadian Pacific Railway in the little books with which the hon. gentleman is acquainted, there might be objections, or in fact it might be impossible to furnish such minute details of some 40 or 50 sections without making a special charge for it, but such information as an ordinary settler would want as to the general character of the land in two or three townships, I think is information which ought to be rendered either without a fee at all or for a very small fee, and certainly there ought not to be charged such a prohibitive fee as \$21.50. I have heard complaints before, though I am not in a position to speak of my own personal knowledge, that have been made in the North-West and in Manitoba by settlers, that they have been compelled, under one pretext or other, to pay very considerable fees to the agents for information of that kind, and there is no doubt that, at this distance, there is a danger of that kind of thing existing, and there can be nothing more likely to drive settlers away from the country than to allow agents to charge large fees for information which is required for actual settlers.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If the hon. gentleman will allow the motion to stand over, I will endeavor to obtain more information to-morrow.

Mr. WATSON. I know that it is quite customary for intending settlers to ask for information as to what lands are vacant. Of course a settler will not select lands unless they are vacant and open to homesteading. I apprehend that, when the returns are brought down, we will find that these lands are held by colonisation companies, and I know that they have exacted these fees, and many settlers have been prevented from settling in that country by these colonisation companies. I know that some of them have charged \$50 and \$100 for settling people on those lands, and this has been recognised by the Government. I have no doubt that these fees were charged by the colonisation companies who have been authorised to bleed the intending settler just as they please, instead of his going to the agent and getting his settlement for \$10.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see that the information asked for was in regard to nine townships, and the charge is said to be \$21.50. If the department has no rule as to the cost of furnishing township plans to settlers, it should have one. There should be a fixed schedule for giving marked plans of townships to settlers. That is done in the United States Land Office, and I think they are furnished there for 50 cents a township. It is evident that such a charge as that of \$21.50 for nine townships is preposterous. And if the public land policy of the Government is being conducted in that way in the North-West, it is very easy to understand why that country settles up so slowly.

Mr. IVES moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THE CAPTAIN OF THE *NORTHERN LIGHT*.

Mr. WELSH moved for:

Return showing the names and salaries of all captains in charge of Government steamers, together with the salaries and allowances at present payable to and received by them, together with all petitions, correspondence, telegrams, &c., relative to the pay of the captain of the *Northern Light*, since 1st January, 1879; also for a Return showing the names and number of men employed in or about the *Northern Light* during last summer, from the time she ceased running in the spring of 1887 until she again resumed in the autumn of same year.

He said: I wish to explain my reasons for moving for these returns. The hon. Minister of Marine says that these matters are engaging his attention from time to time. That reminds me of the words of a very clever and talented gentleman, the editor of a Conservative paper in Prince Edward Island, who said that the Government were trying how not to do things. I think he made a very good remark, and my experience of the action of the hon. Minister of Marine in connection with the *Northern Light*, and everything belonging to her, is, that he has been trying "how not to do it." But the object I have in view is this: The captain of the *Northern Light* has been in command of that steamer since she was first built and put upon the route. He was put on at a salary of so much a year, and that has continued for some time. Now, this is a Government boat, and her captain holds one of the most responsible positions in the marine service, because she has to do her work in the worst season of the year, commencing in November and going through December, January and March; then in the spring, when there is nothing to do, she is laid up. This man has been in the service for a long while, he is a man bearing a good class certificate from the Board of Trade, and he left a good situation to take command of the *Northern Light*. He received his pay in the usual course for the first few years, and, afterwards, the Government thought proper to reduce his pay when the boat was laid up in the spring, after finishing her

winter's work. When the boat was laid up this man was sent home and allowed \$40 a month for the time the boat was laid up—put on half pay. I never heard of such a thing. I do not think there is a shipowner in the Dominion of Canada or any other Dominion that ever attempted such a mean act as to put the master of a ship on half pay during the time the boat was laid up for repairs or any other purpose. The very last man that ought to be sent off is the master of the ship. They do not pay off the engineer. He has been kept on full pay since the first day the boat was laid up. He has been kept on all the year, but the captain was sent home. I was informed last spring—and I have seen it myself—that this boat was laid up alongside the railway wharf, and the captain was put on half pay and sent home. A man comes along and takes charge of this boat for repairs. There have been men repairing her during the whole of the summer and fall—I think the returns will show it. I hope I am telling the truth. The captain should be there to look after these men while they are repairing that boat; he should be there to see that they are properly doing their duty, and keeping their time. But no, he is at home. Well, I brought this matter to the notice of the Minister of Marine last year; I explained it to him and he promised me that it would be attended to, and he also said that he would pay a visit to Prince Edward Island and look into these things and examine them for himself. He forgot to attend to the last part, but he did visit Prince Edward Island—he paid a visit to Charlottetown. I believe he arrived there at seven o'clock in the evening and left at six o'clock the next morning. He viewed the *Northern Light*, either by match light, or by the northern lights in the sky, or by some other kind of light. I wonder if he sent a notice to the captain of the *Northern Light* to meet him there and explain the position of the boat. I think not. I would have liked to see him there myself, but I never knew he was coming until after he was gone. He ought to be called the "Flying Dutchman." I must tell the hon. gentleman that I feel rather annoyed at his action in this matter. I do not know how I can get any satisfaction out of him. We remember the caricature published in a paper called *Grip*. There was a Mrs. Youmans who had the hon. gentleman across her knees and she was giving him a spanking. I think that is the best way to treat him if I cannot get satisfaction out of him any other way. After this country has made him Minister of Marine, and made him "Ruler over the Queen's navee," this is the return we get for it. Now, I do not think there is another hon. gentleman holding a seat in the Government who will justify or support him in his conduct in this matter—except one, perhaps, that is my hon. friend the Postmaster General. He was very lately Minister of Marine. Well, my hon. friend—for he is my friend, and I am sorry to trample on his corns—but he is not very fast. He does not like a special train to carry the mails to Prince Edward Island. But I see a notice just below mine on this paper which, if the hon. gentleman moves it, will bring this matter up, and we can speak of it afterwards. Now, I want this captain of the *Northern Light* to be placed on the same footing as other captains in the Government service. What do we see? I am only speaking of what I know to be true when I say that every other captain in the Dominion service has a yearly salary, and he is paid without any deduction from year to year. You may look at the service in Quebec, in the winter, or in any other part of the Dominion, and you will not see a shilling deducted from the captain's pay. I tell the hon. Minister that I think it is a Shylock proceeding, none but a Shylock would undertake to do such a thing. I do not think there is an hon. gentleman, let alone a member of the Government, but an hon. gentleman sitting on that side of the House, or on this side, that would attempt to justify the action of the hon. Minister. I

Mr. WELSH.

thought myself that all I would have to do was to represent the matter to the hon. gentleman and it would be attended to. I went over to him last year and had a talk with him, and asked him whether it was better to leave him to attend to it, or to discuss it on the floor of the House, and he said he preferred speaking about it. I explained the matter to him fully, and he promised me it would be attended to; but he has broken faith in that matter, although he did not break faith in promising to visit Charlottetown. I have here a memorandum, but I cannot read it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the papers will be all brought down, and then we will be able to make another movement in this matter. I feel very strongly on this point. I think it is very shabby treatment to mete out to a man who has conducted himself efficiently, who is a passed master, and who has proved it by his commanding that boat for so many years without a single accident happening it. Instead of the Government reducing his pay after his being so many years in the service, they should every year increase his pay, and show that they appreciate his conduct. I tell the Minister of Marine that this wrong ought to be redressed, and if this man were placed in his proper position, he would have been retained in command of that boat summer as well as winter. I doubt very much if there is another man, at all events it would be very difficult to find one, competent to take his place. I am not speaking of this matter as a political question; I do not know if the captain of that ship has any political feelings whatever—I do not think he ever voted in his life, and I do not know what his political proclivities might be—but I think it is an act of gross injustice that he should be treated in this way. I believe, I am confident, from my knowledge of the members of the Government, that they will see this wrong will be righted. I have no confidence in the Minister of Marine and I would not speak to him again on the subject; but I have confidence in the other members of the Government that they will see that fair play is meted out to this man.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Return of the receipts and expenditure, in detail, chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, from the 1st day of July, 1887, to the 1st day of March, 1888, and from 1st July, 1886, to 1st March, 1887.—(Sir Richard Oatwright.)

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 1st March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year 1887.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

DEBATES TRANSLATORS—QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SPEAKER laid before the House certain letters, affidavits and other papers relating to the dismissal of Messrs. A. E. Poirier, E. Tremblay and R. Tremblay, who were up to a recent period employed as French translators of the Official Debates of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I presume that it would be regular to have these papers read now, but as they seem to be very bulky, I suppose the usual practice might be followed in this instance of having them printed in the Votes and Proceedings, were it not that there are among them a number of appendices, pamphlets, and so on. I do not ask that those should be printed, but simply the correspondence.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will be for the House to say.

Mr. LAURIER. For instance, I understand that the accusations are based on pamphlets and articles in newspapers. These may not be printed, but the letters which contain the charges of the hon. the Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), together with the answer of the translators, I think ought to be printed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take it that the appendices contain the reasons why the Speaker has taken this action.

Mr. LAURIER. I think not, because if I remember aright, the hon. Secretary of State particularises what matters he complains of in the conduct of the translators. He specifies that they have used such-and-such language, and if it should be necessary in the course of the discussion to refer to the pamphlets, that can be done. But so far as the charges are concerned, I think the letters containing them and the answers are complete in themselves.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not see the necessity of such a proceeding. The complaint which was made by me last Session—and there was reason last Session for the dismissal of these employés—was that they had used certain expressions, which the members of the House can become acquainted with without giving such importance to the case of these gentlemen as to print those papers in the Votes and Proceedings. The case is all in a nutshell. They used expressions which were found offensive to members of the House; they do not deny having used them, but they say they had a right to use them as private citizens. That is all.

Mr. LAURIER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. The question which I intend bringing before the House is not as to whether these officials were or were not improperly dismissed by the proper authority. The only question upon which I intend to invite the opinion of the House is, whether Mr. Speaker had the authority to dismiss them. In my humble judgment, as I stated the other day, Mr. Speaker had no such authority, but that authority is the exclusive possession of the House. That is the only point before the House at present. It may be that the conduct of these gentlemen was such that they should have been dismissed by the proper authority. That may or may not be, but that is not the question at issue at present; and when the matter is fully before the House, so that the House will be in possession of the facts, we shall be able to determine whether the Speaker has exceeded his authority or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then, on the statement of my hon. friend, it is quite clear that these papers ought not, any of them, to appear at present on the Votes and Proceedings. The question is simply this: Whether you, Mr. Speaker, exceeded your authority in giving notice to these persons not to appear again as translators on the *Hansard*. Whether the charges brought against these persons justifies their removal by the proper authorities is not the question. The question is now whether you had the right to give them the notice you did. What does the statement you have just read show. It shows that the committee especially charged with the Official Debates has relegated the duty of dealing with these employés to you, with the assent of the House, I take it—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No; the report was not adopted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They reported, and the Speaker acted upon their report.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I oppose altogether putting these papers on the Votes and Proceedings. Let the hon. gentleman himself state his case now if he wishes, or at the proper time, and I say that the simple question, not as to the proper exercise of your authority, but whether you had any authority under the circumstances, is the question we have to decide. That is the only point before us, and therefore the reference to these papers is of no value at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has not fairly represented the views of the leader of the Opposition. There are two propositions before the House; the one is, whether these parties have done anything worthy of censure or not; and the other is, if it be found that they have, who is the proper authority to call them to account. As I understand this question, Sir, you have as good as dismissed these parties. I do not understand that the *Hansard* reporters or translators have been placed by any Act of Parliament, or by this House, under your jurisdiction. I may or may not be mistaken in that view; but, as I understand from the papers which you have submitted to Parliament and to which you have referred, you have professedly acted upon the report of the committee controlling the Debates of this House, a report that has never been adopted by this House. That being the case, that report, so far as you are concerned, and this House is concerned, is the same as if it had never been made. I am not anxious to act in the dark in this matter. I say the rights of every party, however unimportant may be his position, are entitled to be respected, and that no arbitrary exercise of authority, no illegal or unconstitutional exercise of authority on the part of yourself, Sir, if such be the case, or on the part of any other party, affecting an officer or employé of this House, ought to be unchallenged. If this House is indifferent to the rights of those whom it has employed and who are its servants, it would be derelict in its duties; and it does seem to me, in order that this House may act intelligently upon this question, it is necessary that the papers which have been submitted by you to the House, as a justification of the course you have taken, should be printed and be put at the disposal of the members of this House, so that we would be in a position to form an intelligent opinion on the subject. The hon. gentleman who leads the Government, instead of undertaking to stifle enquiry, as he has done by the course he has taken, ought to have given this House opportunity for enquiry, to see that the officers of this House are not wronged. I believe that every translator employed in this work belongs to one or the other political party. I understand that every one of these translators is an active party man on the one side or the other; and I understand your action, Sir, which the right hon. the First Minister seems disposed to defend, is of such a character as to deny to those holding one set of political opinions the rights or privileges accorded to those who hold another and a different set. If that be so we are entitled to know it. We are entitled to know whether the translators employed by this House are at liberty to attack members of the Opposition, and the views entertained by the Opposition, through the press and on the platform, while they are denied any such right or privilege as regards the supporters of the Government? We want to know what the rule is to be in this matter? We want to know whether any political party in this country is a proscribed party, and whether the hon. gentleman is prepared to defend the course which it is reported has been taken in this

particular matter? If we are to be proscribed, if we are to be put in the position in which Dissenters and Roman Catholics were a hundred years ago, on account of our political sentiments or opinions, we are entitled to know it. There are in some constituencies majorities who do not agree with the views of the hon. gentleman, and have returned members to this House opposed to the hon. gentleman's views; and I am not aware that the laws of this country confer upon the Opposition in the House any less important rights and privileges than they confer upon those who entertain the sentiments and opinions held by the hon. gentleman. It does seem to me that the course recommended by the leader of the Opposition is the proper course, that these papers should be printed at as early a date as possible; it is proper they should be in the hands of the press on both sides, and that we should be in a position to take intelligent action and do justice to those who are in the service of the House, and who, so far as I know, have not been in any respect derelict in their duty. The hon. the Secretary of State seems to think he has been wronged by these gentlemen. Has he been wronged by anything done in their official capacity, as servants of this House? Does he say that? Not at all. He says that, outside of this House, these parties, in the exercise of their rights and privileges as citizens of this country, have taken a course he does not approve. Does the hon. gentleman seek to be vindicated by the law? Not at all. He asks this House in defiance of law, in defiance of what is just and proper and manly, to punish these men—for what? For any dereliction in their duty? No; but because they have offended against his dignity, because they have done something for which the law offers him no means of vindication. I deny the right of the hon. gentleman to make an instrument of this House, or of its Speaker, to gratify his personal animosity by punishing those who have offended against his dignity; he must seek redress elsewhere, and until he is prepared to adopt such a course he has yet to learn the first elements of representative and responsible government.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What is the position of hon. gentlemen opposite. There is a difference of opinion between the hon. the leader of the Opposition and the hon. the follower. The leader says the only question before the House which he intends to bring up, is whether the Speaker has the authority to act as he did. The hon. gentleman behind him disputes that, and says there are two points: first, whether the Speaker had any authority; and, second, whether he exercised that authority properly. The leader of the Opposition states there is only one point. I think we must, in the order of discipline to use an expression which has been used, take the statement of the leader of the Opposition as being the question before the House, and that is whether you had the right to exercise the authority you exercised. I have no doubt you had, and I have no doubt the House will sustain you in the exercise of your authority.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very glad to find that the hon. gentleman has put the question on the ground he has just stated. The other day I took the course which I thought the most courteous to the Speaker, and notified him that I thought he had exceeded his authority. Instead of moving for the papers, I asked him to bring before the House the papers, and to give the House the reasons for his action. He then stated that he would bring down the papers, and to-day he has brought down the papers upon which he has acted, the papers upon which he thinks he was authorised to act in the manner that he has. I have asked that, in courtesy to you, Sir, these papers should be printed. The First Minister says these papers are not to go to the House—they are to remain on the Table, but are not to go any further. I think that is not courtesy to the Chair. I think, when the Chair has laid these papers, upon which the

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.)

Chair has based the action referred to, before the House, those papers should be given to the House in the usual way. The right hon. gentleman says that they are not fit to go to the House, and that they should remain on the Table. I have more courtesy for the Chair than the Prime Minister, the leader of the House. I intend, Mr. Speaker, to question your authority in regard to this matter, and I think it is only fair to you, as well as to the House, that the House should be put in possession of the facts upon which you have acted. The leader of the House thinks differently. I think he is wrong in this matter. I think he should in common courtesy allow the reasons upon which the Chair acted to go to the House and to the country. If not, I will move without them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All right.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has said that the Speaker will be sustained. I think, if his feeling is right and just, it will be better to have him sustained with the facts before the House than without them.

Mr. IVES. I do not propose to follow the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) into a discussion of the merits of this case. I do not suppose that it would be very profitable to enter into the justification of the Secretary of State, Mr. Labelle and myself at this time, but, when the time comes, I may tell the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that we shall be prepared to justify the course we have taken. I shall be prepared, at all events, and I think we shall be able to satisfy not only hon. members on this side of the House, but some of the more fair-minded members—if there be any—on the other side of the House, that we have been kind and generous, and that we did not act as rapidly or as speedily as we might have been expected to do under the provocation we received. When the time comes, we shall be prepared to go into that. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that there are two questions involved. There is only one question proposed to be raised by the leader of the Opposition, and that is the exercise of your authority. If that is the only question, I do not see why we should wait to have the papers printed in the first instance.

Mr. LAURIER. I asked the Speaker to bring the papers on which he based his action before the House. If there are too many to be printed, it is not for me to judge, but they should be brought before the House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They are before the House.

Mr. LAURIER. Most of these papers are printed.

Mr. IVES. They are before the House, and a distinction is always made by the Printing Committee as to what documents are to be printed and what are not. What documents are printed? Documents of importance. What documents are not printed? Documents which are not of sufficient importance to justify their being printed. The document which is not printed is no less before the House than those which are printed. I do not think this matter is of such great importance as to justify the printing of the whole of this record, but I do insist that, if it is printed at all, the very canny suggestion of my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, made in such a childlike and bland manner, that the newspaper clippings and the pamphlets and the pieces almost obscene, should not be printed, should not be adopted and I protest against his suggestion. If anything is printed, let the whole record be printed. I do not care whether it is printed or not. I am prepared to defend myself and justify myself in the course I have taken in this matter.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not rise to enter into the merits of this case at all, but I rise to reply to the positions which have been assumed by the leader of the Government. He has taken two or three positions which I think are quite

untenable. He says that, as the leader of the Opposition differs from the gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who assumed an attitude further in extent than that assumed by the leader of the Opposition, he will accept the position taken by the leader as expressing the position of the Opposition in this House. He forgets that there happens to be an independent party in this House, not very strong it is true, but, as far as I am concerned, I am determined to speak whenever the freedom and rights of the people are concerned, and I contend that the course taken by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is a correct one. The first question is whether the Speaker has taken the correct course, and whether he had authority to dismiss these men; and the other question is more extensive in its character, whether the men should have been dismissed at all for the conduct which is charged against them. I say that the leader of the Opposition has, in this case, stated clearly and distinctly the grounds upon which he laid the matter before the House, but he did not go into the question of whether these men were worthy of dismissal at all. He merely questioned the authority of the court that dismissed them, and, when this report of the committee was never accepted or considered by the House, I question the right of the Speaker to act on the report of the committee without the authority of the House. That is all I desire to say on that branch of the subject. I do not intend to enter into the merits of the case, as to whether the men are guilty or not but I think the leader of the Opposition is quite right in his action, and the motion he has proposed with you, Sir, in the Chair. I also think that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is quite right in raising the question, not only whether you were right in dismissing these men, but whether they were worthy of dismissal. I think the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the House, should not confine the argument to what the leader of the Opposition says in this case, but that he must consider it on a broader ground altogether.

Mr. EDGAR. If anything were required to show that it was necessary to have the papers printed for the information of the members of this House, it is the fact that the leader of the House, is evidently ignorant of their most important contents. The leader of the House evidently supposed that you, Sir, had been acting on a report of this committee which had been adopted by the House; and if he had only seen the papers, if he had seen the report of the committee or the papers in regard to the Internal Economy Commission, he would have learned that that report was never adopted by this House, that it was a report of last Session, and that it is so much waste paper. I am sure that if we go into the consideration of this question, when even the leader of this House is ignorant as to the contents of these papers, we are not likely to arrive at a decision satisfactory to ourselves or to you. Now, I wish to have your decision, Mr. Speaker, as to whether we are entitled to have the papers, which are laid upon the Table, read for the information of the members, and therefore I ask, as a member of this House, that these papers be read.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member wishes the papers to be read, they may be read.

The ASSISTANT CLERK proceeded with the reading of the papers.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I do not think it is very seemly that we should spend our whole time in listening to a pamphlet being read. I do not think the Rules of the House require it, and I do not think it should be done.

Mr. MITCHELL. Give some reasons.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I hold that only the letters that are passed on this matter should be read and not a long pamphlet. It is simply wasting the time of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that that was the proposal of my hon. friend, which was refused by his leader.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we must have the evidence in some form before us before we can be called upon to pronounce upon this question. It is quite true there is a principle involved in it, but there are also the merits of the particular case, and those merits can only be dealt with by a reference to the evidence; and, inasmuch as the House has, to a certain extent, shown an unwillingness to have the evidence printed in the Votes and Proceedings, I presume members must adopt some other mode whereby the evidence can be brought within the reach of each member. I do not agree with the statement of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), that because the papers are technically on the Table they are practically within the reach of each member. The hon. gentleman held them in his hand when he made that statement. It is true they were in the possession of the House, if he was the whole House, which he thought he was when he called for the dismissal of these men. If we are going to deal with the case in any way, we must have the evidence before us in a practical form. I, therefore, for one object to any course calculated to thwart the ends of justice. If that is the meaning of the suggestion, we must enforce the practice and have everything read so as to have the documents practically within the reach of each member.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has chosen to take exception to my asking to have the papers read. He says it is contrary to the Rules of the House, and is unnecessary. It may be unnecessary, and it may be that the hon. gentleman embodies all wisdom in relation to the Rules of the House. I know he was supposed to do so when he occupied the Chair—his word was law then, and his dictum was always obeyed, and we paid every respect to him. But the hon. gentleman now occupies the position of an ordinary member, and he must allow each of us who have had some practice and experience to express our opinion as to whether a certain course proposed is in accordance with the Rules of the House or not. It may be that we are here for the purpose of trying these men; I really do not know whether we are here for that purpose or not. We have not the issue fairly before the House as to whether we are going to try them on the merits of the offence or not, or whether it is on the special question, as stated by the leader of the Opposition, as to the jurisdiction of the Speaker to dismiss these men without the action of the House. These are the points involved. If we are going to try these men on the merits of the case, how can I, who know nothing of the facts, take part in trying them until I know what the evidence is. I regret to say I do not understand the French language, and I insist on my right, if I, as one of the judges, have to try them and to decide as to whether they were first guilty of conduct that warranted dismissal, and, second, whether they were dismissed by an authority having power to dismiss them. I must really know what the charges are, and have them read in a language I understand. The hon. gentleman has chosen to say that we are delaying the business of the country by having these papers read. What was the proposition of the hon. leader of the Opposition? It was that the portion of those papers that was material—the complaints made by the hon. Secretary of State, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, and the hon. member for Sorel,—along with the replies of the persons accused—that limited quantity of evidence that the Clerk is now reading,—should be printed, in order that the members of the House might have an opportunity of forming a correct opinion, and considering judicially before they are asked to decide

upon a matter which they cannot understand until the papers are read. I, therefore, have to ask that the letters of the hon. Secretary of State, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, and the hon. member for Richelieu, with the replies of the persons accused, and all evidence, should be read both in French and English, so that everybody here can understand what we are deciding upon.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think that the hon. gentleman, before he gets up to lecture me, should know what he is talking about, and exhibit a little common sense, which I do not think he has done on the present occasion. He has stated that I objected to the reading of these papers. If he had heard me, he would have heard that I objected to the reading of that French pamphlet containing over a hundred pages of closely printed matter. I said that it was unseemly that the time of this House should be taken up by reading that which will throw no light on the matter. I said that the letters which had passed should be read, but that this pamphlet should not be read.

Mr. MULOCK. Why not?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Because I said it was unseemly to take up the time of the House by reading a pamphlet in French which the hon. gentleman says he does not understand.

Mr. MULOCK. Does the pamphlet contain any evidence on which these charges are made?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. It does contain it, but I understand the hon. member for Quebec East to state that the letters extracted the objectionable words from the pamphlet, and that therefore that these letters contained all the charges.

Mr. LAURIER. I tried to have these letters read, but I was refused by the other side.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am agreeing with the hon. member for Quebec East. He said those letters contained all the extracts from the pamphlet which threw light on the case, and I say those letters might be read; but it is wasting the time of the House to read this pamphlet.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise merely to reply to what the hon. gentleman has stated.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has spoken twice, and I have a right to reply when he makes personal reference to myself in a manner that is not quite accurate. The hon. gentleman says he does not think I should get up and lecture him. Why, Sir, he lectured me because I asked that what was read in French should be read in a language I could understand, and he lectured the House because the whole House assented to its being read. I said there was no use of it being read in a language I did not understand, and I wanted it read in English if it was read in French. If the charges are based on what is in that pamphlet, we have a right to know what they are. The hon. gentleman has looked through this evidence, but I have not. He is in the counsels of the Government, and is ready to second any motion they may make. No doubt he has had an opportunity of getting at the contents of this pamphlet which I have not had, and therefore I would like to have it read.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether the reading of these documents before the House is to be followed, according to the Rules of the House, by the printing of them in the Votes and Proceedings. There is no Rule, so far as I know just now, that makes it obligatory to read the papers that are laid on the Table, but it may be done on a motion. I understood the hon. member for Quebec East to ask that they should be read, no objection was raised at the time, and I said that if the House wanted them read they should be read.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. LAURIER. I asked that they should be taken as read, which is the practice, and it was refused by the majority. When the papers are taken as read, they always appear in the Votes and Proceedings, but the hon. leader of the Government would not consent to have anything printed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The reason I asked you this question is that I understand the hon. gentleman made a motion to have the papers read.

Mr. EDGAR. No; I asked that they should be read.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The motion was made that they should be read, and I understand that that motion will appear in the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. MULOCK. There was no motion. They were read with the unanimous consent of the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Was there a motion, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. There was no motion. It was asked that the papers should be read. Nobody objected, and they were read.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In consequence of that, will these papers be printed in the Votes and Proceedings?

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose all the papers that are before this House and that are read must be printed. That is the procedure followed. Every proceeding that takes place before this House has to appear in the Votes and Proceedings.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the consequence of reading these papers is that they shall appear in the Votes and Proceedings, I believe the House would prefer—I think I am expressing the opinion of both parties—that we should consider them now as read.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When I first rose I mentioned to the House what I think is the rule and practice before the courts among lawyers who want, not to dispute or quarrel only, but to obtain a fair decision by the court. I stated that the complaint made last year by me was a very short and simple one, contained in four or five lines. The hon. member for Richelieu has been mentioned as one of the complainants, but that is not correct. The expressions complained of by myself and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe are few, and they appeared not only in the pamphlet, but in the public press and were circulated all over the country.

Mr. MULOCK. Are they true?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is true that they have been made and published. That is not denied by those against whom the complaint has been made; but their defence consists in their saying this: "We are officers of the House of a certain kind; we have a right to discuss political matters, and we had a right to make use of the expressions complained of in public discussion on the hustings, in the press, or in pamphlets." That is known to every member of the House who has been asking for the reading of these papers. Those expressions were such as, if used by an employé in the service of any hon. gentleman opposite, in the ordinary course of life, would, as I said in my complaint, entitle that servant to immediate dismissal. Then my hon. friend says these officers were engaged by a committee of the House, and you had no right to say that they would not be re-engaged at the beginning of this Session. It appears to me, Sir, that you have the right to declare at the opening of the Session to these officers that they shall be no longer employed, because I understand their engagement closes with the Session and is renewed with the Session, with the consent of this House. The com-

mittee, when they engaged these parties, stated that they should continue, but there is no permanent engagement. Every man in the employment of the House must be under your immediate control in all matters of discipline and propriety. The second question, as to whether, under the circumstances, the language and the expressions that were made use of by these men, and which they acknowledge having used, when complained against, would justify their dismissal or justify your intimating to them that they had ceased to form part of the staff of this House, is one which does not at all trench on your authority to act in any case. I maintain that in both cases there is no need of going to the expense of printing these papers, and if that expense is to be incurred merely to gratify the pique of hon. gentlemen opposite, the responsibility must rest on those who have asked for the publication of the papers. I could well understand that the leader of the Opposition should ask what were the complaints made against these persons; but I say that the information having been given, there is no necessity for going further. The whole subject may be discussed without having these papers printed at a heavy cost.

Mr. MULOCK. I was in hopes that when the Minister of Public Works made the suggestion he did, the difficulty had reached its solution. I understood him to assent to the proposition that the whole of the proceedings, the correspondence and evidence, should be taken as read, and put on record in the Votes and Proceedings. That was a proper and manly suggestion, and even though coming somewhat late, I think it is entitled to respect. I regret that the hon. the Secretary of State appears to manifest a desire to suppress a portion of the evidence.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. MULOCK. If he does not, why does he object to follow the advice, or, at all events, the suggestion of the Minister of Public Works, who was desirous of concluding further discussion by treating the papers as read, so that we might proceed with other business. The hon. the Secretary of State says this House should do what he would do himself, dismiss a servant who is objectionable, but in this case, the men charged with the offending do not happen to be the servants of the Secretary of State. It may not happen that just what is distasteful to the hon. gentleman or to the refined member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) is distasteful to the majority of the House. At all events, we are entitled to an independent opinion on the question, and, inasmuch as the Minister of Public Works made a fair suggestion, I hope the Government will be able to reconcile themselves to following the advice of the present leader of the House and let us proceed to business.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If you, Mr. Speaker, desired that the complaint and the answer shall be considered as read and printed, I have no objection to the papers being put on record; but when a discussion comes on, my hon. friend will find, should it be necessary to quote the pamphlet, that there are expressions in it which will be sufficient to make him blush.

Mr. MULOCK. No, no.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Perhaps the hon. gentleman is accustomed to such expressions. Every man has his own sensitiveness, but I am sure the hon. gentleman would not go so far as to say that the expressions made use of are not highly offensive.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad this difficulty has terminated. I have no disposition, at all events, to protract the business of the House by having read a lot of papers, but I feel it my duty, in dealing with this subject as a judge, to know what I am dealing with. I am glad we have come to the

resolution to consider the papers as read and let them be entered in the Votes and Proceedings; and I may say, in this connection, one word with relation to the conduct of the Minister of Public Works. I have often noticed that the hon. gentleman, when leading this House in the absence of the First Minister, conducts business in a manner agreeable to the Opposition as well as to the party he leads; and he never could have shown his tact and management more clearly than he has done to-day, in at once consenting to have these papers considered as read and entered in the Votes and Proceedings. I can only express my regret that, perhaps, growing age, perhaps the intolerance which power creates, has made the immediate leader of the House, the First Minister, obstinate, and we know that as age increases so does obstinacy; and, if the right hon. gentleman could only show a little of the forbearance and courtesy to members on this side which is displayed by the Minister of Public Works, the business of this House would not suffer.

Mr. EDGAR. I must say that I only suggested that these papers should be read when it seemed there would be no other way of getting even a part of them printed and before the House. As I understand the position now, these papers have been ordered to be taken as read; and you have ruled that being so read, they must appear in the Votes and Proceedings. That being the distinct understanding, I am glad to support the suggestion of the hon. the Minister of Public Works that they be taken as read, and had that suggestion been made in the first instance, there would not have been all this trouble.

Mr. HESSON. On behalf of the hon. gentlemen on this side, I submit that the course adopted is a much more pleasant one than to have the papers read, and am much pleased to see that the leader of the third party has become himself once more. I remember when he strongly put the point not only that papers should be read, but that they should be read in French as in English, and am glad to see that he is willing now to accept a compromise and have them taken as read. I have a suggestion to make to the hon. gentleman, who seems to take up the cudgel warmly for those employés who have been dismissed, whether wrongly or rightly, and that is, that he would employ them in translating the French pamphlets for his benefit as leader of the third party.

Motion agreed to.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH THE U.S.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As the leader of the House is not present, I may mention to the hon. the Minister of Finance that, yesterday, I came to an understanding with the leader of the House that I would move to-day in reference to certain resolutions which I have on the paper. Under that agreement I now move:

That the resolutions in reference to commercial relations between Canada and the United States be made the First Order of the Day for Wednesday, 7th March, and that the debate thereon proceed *de die in diem*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was not in the House when the matter was brought up before, but I would ask my hon. friend whether he proposes to go on assuming that the protocols are not in our hands at that time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I stated before that Mr. Bergne, one of the protocolists on the British side of the Commission, had telegraphed me that he expected to send me the protocols on Tuesday. I have not yet received them, nor have I received any other communication from him, but the moment I do receive them, I will lay them on the Table of the House with the Treaty and the *modus vivendi*,

and I would ask my hon. friend whether he proposes to go on with the debate, which might be somewhat affected by the proposals and the counter-proposals which have taken place between the plenipotentiaries, or whether he will postpone the discussion if they are not here at that time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister was not present at the time that this was mentioned before, and I then agreed that, if the Government were not able to lay these protocols on the Table by that time, this motion should be waived. The First Minister was to have told me to-day—of course the explanation of the Finance Minister is quite satisfactory—at what time he expected these protocols.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am expecting them hourly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the hon. gentleman will feel himself justified in having them printed at once.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. They will be printed without a moment's delay.

Mr. MITCHELL. I presume, from what the hon. gentleman says, that there have been negotiations in regard to the trade relations, as well as in regard to the Fishery Treaty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; I think I am warranted in saying so.

Motion agreed to.

DEFECTIVE LETTERS PATENT ACT.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK (for Mr. McCARTHY) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 4) to amend the Act respecting defective Letters Patent, and the discharge of Securities to the Crown.

Mr. MITCHELL. Please explain.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The explanation is, that the Bill is intended, in regard to certain lands in Ontario, that they should be discharged from certain bonds given to the Crown.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY EMPLOYÉ'S PROTECTION AID.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK (for Mr. McCARTHY) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5) for the protection of railway employés.

Mr. MITCHELL. Explain that.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. This Bill is to provide that railway companies shall protect foreign railway frogs, and shall also put rails on their freight cars for the protection of their hands.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK (for Mr. McCARTHY) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) to amend the Canada Temperance Act.

Mr. MITCHELL. Explain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid from past experience, that this Bill will involve a charge on the revenue in favor of Mr. McCarthy, and, therefore, it should be brought down by resolution.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. This is simply in regard to voting for the repeal of the Act. At present, the voting is for or

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

against the petition, and it has been represented to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that it is often difficult for the voters to know whether they are voting for or against the petition. It is, therefore, proposed they shall be asked to vote for or against the Act instead of for or against the petition.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

AID TO WRECKED VESSELS.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) to allow American vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters.

Mr. CHARLTON. Explain.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. This Bill is for the purpose of granting to American vessels the right to come into Canadian waters to render aid to vessels wrecked or disabled, provided that similar privileges are granted by the United States Government to Canadian vessels. It is, in short, a Bill to provide for the rendering of reciprocal aid to wrecked vessels.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LAND SALES IN THE N. W. T.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What sums have been received from the sale of lands in Manitoba and the North-West Territories during the ordinary year 1887? 2. How much from the 1st January, 1888, to the 1st March, 1888?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The amount received for lands in the North-West during the last calendar year is \$450,701.08. As for the other information asked, the returns are not in from the several agents, and will not be in for a fortnight; but I will see that the hon. gentleman gets the information as soon as I receive it.

CLEARANCES TO VESSELS FOR BEHRING'S SEA.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether the Customs officers on the Pacific coast of Canada have been instructed, or are permitted, to refuse clearances to sealing vessels for Behring's Sea?

Mr. BOWELL. The Customs officials on the Pacific coast of Canada have not been instructed to refuse clearances to any vessel, either for the Behring's Sea or any other part of the world. It is their duty to grant certificates under the law to all vessels whenever the provisions of that law are complied with.

BEHRING'S SEA AND CANADIAN VESSELS.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Whether any convention, agreement, understanding or *modus vivendi* has been arrived at with the United States with reference to the use or navigation of the waters or harbors of Behring's Sea during the season of 1888 by Canadian vessels for the purposes of fishing, sealing, trading or shelter, or any of them?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may answer the hon. gentleman by saying that no such convention or arrangement has been arrived at.

MR. J. V. ELLIS, M.P., AND ANNEXATION.

Mr. GUILLET, What action does the Government propose to take in the case of John Valentine Ellis, Esquire, a Member of the House of Commons for the City of St. John, in the Province of New Brunswick, who has declared himself an advocate of the annexation of Canada to the United States?—

Mr. LISTER. I rise to a point of order. The question contains an averment of facts.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman state his point of order?

Mr. LISTER. I submit the question to the Speaker.

Mr. GUILLET—Who has declared himself an advocate—

Mr. LISTER. I ask for the ruling of the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. Rule 29 reads as follows:—

“Questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs; and to other members relating to any Bill, motion or other public matter, connected with the business of the House, in which such members may be concerned; but in putting any such question, no argument or opinion is to be offered, nor any facts stated, except so far as may be necessary to explain the same.”

The facts stated here are very serious, and I should think it would be better not to put the question in this form, as it is of a nature to reflect upon one of the members of this House.

Mr. GUILLET. I may say that I am giving the language which the hon. gentleman wrote in his own newspaper, and which has not been retracted, and never been repudiated.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I ask the hon. member to withdraw his question.

Mr. GUILLET. I think I have a right to ask this question. I am reading language that was actually published.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. GUILLET. I wish to say that in putting the question on the paper, I did so with the approval of the authorities of the House, who, I assume, ought to know the rules in relation to such matters.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. member withdraw his question?

Mr. GUILLET. If you have ruled so, I shall have to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I shall have to rule it out of order.

ICE BREAKERS—COUNTY OF BERTHIER.

Mr. BERNIER (for Mr. BEAUSOLEIL) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to provide, in the Estimates to be laid before the House, for the construction of ice-breakers in the parishes of St. Barthelemy and St. Cuthbert, in the County of Berthier, in order to prevent the disasters which occur every year on the breaking up of the ice in the St. Lawrence, and to deal favorably with the petition presented in that behalf?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I regret to say that I cannot answer just now the hon. member, because the Estimates are not yet before the House. When they are laid upon the table the hon. member will see if there is an item for that purpose; if not, he will perhaps put another question to the same effect.

INSTRUCTIONS TO LAND AGENTS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. McMullen for a return giving copy of instructions to Dominion Land Agents in Manitoba and the North-West, regarding instructions furnished to intending settlers free of charge, and a copy of instructions as to information for which a fee is imposed; the amount of fees received at the several offices during the years 1885-86 and 1887, for

such information; the amount of all fees collected from intending settlers during those years, and for which no credit was given in their purchase of Dominion Lands.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I shall be very glad to bring down all the information in our possession on this point for the hon. gentleman. I have had a thorough examination made to-day, and have found the original of the letter which was read last night. It will be remembered that the statement made by the hon. gentleman was to the effect that a certain settler had asked for information from one of the land offices in regard to nine townships, that he was told he could get the information on the payment of a fee of \$21.50, that thereupon he wrote to the department, and the Assistant Secretary wrote him to the effect that if he would pay the amount asked he would get the information, but not otherwise. I find the original letter of the gentleman, Mr. Edward Gregson, who asked for the information with respect to the nine townships as stated. I have here the original letter from Mr. Stephenson, agent at the Dominion Lands office at Regina, to this effect:

“I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, dated 14th inst., and in reply to say, that if you send me \$1.20 office fees for the information you ask for, I will then send you the diagrams.”

So what this gentleman asked for was the diagrams of nine townships, the fees required were not \$21.50 but \$1.20, and he was told by the department he would have to pay that small sum for the diagrams. These are the actual facts as they appear from the original documents in the department. However, I will bring down all the information I have on the subject.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not prepared to challenge the statement just made by the hon. Minister. My reason for bringing forward the resolution was for the purpose of gathering information with regard to the information furnished to intending settlers in the North-West. The statement made by Mr. Gregson to me was that a demand for \$21.50 had been made on him by an agent of the Dominion Lands in the North-West, for the information he asked respecting the townships to which the Minister has referred. I have since written to the gentleman, asking him to send the letter he received from the Dominion Lands agent making a demand for \$21.50. I am satisfied that the demand for \$21.50 was undoubtedly made by the Dominion Lands agent, whether in his letter to the department here he admits that such a demand was made or not. He may have stated that a demand for \$1.20 was made—he may have led the department to understand that that was the demand made, but Mr. Gregson has stated that he was required to furnish \$21.50. My remarks are in accordance with those made by the hon. gentleman behind me (Mr. Watson), who stated yesterday that, on several occasions, people desiring to settle in the North-West had been asked by those in official positions there for sums of money for information so furnished to them, altogether in excess of what the departmental regulations would warrant. The Minister said I had stated it was an actual settler who had made that complaint and asked this information. My statement was that it was an intending settler. He said he intended to become a settler in the North-West, and in order to do so, both he and his four sons had asked for information in regard to those particular lands. I am sorry he did not become a settler. He became so disgusted with the manner in which he was treated that he returned home, and is now preparing to go to Dakota, for which I am sorry.

Mr. DAVIN. I live in the North-West. I know Mr. Stephenson, the land agent, and other land agents. I hear most of what goes on in regard to matters of this kind, and all I can tell the House is this: that even if the Minister had not brought down the papers he has brought down to-

day, I would have had no hesitation in rising here and saying that there could not be the least foundation for the statement made by the hon. gentleman. It has been my business to enquire into the way those gentlemen have conducted themselves, it has been forced on me to do so, sometimes by criticism of this sort, and I have made a point to find out how a settler or an enquirer was treated at those offices. I have made a point to find out whether such charges as these have any foundation, and all I can say is that, having made such enquiries, there is not a shadow of foundation for those charges that are constantly brought forward. It is very important to repel such innuendoes, because there is an innuendo in the question, for they are calculated to do any amount of harm to a country, part of which I represent and in which we are all deeply interested. In fact, it is only part and parcel of a well-considered policy of many hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No.

Mr. DAVIN. I say yes. It is only part and parcel of a well-considered policy, and it is a policy that is sure to act as a boomerang and reflect on themselves, injuring them in the estimation of the country.

Mr. WATSON. I made certain statements last night, and my hon. friend for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has used my name in connection with what he has said. I did not say that regularly appointed agents of the Government had acted improperly towards settlers. I do not wish to be so misunderstood on that matter by the House. I said that I expected, when the facts were known, that the agents of the colonisation companies, who act in some districts as Dominion agents to receive applications for lands, would be found to have extorted exorbitant fees from intending settlers. I know that in 1881 and 1882 the country was full of colonisation companies' agents, and they demanded fees varying from \$20 to \$100 from intending settlers for information furnished them. I am not at all surprised at the warmth with which my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has entered into the defence of Government officials. We know the wonderful amount of ability he possesses for the defence of Government officials. Of course, I do not know whether he has made all the enquiries of which he has spoken, but we find he not only defends Government officials but he attacks some men in the west who are as much interested in the country as he is. We find from the public press that we may on some occasions doubt that the hon. gentleman is thoroughly accurate in making statements regarding the North-West. He always waxes warm in advocating the policy of the Government in the North-West. I wish to state on behalf of the Dominion Land agents, that I am not aware of any instances where a regularly appointed agent has extorted exorbitant fees from intending settlers; but I did say, yesterday, and I repeat to-day, that the Government policy of granting large tracts of land to colonisation companies enable them to exact large fees from intending settlers.

TRADE UNIONS.

Mr. AMYOT moved for:

Copies of the rules of all Trade Unions registered under the Act 35 Victoria and the Trade Unions Act, with a list and designation of their several officers.

He said: My object in making this motion is to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to some of the by-laws passed by the trade unions. I do not make the motion in opposition to the trade unions, but for the protection of the laborers themselves. I may at once state that I have in my hand the rules and by-laws of a society that calls itself the Quebec Ship Laborers' Benevolent Society, which

Mr. DAVIN.

was incorporated for the following purpose, as set forth in its Bill of incorporation:—

"That they are subjected to peculiar hardships and accidents in the pursuit of their daily avocations, and that they are desirous of forming themselves into an association, under the name of the Quebec Ship Laborers' Benevolent Society, for the purpose of assisting, in so far as it may be found practicable, the families of members reduced to distress by the illness or death of such members."

This society was incorporated on the 9th of June, 1862, says the first clause of the Bill, "for the purpose aforesaid"; but if I look at the by-laws of this society, I find a number of by-laws, which are called "practical by-laws," which show a very different purpose. Article 39 says:

"The following is the tariff rate of wages demanded by this association, viz., holders and swingers, \$1.00 per day; winchers and watchmen, \$3.00 per day; stagers, \$2.00 per day. Any member of this association who shall work on board ship for less than the established wages, or more than the established hours for said wages, or giving any of his time gratis, such as putting up gear, on being found guilty shall be fined for the first offence, \$5.00, second offence, \$10.00, and for the third offence he shall be dealt with as the association may determine."

In what way we do not know; whether he will be put in such a physical way as not to be able to reach another vessel we do not know. Then, provisions are made with regard to the number of men who shall be engaged on each vessel. Article 40 says:

"The necessary complement of men to form a gang will be the following: 1st. Vessels working 8 winches, shall employ no less than 24 winchers, 9 holders, 3 swingers and 2 stagers. 2nd. Vessels 600 tons and over, known as double-ported, that is, having a port on the larboard and starboard sides in one end of the lower hold or similar in the between decks, said ports if placed in the bow or stern shall employ no less than 18 winchers, 7 holders, 2 swingers and 2 stagers."

It goes on in the same way providing for the different styles of vessels. One of these clauses says:

"Steamships loading or discharging general cargo shall employ no less than 16 men in each compartment, the stevedore having the privilege to discharge the men at the finishing of the said compartment."

Article 41:

"Eight hours will constitute a day's work, commencing at 7 in the morning, one hour to breakfast, the same to dinner, and leave off at 5 in the evening."

Article 42:

"No member of this society will work on board any vessel where a donkey engine is used in loading or discharging timber, deals, boards, &c., except spool-wood."

Article 43:

"Any member of this society who works with a foreman who is not a member will be fined one day's pay for each day he shall have worked."

"Any member of this society who is discharged without a fault, is obliged to inform the other men who are working in the same ship; and if they do not knock off until such time as such man is allowed to resume his work, they will be fined one day's pay for each day they have worked."

According to this, the man who is discharged has only to declare that he has been discharged without a fault and the whole society is bound to strike and prevent anybody from working. Article 49:

"No members of this society will work in any vessels where the sailors are employed in the capacity of laborers at the loading or taking in broken stowage."

Article 50:

"Any member of this society who may be employed by any stevedore or captain to discharge a vessel, such member will be entitled to work at the loading of same vessel; and it shall be the duty of all members to protect each other in this case, under a penalty of one day's pay for each day he has worked. The same rule shall apply to watchmen."

What the protection is I do not know. Article 51:

"All vessels loading a cargo or taking a portion of a cargo of deals, staves, boards or any kind of lumber must employ four men to stow said cargo at the rate of \$4.00 per day; and it shall be distinctly understood that the four men stowing are not to carry under a penalty of one day's pay for each day they have worked."

Article 54:

"No member of this society will furnish labor to the loading of any vessel when the said vessel has been discharged by non-members."

Article 55:

"If any master undertakes to load his vessel with his crew, a record of such shall be taken, and he shall be deprived of labor hereafter by the association."

And it must be remembered that this association has forced—I use the word advisedly—nearly all the ship laborers of that city to enrol in its ranks. Article 59:

"Any member working with a stevedore who has been refused labor from the society will be fined the sum of \$10.00 for each day he has worked."

The consequence of these by-laws is very plain. The finest harbor in the world is now the poorest and the barest. Very few ships come there now—only one or two a week—and the revenues of the harbor, instead of increasing, are decreasing. According to the statement made by the Harbor Commissioners themselves, I find that the exportations in 1885 were, in round numbers, \$6,700,000, in 1886 they were reduced to \$5,800,000, and in 1887 they were still further reduced to \$5,100,000. The importations have also been reduced from \$3,700,000 in 1885, to \$3,500,000 in 1886, and \$3,200,000 in 1887. The population of Quebec is also decreasing, and this is all due to these by-laws, which are not sanctioned by law, but by force and intimidation. I am not against the workmen organising themselves; I believe in the protection of labor. I think that the Commission appointed to report on the protection due to laborers is a proper one. I believe in protecting laborers so far as morality is concerned, so far as the employment of young children and women is concerned, so far even as wages are concerned; but I do not believe in these coalitions, combinations, and associations which, in spite of law, rule by force and violence. I state, as a fact, that this association has ruined the harbor of Quebec, and I ask the Minister of Justice to come and give us help in the matter. We have got from our district certain Ministers, whose capacity I will not deny, but probably they are too much employed otherwise and cannot give us any aid. Therefore I make application to the Minister of Justice to come to the help of Quebec in this matter, and I have brought this motion in order that Parliament may acquire some information as to the cause of the ruin of the harbor of Quebec.

Motion agreed to.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) moved for:

Return of all correspondence by letter or telegram, and all other papers, relative to the conveyance of extra Provincial mails in Prince Edward Island since the 1st of September last.

He said: My object is to draw the attention of the Government to the unfortunate condition of affairs in Prince Edward Island, arising from the action of the Postmaster General. In 1886, the then Postmaster General, Sir Alex. Campbell, owing to the representations of some of his subordinates, withdrew the special trains which formerly existed in the Island for carrying the mails from the place where the *Northern Light* or the ice-boats land. On representations being made to him of the inconvenience which followed the withdrawal of the special trains, Sir Alex. Campbell removed the grievance and replaced the train, although to replace it involved considerable expense. A retrograde movement has, however, again been made by the new Postmaster General, and during the past winter we have not only suffered the inconveniences that must necessarily arise in an Island isolated as is Prince Edward Island, but these inconveniences have been intensified and increased by the action of the Government. Neither the Post Office Department nor the Marine Department will allow any agents of theirs in that Province

to act upon their own judgment or discretion. When the fall begins and the *Northern Light* has to take the place of the summer steamers, common sense would lead one to suppose that the Departments here would select some man in whose judgment they had full confidence, and allow him to direct when these steamers shall or shall not make the passage. But such seems to be the official perversity that prevails in the Post Office and the Marine Departments, that they will not allow even their own officials to direct when the steamers or boats shall cross, and everything has to be done by instructions from Ottawa, given by men who, from the nature of things, cannot know anything of the service and are not able to exercise reasonable discretion in the matter. Therefore, not only egregious official blunders, but blunders which act most prejudicially on the commercial community, are committed. I submit to the Postmaster General whether it would not be judicious on his part to place some little confidence in the Post Office Inspector on the island, and allow him to direct the manner in which the mails shall be carried after they are landed. I wish the House to understand that I am not making any complaint or bringing up any question with reference to the conveyance of mails across the Straits. Every year complaints are made, and probably will again be made at the proper time, on this subject, but what I now complain of is that, after the mails are delivered on the Prince Edward Island side, the special means of conveying them, which for years we have been supplied with, have been taken away. Hon. gentlemen can see the reasons why there should be some special means. Sometimes the mails are delayed on the other side at Cape Tormentine from one to five days, so that when a crossing is effected no means should be neglected to carry the mails speedily to their destination. Sir Alexander Campbell, when Postmaster General, had withdrawn, on the report of some wretched subordinate who knew nothing about it, the special trains, but the moment the matter was brought to his attention by the Senators representing the Island, he at once ordered the train to be replaced; and the service then gave every satisfaction. Now the Postmaster General has seen fit to withdraw that privilege, and will not allow his Post Office Inspector to exercise any discretion in the matter. He will not give us special trains, he will not pay for the conveyance of the mails by horse and sleigh, so that we are really worse off than we were forty or fifty years ago. To-day, if the mail is four or five days late in crossing, it must remain after it has got over, though it may contain 50, 60 or 150 mail bags, at Cape Tormentine, from 6 hours to 24 or 28 hours as the case may be. Now there is no excuse for anything of that kind. The matter was brought to the notice of the Postmaster General, and, when the *Northern Light* was disabled last October, the postmaster of the Island wrote to the Postmaster General and asked if it was not possible, in order that the long-suffering people might have their grievances removed, to have special trains employed when necessary. The Postmaster General replied that he should not exercise any such discretion, and that the postmaster was not to employ a special train or even a horse and sleigh to haul the letters to the capital of the Island without special orders from Ottawa. The unfortunate man had to act on that, and what was the result? In the month of December the *Northern Light* ceased to run, and instead of the agent of the Marine Department at once placing the boats on to take her place, it was found that no one had authority to put the boats on. They telegraphed to Ottawa, and after a lapse of four or five days, the boats were got ready under an order from Ottawa. There was an inexcusable delay in getting means to take the mails across. The boats were got ready, and after they were got ready the Board of Trade of Charlottetown telegraphed to the Postmaster General as follows:—

" CHARLOTTETOWN, 28th December, 1887.

" Postmaster here having no authority to employ special trains to deliver *Northern Light's* mails causes serious inconvenience to business. The Charlottetown Board of Trade respectfully urge that arrangements be at once made to obviate this. No outside mails received since Saturday last."

Two days passed by without a reply, and they telegraphed again asking for a reply. On the 3rd January, nearly a week afterwards, the Postmaster General replies :

" Matter submitted to Council. The expense, about \$7,000, considered too great, besides giving precedent to Western Canada to demand specials from Quebec for eastern mails."

Now, that whole telegram is an absurdity. The Postmaster General ought to have known, if he had enquired of his deputies, that the precedent had been already set, that his predecessor, and every man who had any cognisance of the facts and any authority over this matter from winter to winter, had ordered that special trains should be employed to carry the mails. They knew that very few mails were landed from the boats or from the *Northern Light* which had not to be carried to the capital; and, as to Quebec, I say that is a flimsy excuse which was unworthy of the hon. gentleman. The precedent had existed for years. Supposing the *Northern Light*, after being one or two days crossing, or even one day crossing, arrived at Georgetown or one of the termini an hour or two hours, as she generally did, after the departure of the morning train, those mails, which were already perhaps three or four days old, had to remain 24 hours in Georgetown until the next day's train. The whole commerce of those engaged in business would be partially paralysed owing to the want of action and the refusal of ordinary and reasonable facilities by the Department. Then there was no special train to carry a reply immediately back, so that a gentleman writing from Halifax, to another gentleman in Charlottetown, would have to wait about one week to write a letter and get a reply over this distance of about 150 or 160 miles, and that owing to the want of action, the want of judgment, and the culpable negligence of the department over which the hon. gentleman presides; and this in the face of a previous decision arrived at by his predecessor, who had given a great deal of consideration to the matter and had listened in the Senate for many years to the complaints of Senators from Prince Edward Island, that the specials should be run there all the time to carry the matter to the capital. Then he says it will cost \$7,000. If it did cost \$7,000, there is no reason why the people of that Island should be deprived of that special train, but he must have known that, in sending that telegram, he was not conveying the whole truth. That service did not cost \$1,000. The officials of the train were there. It was merely a cross entry of the Railway Department against the Post Office Department. It was merely the cost of the fuel to run 20 or 30 miles to carry the mails to the capital. On the 9th January the mails were ordered to go by the capes, but there were no boats ready to take them. The same policy which I have been so much deprecating, and which prevails in the Post Office Department, prevails also in the Marine Department. They seem to have no confidence in their agent. He had no authority to lay out \$5 to get the boats ready to carry the mails without authority from Ottawa. It was only on the 12th January that the boats were ready. Although it may be a little tedious, I want to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the facts under which we suffer, and then to ask if it is reasonable that those things should continue. So, after nearly a week's delay, when the boats were ready on the 12th January, that day was stormy and they could not go out, but on the 13th January they went out. There were 165 bags of mail matter at Cape Tormentine. The boats brought over 70 bags and left 95 behind. We had been a week without mails and, when they arrived, they were not much more than a third of the whole of the mails that were

Mr. DAVIES.

ready, and that, and the delay for that week, nearly the whole of it was due to the culpable negligence and inaction of those two departments. Then when those 70 bags arrived, they were allowed to remain all that day at Cape Traverse, and it was not until the 14th that they reached Charlottetown. I venture to say that, if a little village containing 300 voters in the hon. gentleman's county had been treated half so shabbily as the population of 120,000 people on the Island of Prince Edward has been, he would have given orders very quickly to have the evil remedied. The conduct of the hon. gentleman seems inexplicable. I cannot understand it. The Conservative newspaper in Prince Edward Island had tried to account for it, and after commenting for some time on the delay, it wound up as follows:—

" For the grossest and most inexcusable stupidity, Mr. McLellan, in his official capacity, has certainly no superior. Our language may appear strong, but we submit that our case warrants its use."

That is not the language of any Grit or Liberal, but it is the language of one of the strongest Tory newspapers in the Dominion, and the facts bear it out. Hon. gentlemen smile, but, if they were conducting a large business and waiting for returns from the United States of their shipments of oats and potatoes, and found that the mail had crossed and that 165 mail bags were lying there, and that the Postmaster General had telegraphed that they were not to be brought to town for 48 hours, they would think "inexcusable stupidity" as mild a term as could be used; and, for my part, I endorse the term as far as it is parliamentary to do it. Well, let me proceed with the facts of that week. On Saturday they again crossed, and the remaining 95 bags were brought over. These 95 bags remained all day Saturday, and all day Sunday, and the ordinary train which left Cape Traverse in the morning, brought them down, and they reached Charlottetown on Monday. On the 22nd, the mail again crossed, but the train, by order of the Postmaster General, had again left—the boat was about an hour late. The train would not wait. There were no passengers to take, however. Hon. gentlemen know that this railway which was built at a cost of \$175,000 by the Government, a few years ago, was built, as they themselves stated, to carry out the terms which they had made with Prince Edward Island, terms for the conveyance of the mails and passengers. There are no towns to be served by it. The main object of the railway was to carry passengers and the mails to and fro. They started the train in the morning with, perhaps one or two passengers, certainly not more. They run that railway 13 miles to get to the main line, and they will not wait until the mail crosses. That is the complaint. The mail crossed too late that day. The train went forward on the 23rd, 24 hours after it crossed that mail was brought to town. On the 24th, another mail crossed, and it was too late for the town. Then the Board of Trade commenced telegraphing to the Premier. This thing was intolerable. Mind you, it has nothing to do with parties, it has nothing to do with politics; it is a matter that interests every grown-up man and woman on the Island. Well, the Board of Trade telegraphed to the Premier on the 12th January :

" The Right Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,
Ottawa.

Charlottetown Board of Trade, in annual meeting assembled, solemnly protest against present arrangement of mail and passenger service with mainland. No mails received since that of Thursday, 5th inst., from Pictou, although weather fine and Straits suitable for ice-boat crossing. No out going mails since yesterday week, except one by *Northern Light* last evening, which was dispatched on Saturday with accumulations of previous two days. These mails were sent by Georgetown against judgment of everybody here, because Cape service was not ready; crew not organised for crossing Tormentine to-day. When mail crosses from Tormentine in a forenoon, the proper time, it cannot be delivered here by regular train until noon the following day. Under present arrangement of Traverse Railway, there is a positive injury to the Island, as mails take an average of twenty-four hours from Traverse by regular

train, while they could be through by teams in three hours. Management of mail, steam and ice-boat service, from Ottawa, complete failure. We pray that a special train from Traverse be granted as in former years. Not possible to arrange regular trains to suit crossing. Please telegraph reply."

Now, hon. gentlemen will see that before the railway was built at all, before we ever joined—I was going to say, unfortunately joined—Confederation, when the mails did cross, they were brought to Charlottetown by special teams in two or three hours—always; and within three or four hours afterwards, a team took out the return mail, just allowing sufficient time for the letters to be delivered, and time to answer them. Now, under the masterly arrangement made by the present Postmaster General, these mails that were formerly delivered by horse and sleigh in three hours, are delivered by his railway in twenty-four. Sir, that is intolerable, and cannot be submitted to. Well, on the 13th the Postmaster General telegraphs in reply:

"Sir John asked me to reply to your message. On information received on the 8th, it was decided to put on ice-boats. Application was made to Marine Department to commence the service. Railway will run a train from Traverse at half past eleven to connect with through train to Charlottetown. In past years, boats have generally crossed in time to connect, and special efforts will be made to ensure this."

Now, the hon. gentleman says, instead of starting the train in the early morning at 9, I will meet your wishes by delaying it until 11. I dare say his intentions were good, but his ignorance of times and the facts about the crossing, frustrated entirely his good intentions. As a matter of fact, the boats do not get over by 11 o'clock except on rare occasions—my hon. friend near me says not once in 50 times. They leave the other side at 7 or 8 o'clock, and get over by 12 or 1 o'clock. I went to Cape Traverse about it and I found that the boats had crossed and reached the board ice, and when within five or six hundred yards of the train, the whistle blew, and the train started and left behind 100 mail bags that were to be carried to the city. Well, Sir, the Board of Trade was not satisfied with the answer given by the Postmaster General, and they again telegraphed to the Premier on the 23rd:

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,
Ottawa.

"First mail since Wednesday crossed yesterday; forwarded this morning from Traverse to Summerside, missing the train."

Now, I want to explain what that is. There was a masterly stroke of genius exhibited there by the Postmaster General. After complaint had been made, and after it was apparent that the delay in the starting the train at 11 o'clock did no good, the Postmaster General thought the matter over, and, as I say, by a masterly stroke of genius, he adopted a policy which, I think, ought to recommend him to Her Majesty for some signal mark of her royal favor. He directed that the mails, instead of being carried to Charlottetown, should be put in a sleigh and carried 17 miles further away to the town of Summerside, in the west, in order that they might possibly catch the train coming down by the evening. What was the result? The Charlottetown Board of Trade say what the results were:

"First mail since Wednesday crossed yesterday; forwarded this morning from Traverse to Summerside, missing the train."

It got in too late again, and I asked the man who drove it up how late he was. He said he had arrived at the station with four teams and some 75 mail bags the moment the train was steaming out—the train with which the hon. gentleman was going to carry the mails, would not even allow the bags to be transferred from the sleighs into the train; so that did no good. But he persisted in it and kept on, in spite of the protests of the Board of Trade. That telegram goes on:

"Will not now arrive in Charlottetown until to-morrow, nearly two days after arrival at Traverse. If sent to Charlottetown direct by team, 30 miles, could have been here this morning. Traverse branch opened this morning, and might have brought mails to intercept main line trains

at County Line, Charlottetown, by post road, about two hours further than Summerside from Traverse. Would it not be possible to permit postal authorities here to meet the reasonable requirements of the community?"

On the 26th the Charlottetown Board of Trade again telegraphed to Sir John A. Macdonald:

"No foreign mail crossed since Sunday last until to-day, when train left Traverse 15 minutes before ice-boats lauded the mails" —

That is a nice state of affairs, —

—"thus preventing the arrival of mails at Charlottetown before to-morrow. We again ask, is there no remedy for this condition of things?"

The Postmaster General replied to that as follows:—

"Your message of 26th to Sir John, reached me to-day. At once saw Superintendent of Railways, who will give instructions to prevent similar occurrences. Please communicate on postal matters with me direct."

I do not know why, but the Mail Department and Board of Trade did not seem to have that confidence in the hon. gentleman that was desirable, so they telegraphed to Sir John A.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They had confidence in me.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) They seem to have had confidence in the Premier, and I am anxious to bring the facts before him again, because I am satisfied that if he would give five minutes attention to this matter, he would remedy it. The policy of the hon. gentleman does not commend itself to me, but I believe that he will not see a gross injustice done to the community, when it is explained to him, without remedying it. But the Postmaster General was responsible for the whole trouble. He will pay \$6 for a team to haul those mails 17 miles further away, and will not pay \$13 to haul them to Charlottetown. The 120,000 people of Prince Edward Island, who are at very great natural inconvenience, supposing the best was done, would have to suffer a good deal; but these natural inconveniences are intensified and duplicated ten times over by the stupidity and ignorance of these officials. If the hon. gentleman had acted for the first time in this way I would have thought it was through sheer ignorance; but when his predecessor, having considered the whole matter, had determined that special trains ought to run, and he came in and revoked that order, and would not grant teams to carry the mails, but persisted in carrying them 17 miles further than was necessary, and at the same time declared that a special train would cost \$7,000 when he knew it meant simply a cross entry in the books of the Railway Department as against the Post Office Department, I say I almost despair of anything being done to have these wrongs set right until at least some pressure is brought to bear on the hon. gentleman by his colleagues. I do not want to detain the House on this matter any longer, but I wish to impress this fact: that while Parliament voted \$175,000 to build that short line of road, by the perverseness with which it is managed by the authorities, it is, instead of a blessing, a curse, and, while before the rail road was built we had the mails delivered in three hours, the same mails now take twenty-four hours to make the run. Thirty or forty years ago our mail service was in ten times as good a condition as it is to-day. We had special teams to haul the mails before the railroad was built, and now that we have the road we have gone backward. We have members from every part of the Dominion rising in their places and stating that all reasonable efforts are made by the Post Office, if by no other department, to give the people the benefit of modern improvements, to carry the mails from one place to another rapidly, and I believe this is the case all through the North-West and everywhere else. Parsimony and cheese-paring and meanness have not formed the policy which has characterised

the Post Office in days gone by. Both parties have recognised the supreme importance of the prompt delivery of postal matter, especially in the present day. Why, the Finance Minister gave a quasi-sanction to a scheme for the construction of a tunnel which was going to cost millions, and yet in the face of that we hear the Postmaster General complaining of a nominal charge on the Government books of \$7,000 being too much to be paid in connection with Prince Edward Island, while, as a matter of fact, it will not cost \$1,000. If the hon. gentleman will not give us a special train, the oil and coal for the running of which might possibly cost \$1,000 to the country, let him do what was done forty years ago in the Island, let him employ horses and sleighs. It formerly cost \$13 the round trip, four horses and sleigh, for a distance of 30 miles. If we are to be cut off from the rest of the Dominion, if we are to be deprived of the advantages which every other Province enjoys, let the hon. gentleman say so. I have read the comments made by the Tory press, I have read the telegrams of the Board of Trade, a strictly non-political body, stating that matters there are intolerable; all due entirely to the mismanagement of the hon. gentleman, and I believe with the Tory newspaper that the hon. gentleman has some intense grudge to satisfy against the people of the Island or he would not have acted so parsimoniously and contemptibly as he has done.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman has relieved himself I suppose very considerably. He has told us that the arrangements for the transmission of the mails in the town of Charlottetown are ten times worse than they were thirty or forty years ago. The hon. gentleman knows that this Government has expended enormous sums in subsidising a railway to Cape Tormentine, and that the land carriage to Cape Tormentine, in the period to which he refers twenty or thirty years ago, was the greatest difficulty in the transmission of the mails, and it was a journey that was most dreaded by passengers. By expending \$120,000 or \$130,000, in subsidising a railway to Cape Tormentine, twenty-four hours at least were saved on the passage of the mails by that railway from what it occupied in the old time.

Mr. WELSH. No.

Mr. McLELAN. I think those who conveyed the mails ten or twenty years ago, or even five years ago, will say that a large saving in time has been made by the construction of the railway to Cape Tormentine. A few years ago there were complaints as to the crossing of the Straits by the ice-boats, and accidents were occurring. It was under the same management and, perhaps, under the same captains as those who were running it before the Island entered the Confederation. I asked the Postmaster General when I was in charge of the Marine Department, to give me charge of that service, as I believed I could organise a better system for crossing the Straits than that which existed then, or had existed previous to Confederation. I placed it in the hands of a gentleman who had years of experience in winter passages in the Gulf, and an improved system was organised. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1888, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 1st March, 1888.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the said Message and Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—THE ESTIMATES.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I congratulate the Minister of Finance on the promptness with which he has brought down the Estimates, and I may say it appears well for the expedition with which the Session may be conducted. I would ask the hon. Minister if he is prepared to tell the House whether he will or will not be likely to proceed with his financial statement at an early day?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that I am not able to state how early it will be in my power to make the financial statement, but I may inform the hon. gentleman and the House that it is our intention to proceed at once with the Estimates. The practice in England, as the hon. gentleman is aware, is to proceed with the Estimates long before the Chancellor of the Exchequer brings down his Budget, and we propose to proceed with the consideration of the Estimates in advance of the financial statement being made.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a new departure. I am not at all disposed myself at present to raise any objection to it. I have no doubt it has been well considered, and I am aware of the English practice; in fact, I see certain conveniences in it. I understand, then, that the hon. gentleman has it not in contemplation to proceed either on Friday or Tuesday next.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it will be well for the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, in connection with the statement just made, to call together the Committee at once, because in connection with the passage of many of the items we first want to know how the money voted last Session has been disposed of.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest also that a meeting of the Committee on Privileges and Elections be called for an early day, as a most important matter has been referred to it.

RETURNS ORDERED.

List of Trade Unions which have complied with the provisions of the Act 35 Victoria, chapter 30, and the Trade Unions Act, showing the date in each case.—(Mr. Amyot.)

Copies of regulations made by the Governor in Council respecting the registry of Trade Unions.—(Mr. Amyot.)

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 2nd March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) moved:

That the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be extended to the 24th March instant, and the time for presenting Private Bills to the 29th March.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 8) to incorporate the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Bill (No. 9) respecting the Canada Southern, and Erie and the Niagara Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

TRADE COMBINATIONS.

Mr. WALLACE (York) moved that the Select Committee appointed on Wednesday last to examine into certain trade combinations be empowered to employ a shorthand writer to take down such evidence as the committee may deem necessary.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved that the First Report of the Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House be adopted. He said: I must explain that there are three recommendations contained in this report. First, the recommendation to appoint Mr. Owen to fill the vacancy caused by the decease of Mr. Eyvel. Mr. Owens has been recommended to us as one of the most efficient reporters that could be found here, so that, after consideration, the committee beg to recommend his appointment. The second recommendation is that a gratuity equal to two months' salary be granted the widow of the unfortunate Mr. Eyvel, on account of the circumstances that led to his death; and the third recommendation is one we have been obliged to make since the last two years concerning the arrangement for the printing of the Official Reports, as we have not yet been able to carry out the rules on this subject adopted by the House in July, 1885. We expect this will be the last year we will ask to continue this arrangement, because we believe that the Government printing establishment will be in operation next Session. The report also contains the recommendation to continue the contract for binding with the same contractor, as last year, on the same terms and conditions.

Mr. WALLACE. With reference to the second recommendation of the report, I regret the committee have not seen their way to make a still larger appropriation for the family of the late George Eyvel. The circumstances that led to his death are very well known to every member of this House. Mr. Eyvel, in the performance of his duty as a servant of this House and the Government, was reporting the proceedings of the Labor Commission meetings in the city of Toronto, and on his way home he was attacked by robbers, struck down in the street, on a bitterly cold night, and lay insensible until nearly dead. When he recovered consciousness, he was so much reduced in strength he could scarcely help himself, and as a result of the injuries received he died a few days ago, his death being the direct result of the injuries he received that night. I think, therefore, this House should deal a little more generously with the family of the late George Eyvel than the committee propose in this report. We have a precedent for such action, in the fact that the House of Commons has, on previous occasions, made grants to the widows and relatives of deceased servants, under circumstances that do not claim our sympathy so strongly as do the circumstances in this case. Mrs. Todd was voted by this House \$1,000 on the death of her husband. The family of the late Mr. Coffin, Commissioner of Ordnance Lands, was voted the sum of \$2,000. The Senate voted the family of the late Mr. Fennings Taylor a year's salary, and the family of the late Rev. Mr. Johnson, Chaplain of the Senate, six months' pay. There are also other cases affording precedents for the action I recommend, and I would suggest that the report

be referred back to the committee with instructions to make the amount at least six months' pay, or \$1,000; and I am confident that such a grant will meet the approval of this House and the country as well.

Mr. DENISON. I merely desire to say a word in seconding the motion of the hon. member for York. I believe it is highly desirable that what he suggests should be done for the family of Mr. Eyvel. The circumstance of his being attacked is one this House should bear in mind. It is not the usual case of a man meeting his death through old age, but of his being taken off in the prime of life.

Mr. LISTER. I may be permitted to say a word in support of the hon. member for North York, and that is that I think the suggestion is the most generous act on his part. So far as the late Mr. Eyvel is concerned, he was for many years an official of this House, and for many years served this House at the small salary of \$1,000. He was a most efficient reporter and courteous gentleman, and I am sure I echo the sentiments of this side of the House in saying we will be glad to see the Government deal generously with his widow. He was a resident for many years of the town of Sarnia, and I had opportunities of knowing him intimately, and can appreciate his good qualities. A more diligent and more faithful servant this House could not have had, and I think the Government would be only doing an act of generosity, and kindness, and justice, in recognising his services by dealing generously with his dependent wife and family. I believe he leaves his family of three small children almost entirely destitute, and, as we all know, the circumstances connected with his death were of a most painful character. He was stricken down, as my hon. friend has said, on his way home from the Labor Commission, where he was discharging his duties as a servant of this House, and was left on the street for hours on a bitterly cold night until he was picked up by a policeman, who did not know him, and who took him to the police station, where he was put into a warm room, when his hands were frozen at the time, and the result of that was his death. I believe that if medical men had been called in immediately, his life would have been saved to himself and his family. I think the House, in taking a generous view of this case, will at least grant six months' salary to his widow.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad to see that it is unnecessary to rise to support this motion, because it seems to meet with the general consent of the House, but I cannot deny myself the pleasure of speaking in favor of it. As a member of the committee, I may say that many, if not all, of the members were in favor of taking some such course as this, but they felt it would not be within their province to do so, and that it was better that it should come from the House itself. I think I may say that the committee were unanimous in favor of a liberal grant being made in this case. I knew Mr. Eyvel well, and a man more calculated to inspire and fix esteem has never been in the gallery of this House, or, for that matter, in this House. Before he was on the *Hansard* staff he served the House with perfect propriety and great ability in another capacity. He worked for a newspaper in that gallery, and I do think that, in regard to a man who has had relations of this kind with the House, the House will always be ready to manifest sentiments such as I am happy to hear expressed to-day.

Mr. SCRIVER. I desire simply to say that while, as my hon. friend who has just taken his seat has said, the committee did not feel at liberty to recommend any other than the usual course pursued under such circumstances, that two months' pay should be given as a gratuity to the widow, they would have been glad to have recommended a larger appropriation; but, even in regard to this, they acted under a misapprehension, I find, in regard to one matter. I am told that civil servants are paid a month in advance,

and that is not the case in regard to the official stenographers of the House. If the committee had been aware of that fact, they would certainly have recommended that at least three months' salary should be paid.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. After the expression of the opinion which seems to be so general on both sides of the House in regard to this case, perhaps the committee had better withdraw their report and limit themselves to calling the attention of the House to this case, and then leave it in the hands of the Government to consider it, and to place in the Supplementary Estimates what we think would be proper in consideration of the circumstances.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I am sure that the members of the committee who have united in making their recommendation will be satisfied to see that they have met so well the feelings of the House. As my hon. friend at my side (Mr. Davin) has said, the feeling of the committee was that something ought to be done, and that Mr. Eyvel's family was entitled to the recognition which we desired to offer, so, for my part, I am sure that we shall willingly take back that part of the report which refers to that recommendation and ask that the report be adopted without that portion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand that the hon. gentleman wants the first and third paragraphs adopted. Perhaps the House will consider that the second paragraph is not before the House.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved that the First Report of the Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of the House be adopted, with the exception of the recommendation that a gratuity be granted to Mrs. Eyvel.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Report of Royal Commission on the leasing of water-power, Lachine Canal.—(Mr. Pope.)

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. JAMIESON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 10) to amend the Canada Temperance Act. He said: No lengthened explanation of this Bill will be required from me. It contains the provisions of the Bill introduced by me at two previous Sessions of this House. In addition to that, I have embodied in it some other amendments which have been found to be necessary, owing to the defective working of the Act. We have experienced considerable difficulties in the working of the Act, and it is thought necessary to have it amended in some particulars. It has been thought advisable that the Act should be applicable to the whole Dominion. At present, it is not applicable to the Province of British Columbia, owing to the fact that they have no county organisations there. We propose, therefore, to make it applicable there. It is not applicable, either, to temporary judicial districts, and we propose to apply it to those districts, of which there are several in the Province of Ontario. It is also proposed that no repeal vote shall be taken until the Act has been in force at least two years and ten months. We also propose that, in the case of liquor being sold for medicinal purposes, under the certificate of a medical man, a penalty shall be imposed on him if he gives a colorable or fraudulent certificate. We also propose to repeal the 103rd section of the Act. A good deal of difficulty has arisen owing to the over-particularity of that clause. There is a special rule laid down for each Province separately. The clause I refer to is the one which deals with the magisterial authority before which the trials may take place. We propose to make

Mr. SCRIVER.

one law applicable to each part of the Dominion. In the Province of Ontario difficulties have arisen in consequence of the conflict of authority, and in this and many other respects we believe the law would be much better enforced if one provision were made for the whole Dominion. An amendment is also proposed to the search clause. At present a search cannot be made for liquor under the Act unless a prosecution is pending, and when a prosecution is pending, parties who are in the habit of infringing the law take advantage of the clause to dispose of their liquor. We propose that on the information of a credible witness, a Justice of the Peace, or a person having authority under the Act, shall be permitted to issue a search warrant in the first instance. It is also proposed to extend the right of search, so that it may be made at any time. At present it can only be made in the day time. It is also proposed to append to the Bill a set of forms for the guidance of Justices of the Peace and others connected with the enforcement of the law. It has been found that, owing to technical defects, many indictments have been quashed before Justices of the Peace, which should have been upheld. Finally, there is a provision in the Bill respecting the application of fines. It is deemed advisable by those promoting this Bill that in cases where an officer of the Provincial Government is party to the prosecution, one half the penalty shall be paid to him for the enforcement of the law. In all other cases, as in the case where a private individual prosecutes, it is proposed that one half the penalty be paid to him and the other half to the treasurer of the municipality. These, in brief, are the amendments I propose, which, I hope, will meet with the favorable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND MAIL SERVICE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Davies for a return of correspondence, by letter or telegram, and all other papers relative to the conveyance of extra Provincial mails in Prince Edward Island since 1st September last.

Mr. McLELAN. When the House adjourned last evening I was making some remark, in answer to the extraordinary statements made by the hon. gentleman from Queen's (Prince Edward Island) in his usual manner. I was dealing with his statement that there have been no improvements in the means of communication for the last forty or fifty years; and I was reminding the House that, forty or fifty years ago, communication during the winter months for five or six months in the year, was made by a land voyage of fifty-two miles, and by ice-boats, under the control of certain men living at Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse. I had occasion to look into the history of that service, and I was unable to ascertain that any improvement had been made for thirty or forty years by the Local Government previous to Confederation. When the service came under the control of the Post Office Department at Ottawa, complaints were made by people of the Island that it was insufficient, that the service with which they had so long been content, apparently, had become insufficient, and that steps should be taken by the Government to improve it. I am not now speaking of the steam communication, but of the ice-boat service, to which the hon. gentleman has more particularly referred. The first step taken was to improve the means of transit to the Capes.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman will permit me to say that I carefully excluded any reference to the ice-boat service. I stated distinctly that I was making no complaint about it.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman said that we were retrograding, and that the communication was worse than it was forty or fifty years ago.

Mr. DAVIES. The mail service on the Island.

Mr. McLELAN. I told the House last evening that the first step that the Government took was to construct railways down to the ice, so as to dispense with that long route of fifty-two miles of land travel, in the season of the year when travellers experienced the greatest hardships. In order to avoid that difficulty, we subsidised a railway in the county of Westmoreland at an expense of \$120,000, and on the Cape Traverse side we expended \$175,000 in building a railway down to the Cape, and a wharf at that point. The Government also provided a grant in the Estimates for the construction, at Cape Tormentine, of a wharf costing about \$100,000 more, to facilitate this service. Now, the carriage of the mails across the Straits was generally done by certain individuals living on the Cape, under a contract of so much per trip, just the same as contracts were given to other mail conductors throughout the country. They were not bound to any particular hours in crossing, but it was left to their own judgment as to when they should cross. Complaints were made as to the manner in which that service was being performed. I may say that no change had taken place in the manner of its performance since the time the hon. gentleman was a member of the Government and controlled it himself. When I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries I suggested to the Postmaster General, shortly after an accident occurred, when I had occasion to study more especially the condition of the service, and found that it was capable of improvement—I suggested to the Postmaster General that we should place that service in the hands of the Marine and Fisheries Department. He consented, and the Government approved of the change. I sent an officer from my department down there to study the subject, before the winter set in, and he came back and reported to me. I approved of his plans, in a great measure, and we agreed upon a system for the winter. I sent him down to organise that system and carry it out, and I gave him an open order for any expense he thought to be necessary. And let me say that when I sent that officer down there and kept him in charge of that service all winter, complaints came to me continually from the Island that I was interfering with an old institution, and was taking the management out of the hands of the people who had held it for forty or fifty years. I went on, and I believe gentlemen from Prince Edward Island now will say that the changes made in that service are beneficial and have effected a great improvement, as compared with the service that previously existed under the management of the Local Government, and up to the time I took charge of it.

Mr. WELSH. Yes.

Mr. McLELAN. I have the testimony of the hon. gentleman who says "yes," and of a great many more from Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia who have crossed the Straits and who say that the system now is almost as perfect as it can be made. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) made another statement which I consider rather extraordinary, namely, that the arrangement which I made for the connection of the ice-boat service was such that not once in fifty times did the service connect. In looking at the time-table of the Island Railway I found that there was a train leaving Cape Traverse about 6:45 in the morning to connect with the train that runs from Summerside to Charlottetown, arriving there at about 10 in the morning. I found there was another train running through the Island with which that train, if delayed until about 12 o'clock, would be able to connect. I asked the Railway Department to change the hour of running on that branch to Cape Traverse to 11:30, which they did, and I believe in almost every case that would enable connection to be made between the ice-boats and the railway. The hon. gentleman has risen in his place and stated that not once in fifty times was that connection made. The hon. gentleman

should have known, if he came here with the intention of giving the facts to the House, how many times they failed to connect before making his assertion to the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I had a statement here, and I read it

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman in making a speech depended on his imagination and political feeling, in order to make capital against the department and the Government in this matter. The hon. gentleman, if he had made enquiries, would have found from the return that from the time the boats commenced running up to 28th February, the last return we have, there were only nine occasions on which they failed to connect, and on one of those occasions, when there was unusual delay, a special train was sent on with the mails. The hon. gentleman, I say, should have made due enquiries before he ventured on the assertion that only once in fifty times had they been able to make connection. The hon. gentleman complains that we do not put on special trains for this service when they do fail to connect, and he complains that we send the mails to Summerside by land. Under the arrangement Summerside receives the mails at every crossing, and we have a contract with the land service to carry the mails from Traverse to Summerside when we cannot send them by train. When they fail to connect we have sent forward the mails from Charlottetown to Summerside in order that they might go forward by the night train and reach Charlottetown at 10 o'clock next morning. So they do not lie over to the next day, but, instead of reaching Charlottetown at about 3 o'clock in the day, as they will do if they connect, they reach there the next morning by train from Summerside. That is the reason why we send the mails to Summerside. The hon. gentleman complains that it is a great hardship because the Government do not send forward special trains. I have enquired as to how often the mails from the whole Lower Provinces have failed to connect with Montreal this winter, and I have just received a telegram which states that since 1st November the mails from Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island have sixteen times failed to connect at Montreal with trains running to Ottawa and the west. We do not send on, and do not expect to send on, special trains to carry the mails in case they miss the connection. They lie there till the next train, and mails that should have been delivered to us at noon would not be delivered before the morning following. So that if the people of Prince Edward Island complain because we do not immediately charter a train and send forward the mails which miss connection, and only nine times during the season of crossing, from 13th January up to 28th February, they should remember that the mails failed to connect sixteen times at Montreal with the western train. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has complained that we do not give to our agents there authority to act upon their own responsibility. When I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries I gave such an order to the captain of the *Northern Light*, to act upon his own responsibility. I told him that as he was upon the spot he should consider the condition of the ice in the Gulf, and he was to be the judge as to when he could proceed to sea with due regard to the safety of the vessel. That order was unsatisfactory to the people of the Island. They said we should order the captain to go to sea; and so unsatisfactory was it that the Government of the Island embodied it in the complaints which they laid at the foot of the Throne, that I had given an order to the captain to act upon his own authority.

Mr. WELSH. Quite right, too.

Mr. McLELAN. It seems to be impossible to please the people of Prince Edward Island in anything. If I undertake to improve the ice-boat service, fault is found with me on the ground that I am interfering with an old institution, and

people who have long held that monopoly are put aside while officers of the Fishery Department are sent down from Ottawa to take charge of it. If I give an order to the captain of a steamer that he should exercise his judgment as to when he should risk a vessel in crossing the Straits, complaint is made that he should be given that responsibility; and now, when we do not give authority to our officers in connection with the mails, complaint is made by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has intimated to the House that I have withheld those special trains upon those nine occasions—I suppose he will refer to some other occasions at Georgetown also, out of some grudge I feel to the people of the Island. I deny it. I deny that I have any such feeling as the hon. gentleman would impute to me. It is not possible for me to have such a feeling; it is not possible for me to exercise such a feeling with the full knowledge of this subject which my colleagues possess. The Government would not permit any member of the Cabinet to bring his feelings into any matter that affected the people of any section or Province of the Dominion. I have nothing but the most kindly and generous feelings towards the people of Prince Edward Island, and the Government has always treated that Province, in its isolated condition, bountifully, and especially the postal service. If the hon. gentleman had examined the facts, he would have found that when that Province entered Confederation in 1874 it had only 179 post offices, while we have increased the number to 298 at the present time. It had an annual mail travel in 1874 of 249,000 miles, which we have increased to 489,000 miles. The percentage of increase in these things has been greater in Prince Edward Island than it has been in either New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. The increase in the annual mileage travelled in connection with the postal service from 1874 to 1887 was 44 per cent. in Nova Scotia, 53 per cent. in New Brunswick, and 96 per cent. in Prince Edward Island. These figures show how exceptionally well treated is the Province of Prince Edward Island in these respects. The hon. gentleman referred to my own county of Colchester, telling the House that if there was a matter affecting a little village of 300 population in my county, a special means would be adopted by me to accommodate those 300 people. Well, Sir, we have not only villages of 300 population in the county of Colchester, but we have also villages growing to the dignity of small towns; and some of these towns regard themselves as of considerable commercial importance. I may tell the hon. gentleman that one little town in the county I have the honor to represent pays to the Minister of Customs within \$1,000 of one-half as much revenue as the whole Province of Prince Edward Island. Yet, instead of interfering specially for the benefit of the little villages and towns in his own county, the Postmaster General does not order special trains to carry the English mails to that county, nor even to the large and flourishing cities of Halifax and St. John. And so, Sir, if the hon. gentleman had not felt it necessary to draw upon his imagination and his political feelings, he would not have made a statement so unworthy of him, as that I would have appropriated the public funds in order to benefit little villages of 300 inhabitants in the county of Colchester. The hon. gentleman says that even supposing the running of those special trains does cost \$7,000, we should not hesitate to run them on all occasions. Notwithstanding that great stupidity with which the hon. gentleman says the Postmaster General is endowed, I think the arrangement I have made, by changing the time of starting the Cape Traverse Railway, has resulted in a large saving of money, and the railway failed to connect only nine times during the season. Therefore, I think that so long as there was a reasonable prospect of meeting the wants of the community, I was justified in making that change, in order to effect a saving of public money. The hon. gentleman says he could run all the trains that were

Mr. McLELAN.

run last year, at a cost of \$1,000, for which we paid \$6,700.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) May I ask the hon. gentleman to state to the House to whom he paid this money? Did he not pay it to the Post Office Department, and let it stand simply as a cross-entry in the Government books?

Mr. McLELAN. I paid it to the Railway Department, and the Railway Department paid it out for the expense of running the trains. If the hon. gentleman could run them for \$1,000, it would be well to remove the gentleman who is now running them and put the hon. gentleman in his place. But he says the cost was only \$7,000, at any rate, and why should we not expend that money? Well, Sir, I did not think it was advisable. The post office service at the best, if reasonable accommodation is given to the people, is very expensive, and the revenue from it falls very short of the expense; and I believe that wherever we can effect a saving in that expense without injuring the service, it is right that we should do so. There are many places calling for postal accommodation, and it is better to cut down the expense in some places, and apply it to the wants of the people who need accommodation. Therefore, I think I was justified in reducing largely the expense on these special trains. If the hon. gentleman looks at the post office accounts, which show what we have expended on the postal service of Prince Edward Island and on the communication between that Province and the other Provinces, I think he will quietly admit to himself, if he does not to the House, that we are justified in saving that expenditure in every way we possibly can. The expense on the ordinary service on the Island, last year, was \$50,262; the subsidy for carrying the mails from the mainland was \$10,000; the cost of the service at the Capes was \$6,312; the cost of running the *Northern Light* and the *Neptune* was \$33,000; and other subsidies were \$3,000; making in all an expenditure of \$103,000 for postal services for Prince Edward Island and for maintaining communication with the mainland. Now, I think the hon. gentleman will admit that this is a very large expenditure indeed, and that if we can, without great inconvenience to the Island, save from \$5,000 to \$7,000 yearly, we will be justified in doing it, in order that the money saved may be appropriated to provide for other postal services in the country. I do not expect to save the entire amount of \$7,000, for an agreement was made by the Government some days previous to the delivery of the hon. gentleman's speech; and I may say that if the hon. gentleman had delivered the speech he made yesterday, previous to the decision of the Government, I very much doubt if it would have been reached.

Mr. DAVIES. You do not decide on justice, then?

Mr. McLELAN. If the hon. gentleman had made that speech and the extraordinary statements it contained—

Mr. DAVIES. I can verify every one of them.

Mr. McLELAN—statements unfounded on fact, it would have gone a great way to prejudice the minds of my colleagues and myself in making any change in the matter. During the early part of the winter, the hon. gentleman knows that, all commercial activity on the Island comparatively ceases, and there is but little shipment of freight. There is no commercial activity, or very little, outside of the Island itself, and, therefore, it is not so important that there should be expensive rapid communication then as it is later on in the season; and as the season advances and the merchants are commencing their operations, it will be more important they should have more rapid communication. The Government, therefore, have decided that, under the circumstances, as spring advances, we shall have special trains whenever the mails fail

to connect at Cape Traverse. As I have shown the House, up to the present, the mails have failed to connect only nine times, and there will be very few failures from this out, as the days lengthen, daylight begins earlier. As commercial activity revives for the spring operations, it will be more important to have rapid mail communication, and special trains will be given to forward the mails when they fail to connect. I am sorry to have been obliged to take up the time of the House on this matter, but the hon. gentleman made such extraordinary statements that I felt it was due to the Government and myself to make some explanation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not think there is any use in prolonging this discussion, as I understand the Government have just ordered a special train to be put on, in order that the grievances may be removed, thus acknowledging that for the rest of the past year the Province has suffered wrong. We do not complain at all of the service of the ice-boats; we are prepared to commend the Government for the expenditure they have made on the branch railway from Sackville to Cape Tormentine, but I do not wish that it be understood in this House that Prince Edward Island is to be charged entirely with the road as being built entirely for that Province, for the road is of great benefit to the northern part of New Brunswick as well as to Prince Edward Island. I am also quite willing to commend the Government for having built the road from Cape Traverse and for the manner in which they have organised the ice-boat service, which, I believe, they have put on a much better footing than it previously had. My hon. colleague from Queen's (Mr. Davies) did not complain of the ice-boat service, but passed that over, as we all know it is a difficult service, and we are perfectly satisfied the Government are doing what they can in that regard, but what we do complain of is the irregularity in the delivery of the mails after they reach the Island. The Postmaster General ought to know that the months of November and December are our busiest months. They are those among which our business men use all haste to get their produce shipped, and their importations in, and it is then we expect the Government more particularly to provide us with a most efficient service. In the midwinter we are not so exacting. But after the summer boats ceased running, a day or two were lost before the winter boat was put on the route, and then, when she was put on, she made the round trip in the day, arriving at Georgetown about three or four o'clock, and the mails were not sent to Charlottetown for twenty-four hours. This happened during the month of December; and I find that one of the organs supporting the Government in the Island pointed out that in the month of December, for fourteen days we only received seven mails, and sometimes we were three or four days without any mails at all. Again, after the *Northern Light* was laid up, three or four days elapsed before the ice-boats were put on; and after they were organised, there were no special trains to carry the mails for distribution throughout the Island. These are the irregularities we complain of, these are the grievances that have been discussed again and again in this House and the Senate, and we regret having, year after year, to bring this question up. This time I hope the grievances will be settled at once and for ever. I hope that when this train is put on it will be kept on, and we will not have again to refer to this subject. I am sorry the *Northern Light* has not been able to do better work than she has done this year. Had the suggestion I threw out last year, to put on a second boat in conjunction with the *Northern Light*, been acted on, I believe that service would have been better performed than it is, and the people would be much more satisfied. The manner in which they have been treated with regard to the winter navigation, is causing a

great deal of dissatisfaction in the Province, dissatisfaction which, through the neglect of the Government, is becoming worse every year. The result in the colony will be that by-and-bye an agitation will arise there, I am confident, for separation from the Union. I do not want to continue this at any length, but I must refer to one small item with which the Postmaster General dealt, viz.: that the revenue from a little town in his Province is nearly as large as that of the whole of Prince Edward Island. I may reply that we only get back two thirds of the revenue we pay into the Dominion Treasury, and I think it is out of place for the hon. gentleman to make the boast he did, coming as he does from the Lower Provinces, and knowing that our merchants get their supplies principally from Montreal and Halifax, and pay duties on their goods in those cities instead of at Charlottetown, where they ought to be paid and credited to our account.

Mr. WELSH. I do not want to prolong this discussion, but the hon. the Postmaster General has made reference to the instructions he sent to the captain of the *Northern Light* that he could proceed, but holding him responsible, and he says that the people of Prince Edward Island were not satisfied with that. I should think they would not be satisfied with that. Fancy giving the captain instructions to go on, and holding him responsible for the safety of his boat. Naturally, he would lie in port. That is not what my hon. colleague referred to at all. In the winter we find that we have to consult the Railway Department, the Post Office Department and the Marine Department, and we know how the official business is carried on, and how long it takes for all these departments to be consulted. The Government ought to have sufficient confidence in their agents, and I believe they will have in future, in their agents in the Island, so that those matters can be attended to without the necessity of holding consultations in Ottawa as to the procedure they will adopt in Prince Edward Island. I say that these matters can safely be left in the hands of the superintendent of the Railway Department, the postmaster, and the agent of the Marine Department, without consulting Ottawa, and I am quite certain that the good sense of the Government will decide to take that course. My hon. friend has referred to the matter of ice-boats. I was not aware that my hon. colleague referred to the ice-boats at all, but I must say that the hon. gentleman has improved the service of ice-boats very much, and the gentleman he appointed to take charge of that, Captain McElhinney, had a great deal of difficulty to contend against, and he did a great deal of good in that service. The Postmaster General, when he was in the Marine Department, did good work there, but in the matter of the railways, as soon as I found out that special trains were being taken, I called on him and he treated me most courteously and kindly, but he said he thought he could save so much money. I said: "You do not feel as the people of the Island do, and they will not put up with it, and you must do something for them." Still, it was evident that he thought it was his duty to save as much money for the country as he could. We had some correspondence on the subject, but he decided that we could do without it. I will say for the hon. gentleman that he treated me most kindly and courteously. I will not occupy the time of the House, although I might, but I will let the matter drop, as I understand the special trains have been ordered.

Mr. PERRY. The Postmaster General has made a statement which I cannot let pass unnoticed. He made a charge against the Province of Prince Edward Island of the amount expended last year for mail accommodation. I did not catch the amount, but in that he has included the amount paid to the steamer *Neptune*. He must remember that the steamer *Neptune* is not working across the Straits.

We must bear in mind that no steamer at all is going across there now; that the *Northern Light* has been idle since the 8th January, and I find, from a return which was printed last Session, that the Government has been very generous in the payment of the *Neptune*. I believe it has been stated that the Minister of Marine has some private interest in that steamboat, but, at all events, there was an amount paid of \$18,500 for the small services which that steamer performed last year in crossing from Georgetown to Pictou, and that is a charge which stares the people of Prince Edward Island in the face. How many trips did that steamer make last year? The *Neptune* would not have been sent for to assist the *Northern Light* if it had not been in view of the general election. The *Neptune* made 38 trips last year, and I was surprised to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in the discussion last year, state that the steamer *Neptune* had been plying for two and a-half months from Nova Scotia to Prince Edward Island. That shows that the Minister of Marine does not know what he is saying in regard to the Province of Prince Edward Island, or, if he does, that he cares very little. It was only a month and a-half that the *Neptune* was plying there. She commenced on December 20th, and stopped on February 4th. The Minister of Marine contends that she took two and a-half months, and he will find that statement in the *Hansard* of last year, if he does not believe me. So little does that hon. gentleman know or care, I suppose, as to the terms of Confederation being carried out with the people of Prince Edward Island, that he does not know how many days, weeks or months the steamer *Neptune*, which he sent for, and employed, and paid for, was in the service there. I find she was there about six weeks, for which he has paid her owners \$18,500, and the Postmaster General charges that, without even a blush upon his face, as an expenditure against Prince Edward Island for the carriage of mails. The hon. gentleman made a statement, and I think a very weak statement, here, and says the Government have been generous to the people of Prince Edward Island. They have been generous with a vengeance. I tell him now, and I tell the Government and the members of this House, that the present Government have not made a decent attempt to carry out the terms of agreement with the people of that Island. I say the crossing by the Capes is no better than it was fifteen years ago. I say that the present Government have imposed upon the people who cross there the necessity to sign away their lives and their property before they do cross, because they make them sign a statement that the Government is not responsible for any loss they may sustain. Sir, I would scorn to sign away my life and property in that way. I say it is a shame and a reflection on the Government to allow a state of affairs to exist where opposition boats can make money. Although they are not subsidised by the Government, although they have no mails to carry, they are making money. Why does not the Government have boats enough to carry all the mails and passengers? Sir, the day we crossed, if there had been no opposition boats we would have had to stay over on the other side. I say it is a shame to allow opposition boats. They ought to have boats enough of their own, without having to fall back upon opposition to cross from one side to the other. Now, Sir, I complain that they have cast old servants overboard; they have dispensed with the services of Captain Irvine, who has been in the service for thirty years. I remember well when he came all the way from Prince Edward Island here for the purpose of giving information to the Government about the crossing. I am glad to find that the Government have adopted a good many of Captain Irvine's suggestions. They have built houses for boats, and done some other things. But how did they pay this old servant? Did they superannuate him? Did they even recognise his past services? Can they point now to

Mr. PERRY.

any other man in the service that makes more successful passages, from one side to the other, than Captain Irvine has done for the past thirty years? Sir, I defy them to do it. I say it is a reflection upon the people of Prince Edward Island when we find that while our mails used to be carried, twenty or twenty-five years ago, in three hours from Cape Traverse to Charlottetown, it now takes forty-eight hours to carry them. I say it is a reflection upon the administration of the Postmaster General. Sir, I remember quite well that members supporting the present Administration from 1879 to 1886 have brought this matter, year after year, to the notice of the Government, but without any success. And to show how this Administration is regarded in Prince Edward Island, I will quote from the *Guardian*, a Conservative paper printed in Charlottetown. This is what it says, in its issue of the 28th January, of the present year:

"We received a mail from the mainland on Tuesday, the first for one week. It reached Cape Traverse on Sabbath, but forty-eight hours elapsed before it reached this city. A special train might have brought the mails to Charlottetown early on Monday. But it seems as if neither a sense of justice, nor the responsibilities of a solemn contract, have any influence in some quarters. If Prince Edward Island is not of sufficient importance to merit even fair treatment at the hands of our rulers, they had better cut us adrift, and allow us to shape our own destinies. With regard to postal accommodation, we could not be in any worse condition than we are at present."

The administration of that service is also condemned by a Conservative paper, called the *Summerside Journal*, which says that Mr. Brecken, the postmaster at Charlottetown and post office inspector, wrote a letter to the editor and sent it off on the 14th, and on the 20th the letter reached its destination—only 40 miles between the two points, but six days on the road. He asks, very naturally, what became of this letter during this time. Well, Sir, he goes on to remark that it is hard to expect the water at the foot of the stream to be any purer than the spring itself, and so he holds the Postmaster General responsible for all this mismanagement. I will now read an extract from the *Summerside Journal*, a strong supporter of the present Administration. I will not read it all, but I will read an extract:

"Last week we formulated a complaint against the Post Office Department, that several bundles of the *Agriculturist*, directed to Kelly's Cross, Clyde Station and Fredericton, had been delayed for several days in transit, and that long after they should have been in the hands of their readers they were lying in the Summerside Post Office. We complained to Mr. Brecken, but his investigation of the irregularity has not yet been attended with any satisfactory result. The most gross and inexcusable carelessness exists among some of the postal officials in this Province, who are not only paid for, but sworn to, the faithful performance of their duty."

Now, that statement is from a Conservative paper, the only Conservative paper published in the county. I will read another extract from the *Examiner*, a paper which is very well known, I have no doubt, in the department. I suppose it is one of those papers for which the Government pay \$1,000 a year for the use of one department alone. But when the people of Prince Edward Island ask for two or three thousand dollars, they are told: "No, we cannot give it." These gentlemen are able to help themselves—\$30,000 a year for travelling expenses, cab hire, and street car; \$27,000 a year paid in the city of Ottawa alone—but when the people of Prince Edward Island ask for a small instalment of their rights, a small portion of what is due them under the terms of Confederation, they are denied—the Dominion of Canada cannot afford to pay for that. I say it is a reflection upon the Government of Canada to perpetrate such wrongs upon one of the smallest Provinces, one of the most loyal Provinces. This is what the *Examiner* says, and I know the Postmaster General is well acquainted with that paper:

"If some radical change is not made in the mail arrangements, many of our people will be obliged to open branch offices at Summerside. Others talk of getting the contents of their letters through by telegraph."

Now, what a statement that is, and my hon. friend has the boldness to come here and tell us that he has done all

that could be done. Does he suppose that we are standing still on the Island? Does he suppose we are not civilised, that we do not want to get the news—even from Ottawa, even from his own Department? Sir, we are an intelligent people, and the result of the last election on the 22nd February, 1887, shows the intelligence of the people of Prince Edward Island—not only shows their intelligence, but it shows their independence. This shows that the people of Prince Edward Island are able to judge for themselves, and do not allow themselves to be blinded by the spectacles that blind the hon. gentleman, I mean the money bags, but they endeavor to promote their own interests. I was surprised to hear the statement of the Minister that he had administered the affairs of the Island to his own satisfaction. This may occur in the case of a gentleman who makes his own political conscience; but the people of the Island do not speak in that strain—they speak in a different way, as they have a right to speak. At the same time the people of the Island have no feelings of spite toward the hon. gentleman or the present Administration; they would like to be friendly with the Government, but we consider that the Administration should make decent attempts to give us justice. If they are not able to keep up communication with the Island by steamer, let them try to build a tunnel. They have had this matter under consideration three or four years, a Bill has been passed by Parliament to incorporate a company, different surveys have been made and reports issued, and the Government should be able to come to a decision as to whether the scheme is practicable. If it is impracticable, of course we will not look for impossibilities, but let us have the best that can be done; and almost the worst that can be done has been done to the Island in this respect. When the statement is openly made in the House by an hon. member that the means of communication is no better than it was forty years ago, that is a reflection upon the Government. I say that they have not made any definite attempt to remedy this grievance. What have they done this year? In order to punish the people for the great Grit vote they gave in 1887, the *Northern Light* has been thrown to one side for want of repairs. The captain is afraid to put out to sea, especially when he looks at the directions he received from the present Postmaster General, that if the vessel was strained it would be at the captain's peril. I have always been surprised, and I am surprised yet, that up to this day the Government have not improved the means of crossing the Straits, and it does not appear as if they intended to do anything more. I suppose, however, on the eve of an election another attempt will be made, which will doubtless turn out as this has done and prove abortive. The question of crossing will come up again, and I will not therefore further refer to it. It has been shown that letters have been allowed to lie in the post office from day to day and week to week, and that a letter due on the 14th, never reached Charlottetown till the 20th, and the postmaster at Summerside marked on the back the date on which the letter made its appearance in his office. Where was it during the balance of the time? There must be something wrong in regard to the post office service, and the sooner the Postmaster General has these wrongs rectified and justice done in regard to carrying the Island mails the better, for this is one of the reasons why the people of the Island are dissatisfied with the present Administration.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It would be ungenerous on my part to occupy any more of the time of the House with this question, and I would not do so were it not that the Postmaster General had attempted this afternoon to lead the House to believe that, in stating my case yesterday, I had overstated the facts. The hon. gentleman has been overrated by his

colleagues, or he has come to a better determination, for he has informed the House that the grievances of which we complained will be remedied, and special trains will be put on. If he had come to that conclusion either by any process of reasoning, or from any information he had received from me or from my colleagues, or from any source, he might have stated it to the House without indulging in the remarks he has offered to-day. But he shows that he has some feeling against the Island. He is now going to give special trains, but he tells the House that he doubts whether he is doing right because the amount the Island pays into the Treasury is ridiculously small. I had thought at this time of the day there was no one in this House, particularly anyone holding the position of a Cabinet Minister, who was not aware that the statement in the Trade and Navigation Returns as to the amount paid by each Province was entirely misleading. Why, the hon. gentleman knows himself that the statement in the Trade and Navigation Returns shows the Province of Quebec to pay nearly two millions more duty than does the great Province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman ought to know, if he does not know, that the statement is entirely misleading, and that Quebec does not pay more than the great Province of Ontario into the Treasury of this country. And when the hon. gentleman thought to lead this House to believe that the small amount that appears to have been paid or collected in the ports of the Island on dutiable goods was the only sum the Island paid, he did so either through crass ignorance or a feeling which I say is very reprehensible. That old idea has been exploded long ago. The hon. gentleman cannot be excused when he makes that statement. He knows that the average man on the Island consumes as much dutiable goods as the average man in the Dominion, and that per head we pay as much on the goods consumed and consume as much dutiable goods as does the Province from which he hails and the wonderful county from which he comes. The hon. gentleman refers to the fact that they pay nearly one-half as much in Truro as is collected in the Island. Does he wish the House to understand that Truro pays more per head than does Charlottetown? If he does not intend to mislead the House, why does he make such a statement? The hon. gentleman stands convicted by the records of having made a statement that will not bear the slightest investigation, and I will not permit him to make that statement without contradiction—a statement that once misled the country, and I hope will not again do so, namely, that the Island does not pay its quota of the taxes of the country. The only reason I rose was on account of the statement of the Minister that I had, in stating my case, exaggerated the facts. The facts required no exaggeration. The statements I read to the House were telegrams from the Charlottetown Board of Trade, a non-political body, and they stated the facts which were reiterated by myself in bringing the question before the House. The hon. gentleman has tried to make it appear that the statements of the Board of Trade are not true. Does he not know that from the 5th to the 12th of January not a mail was received on the Island. I did not make my statements without making myself thoroughly acquainted with the facts. I went to the Charlottetown Post Office and obtained the day and hour of every crossing, and the time when the mails left Cape Traverse, and I found that from the 5th to the 12th of January no mail arrived. The hon. gentleman sought to lead the House to believe, or at least those members who were ignorant of the situation down there, that there were only nine days during which the people of the Island were deprived of their mails. I have already said that from the 5th to the 12th of January they never received a mail of any kind, and when the mail did arrive, he let it lie for twenty-four hours before he had it conveyed to Charlottetown, and that in face of the fact that his predecessor in office had

at one time withdrawn the special trains, and then, seeing the injustice of the withdrawal, had put them on again; and it remained for this hon. gentleman to come forward and withdraw the privilege or the right which his predecessor in office had given. I have shown that from the 5th to the 8th of January the mails did not cross at all, and that on the 13th, 14th, 22nd, 23rd and 26th of January, and on the 2nd, 8th, 11th, 13th and 18th of February, the mails did not connect, and were sometimes left standing from twenty-four to forty-eight hours. I do not want to weary the House with these statements, but I should be sorry to think that any member of the House should imagine that I could get up and exaggerate or misstate the facts. The hon. gentleman knows the facts, and if he can point out one day on which I have incorrectly stated that the mails did not cross I will withdraw the statement. When I stated that the trains did not cost \$7,000, I meant that they did not actually cost that much. Technically they might have cost that, but practically they did not, for, as I pointed out, that expenditure consisted largely in a cross-entry of the Post Office Department against the Railway Department; and I venture the assertion that \$1,000 would cover the cash cost of that train to the Government. I do not make that statement without having made enquiry. I find that the hon. gentleman himself states, in a telegram which he sent to the Board of Trade, that the Railway Department charged the Post Office Department for special trains at the same rate as they charge a private party. The Railway Department does not charge private parties for the simple outlay, but a large sum in addition; and when the train is there, and remains on the county line the whole day, with the officials on board kicking their heels and waiting for something to do, their pay goes on all the while, and the only increased cost of running it would be the wear and tear of the track and train and the cost of coal and oil. However, I am only too glad to learn that a change is to be made and the grievance removed; but I am exceedingly sorry that in mentioning that, the hon. gentleman should have said that he would have been prevented making the change if, before making it, he had heard the speech I have made.

Mr. McLELAN. No, you are wrong. What I said was that I was afraid such a speech would have prevented myself and my colleagues.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, I hope better things of the hon. gentleman's colleagues, and I think some at least of his colleagues would be prepared to do justice when it is necessary, even if he would not be. I do not think there was any need of his leading the House to believe that any statements I made were not true, for they are all historical statements, as they appear in the telegrams and the official documents to which I have referred.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman has attempted to give the House the impression that I have made statements that are not borne out by the official records. The statement I made as to the number of times the boats and trains have failed to connect are from the official records of the department. He says I have expressed a doubt as to whether it was right to put on these special trains. I have certainly been misunderstood by the hon. gentleman. I expressed no doubt whether it was right or not. The hon. member for Prince (Mr. Perry) has given a reason why the special trains may now be put on. That hon. gentleman has said, in a manner which should be a pattern for the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), that it is comparatively unimportant to have the special trains on in mid-winter—that it is not of such importance as earlier in the season or in the spring, when the people of the Island are arranging for their summer business. For that reason I have thought it best, and my colleagues have agreed with me, to main-

Mr. DAVIES P.E.I.)

tain the connection. The hon. gentleman says I want to withhold that expenditure because Prince Edward Island pays only \$1.28 a head into the revenue, and, comparing his Province with the Province of Quebec, he wants to show that the people of the Island pay their full quota. I only allude to that matter incidentally, stating that the town of Truro paid half as much into the Customs revenue, as the whole Island of Prince Edward. I did not regard that as a guide to my actions in this matter. If the Island required that there should be special trains to maintain the service efficiently, they would be put on even if the Island did not pay a dollar into the Customs revenue, if it was right and in the interest of that community that they should be put on. The hon. gentleman says that although his Province pays only \$153,000 into the revenue, it purchases goods from other Provinces. I wish to call his attention to the fact that the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia pay from \$3 to \$4 a head into the revenue, although they enjoy throughout the year uninterrupted communication with the Upper Provinces, and so are in a better position to make, and do make, large purchases in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. But I am not going to be drawn into a discussion on that subject, on the present occasion; I think it is quite sufficient to deal with this matter on its merits. I want to remind the hon. gentleman that, a year or two ago, when one of the boats on the service between the Island and the mainland became disabled, the Government sent down a government boat which plied between the mainland and the Island, in addition to the two regular boats. The people of Prince Edward Island have complained from year to year of the *Northern Light*, and they have frequently pressed on the department the necessity of getting a sealing vessel from Newfoundland, which they claimed would give better service than the *Northern Light*. Yielding to that pressure the department last year procured from Newfoundland the most powerful sealing vessel they could bring up, at a cost of over \$18,000. She was run for a month and a half as a test; the result of the experiment was not satisfactory, except in showing that the *Northern Light* gave a better service. And now the hon. gentleman who spoke previously complains that we made that expenditure.

Motion agreed to.

PENSION TO MRS. GOWANLOCK.

Mr. BARRON asked, Does the Government intend to pay Mrs. Gowanlock, the widow of——Gowanlock, who was killed by Indians at Frog Lake, during the late North-West Rebellion, a pension in the same manner and to the same extent as that paid to Mrs. Delaney?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Mrs. Gowanlock's husband was not an employé of the Indian Department, while Mrs. Delaney's was. The former was at the time of the outbreak building a mill in partnership with Mr. Laurie at Battleford. The department had paid them part of a bonus in advance, and was to have paid the balance on the completion of the mill, but the mill was never completed. Mr. Delaney held the position of farm instructor at Frog Lake at the time of the massacre, and it was on this account his widow received the pension. I may say further that Mrs. Gowanlock has received for personal losses from the Department of the Interior, under the Rebellion Losses Commission, \$907, and that the firm of which Mr. Gowanlock was a member received \$4,202, one-half of which went, I believe, to the Gowanlock estate.

BEXLEY POSTMASTER.

Mr. BARRON asked, Have the Government yet filled the office of Postmaster at Bexley Post Office? If so, who has been appointed?

Mr. McLELAN. The office has not yet been filled, but I have given instructions to have it filled.

COLLECTION OF CRIMINAL LAWS.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL (for Mr. BERNIER) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to furnish to Justices of the Peace throughout the Dominion a collection of the Criminal Laws, as promised by the Honorable Secretary of State; and if so, when?

Mr. CHAPLEAU (Translation.) As I stated last Session, an order was issued by the Government that this collection of criminal laws should be sent to the commission of peace, pursuant to the request made by the Provincial Government at the time. This was done. Since then, a number of justices of the peace have been appointed. I shall enquire whether the latter have received this collection, and the Government will deliberate whether it will renew the issue of these criminal laws to each new commission of the peace.

SPEAKER'S ORDER—DORCHESTER ELECTION.

Mr. CHOQUETTE (for Mr. AMYOT) asked, What is the reason of the delay which occurred between the issuing of his warrant by the Honorable the Speaker of the House of Commons, on the 23rd August last, respecting the election for the Electoral District of Dorchester, and the issuing of the writ of election for that district, dated the 22nd December last, or thereabouts?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I presume the reason must have been that, as the Session was not soon forthcoming, there was no hurry for this election. I presume, furthermore, that the hon. member putting the question, as well as the gentleman in whose name it is put, have had no ground of complaint at this delay.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY CAPITAL ACCOUNT.

Mr. WELDON asked, What amount had been placed or charged to capital account of the Intercolonial Railway during the last four fiscal years?

Mr. POPE. \$3,934,650.83.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. DENISON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to compel the Grand Trunk Railway Company to obey the order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, made in November,—that they should, by the 1st of January, 1888, erect and maintain gates at the York and Simcoe-street crossings, near the Union Station, in the city of Toronto.

Mr. POPE. This is the first complaint I have heard with reference to this matter. I supposed that the gates were already there. I have no doubt the Grand Trunk Company will, as they have always hitherto done, carry out the order of the Railway Committee. If not we will see that they do.

RENDERED LARD.

Mr. TAYLOR moved:

That the House resolve itself into Committee to consider a resolution declaring it expedient to introduce a Bill providing for the regulation of the manufacture and sale of rendered lard.

He said: Some two years ago I moved a resolution somewhat similar to this. It read as follows: "That it is expedient to bring in a bill to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, butterine, or other substitutes for butter." When I made that motion, there were many hon. gentlemen on both sides who were not familiar with the

subject, and some of them made statements at the time which, I think, they have ever since regretted. I am referring to Mr. Jackson, who was then member for South Norfolk, and I think it was due to the statements he made on that occasion that he does not represent that constituency at present. I wish now to draw the attention of the House and the country to the effect of the legislation then passed on this article of oleomargarine. In 1884-5 we imported 1,162,337 lbs. butter; in 1885-6 we imported 1,249,090, while this year, 1886-7, we have imported but a total of 246,272 lbs. We imported into Ontario 6,155 lbs., Quebec 542 lbs., Nova Scotia 189 lbs., New Brunswick 1,881 lbs., Manitoba 9 lbs., and in British Columbia the large quantity of 237,496 lbs., or within 9,000 lbs of the total import. Nearly 1,000,000 lbs. less have been imported into Canada since legislation was passed affecting the article, compared with what was imported in the ten months of the preceding year, the legislation having been passed two months previous to the end of the fiscal year. We exported in 1886-7 5,455,809 lbs. of butter. I am of the impression that the 237,000 lbs. imported into British Columbia, and paying four cents a pound duty might profitably have been exported from Ontario. I am strongly of opinion that a large quantity of this 237,000 lbs. was a spurious article of butter. I think it would be well if the Customs authorities would instruct their officers to place in bond any butter imported into this country, so that it might be properly analysed, for I am strongly of opinion that there is yet spurious butter brought into the country; and, in dealing with this article of lard, I think that legislation should take the same direction as that dealing with the article of oleomargarine, and that all lard brought into this country should be placed in bond and only liberated after having been analysed and inspected. I purpose by the resolution I am about to move to draw the attention of the Government and this House to the large importation into this country annually from the United States of lard, which I believe to be as spurious in many respects as the oleomargarine that we were importing previous to the passing of the Act two years ago. I think it is due to the agriculturists of this country that the article of lard should be as properly protected as the article of butter, because it is one of the staple articles of the farmers of this country. We find that with the amount of two cents per lb., the enormous quantity of 3,522,464 lbs. were imported last year, besides grease for soap factories, amounting to 2,440,301 lbs., making a total of nearly 6,000,000 lbs. of lard and grease imported from the United States last year. I am satisfied in regard to this, because we have purchased it in our own family, and have found that this article of spurious lard is made largely from cotton seed and other articles of that class, and, perhaps, grease of an inferior quality, so that, when you bring it into your house, it is impossible to detect it from the good article. We have manufactories which are manufacturing pure lard in this country, and I do not think they have yet got into the habit of adulterating their lard; but the article which is imported from the United States is largely adulterated, most of it being manufactured from cotton seed or cotton seed oil. I ask that legislation may be had to prevent these people from competing with the spurious article now imported against the genuine article made in this country. I suggest to the Government that this lard should be inspected before it is taken out of the Customs, and that it should be prohibited altogether, if it is found to be adulterated, in the same way as we have acted with regard to oleomargarine.

Mr. SPROULE. In seconding the motion, I do so because I believe that it aims at a matter which is very important to a large number of the people of this country. This is one of the lines in which the agriculturists of this country either make profits or have to sustain losses, and they are subjected to a very unfair competition by the

spurious articles which are brought in from the United States. At the time the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) introduced his resolution relative to oleomargarine and butterine, it was thought that no good could be accomplished in that direction, that the benefit to the farmer was of no value, that his interests could not be advanced in any way by any restrictions proposed to be put on the introduction of butter; but the result has proved that it was of the greatest good to the farmers, because it has kept out an article which was not butter at all, but a spurious article, to the extent of nearly 1,000,000 lbs., and the farmers have benefited by the restrictions which were put on that trade. I believe there has been a large amount of spurious lard and grease introduced for making soap, and that, under the name of lard, a great deal has been brought in which has been afterwards sold under the name of butter. I think there is still some coming in under the name of butter, and I think this would stop the introduction of this very injurious article, because, if it were submitted to a chemical test, it would be impossible for it to be palmed off on the people as taking the place of the dairy products of this country. As farming is failing in many other lines, it is the more important to protect the interests of that large class of people in this country in regard to their dairy products, and if it only affects the tenth part of the amount in the line of butter, it will accomplish a great good and we will be well satisfied with such legislation as may affect it.

Motion agreed to.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER FLOODS.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL (Translation) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, documents, representations or information received by the Government in relation to the inundations which occur periodically on the north and south shores of the River St. Lawrence, and more particularly respecting the great inundation which occurred in the spring of 1887; also copies of all reports made by the Commission of Engineers appointed to enquire as to the cause of the inundations and to ascertain the best means of preventing the same or of diminishing the disastrous effects thereof for the future.

He said: In making this motion, I am desirous of drawing the attention of the Government and of the House to the necessity of taking immediate steps to obviate and lessen the ravages which are caused, every year, by the overflow of the St. Lawrence River. The House will remember that, last year, the flood was of extraordinary proportions, and the consequent damage at Montreal, Laprairie, Longueuil, Berthier, St. Cuthbert, St. Barthélemy and the adjoining counties, was very considerable, rising even to the sum of several hundreds of thousands of dollars. The Government and municipalities, which suffered by these floods, were naturally affected by this state of things. A commission of engineers was charged with an enquiry into the causes of these floods, and into the measures to be taken to prevent similar disasters in future. This commission consisted of three engineers, one nominated by the Montreal Harbor Commissioners, the second by the Corporation of Montreal, and the third by the Federal Government. Several sittings were held and a number of witnesses heard. A close examination of several portions of the St. Lawrence River was made, and the report to the Government showed certain information and recommendations which ought to be laid before this House. Furthermore, the mayors of the different interested municipalities were called upon to supply the Department of Public Works with personal information and observations on the causes of these overflows. I have knowledge of the fact that a large number of mayors have sent important reports on the subject. The most widely received opinion is that which holds the Montreal Board of Harbor Commissioners responsible for the disasters, by reason that it has dumped into the channels dividing the Boucherville Islands and the Berthier Island, enormous quantities of earth drawn

Mr. SPROULE.

from the digging of Montreal Harbor and the Lake St. Peter Channel. The Board is charged with having thus given the ice solid bulwarks, causing the formation of dykes which forced the river to flow backward and overflow the adjoining country with the flood of water that could not follow its regular course. In Berthier county, the water stretched over an area of several miles; the ice gathered; new currents were formed; houses, barns and fences were swept away or injured, with considerable loss to the farmers. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that the Government took the matter in hand. It is time that the House should be fully informed on the subject, and that it force the Government to bring down a measure, comprising not merely a few individual works in a particular locality, but a complete system of protection for the two shores of the river. I make this motion at the beginning of the Session, in order that time may not elapse before the hon. Minister of Public Works submits a measure that will allow the work to be begun next summer so as to be completed in good time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to answer him in English. I know he understands that language perfectly well, and, perhaps, the English members would like to know my answer. To the first part of the motion there is no objection. To the last part of the motion there is this objection: The reports so far received have been published, and if the hon. gentleman will examine the records of my department this year, he will find the last report at the end of one of the appendices. I would, therefore, ask him to drop the last part of the motion. When the final report reaches me, which may be in two or three weeks, I will take care to have it laid on the Table of the House as soon as possible.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. I have no objection to the amendment.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

"TRUSTS" OR "COMBINES."

Mr. EDGAR, upon the Order standing in his name being read, for a Select Committee to enquire into and report as to the existence, operations and effect of certain organisations in Canada, known as "trusts" or "combines," said: I do not think that all the friends of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) felt sufficiently grateful to me for the assistance I rendered him the other evening in securing an amendment to his motion, which was for a committee of a similar character to the one which stands in my name on the notice paper. I think I have improved his motion very much by having a reference contained in it as to combines among manufacturers. However, the great organ-in-chief of the combines, in Toronto, did not think that I had a right to interfere in the matter. Of course they are entitled to their opinion, but they went a little further than expressing an opinion, and undertook to make a statement of fact to which I shall refer for a moment. *The Empire*, published in Toronto, yesterday, in its editorial article, objects to my interfering with combines, and gives this as one of the reasons:

"It may not be known to every one, but it is a fact, that Mr. Edgar is himself a member of a combine to prevent competition and keep up prices, but such is a fact."

Now, they seem to have strained the Queen's English to get in the double assertion that their statement was a fact. Well, Mr. Speaker, it may be a good enough fact for that paper, but it is rather an extraordinary thing that the information never reached me yet that I was a member of a combine of any kind, now or at any other time in the past, and I wish to give that statement an explicit and emphatic denial. If no amendment had been made in the sense of my amendment to the hon. gentleman's motion, I

would have felt it my duty to go on with this motion for a committee, but I do not see now that there would be any particular advantage in doing so. Moreover, I think that two committees are not necessary to enquire into this subject, because the conviction is very strong in my mind, and I think it is gaining ground in the minds of the public, that combines can be remedied in this country, most of them at any rate, in a very much simpler way than by elaborate legislation in this House. There are certain combines into which I have no doubt this committee will find it their duty to examine carefully, which do not depend for their existence upon a Customs tariff. But it will be found that most of the combines in this country, especially those relating to the necessaries of life, have only come into existence, and can only maintain their existence, by reason of the protection thrown around them by the high tariff upon those articles the price of which a combine is formed to raise. Now, I am perfectly willing to give the Finance Minister credit for being sincere when he strongly supported a protective tariff, and I am ready to admit that he believed it would be for the good of the country. I am also willing to give him credit for enough intelligence to recognise the fact that, in many instances, his tariff will require revision to meet this evil of combines. The hon. Finance Minister must see, as well as other people can, that a number of these combines are propped up, and held up, and continued in existence simply by the high tariff which surrounds the particular article; and that if these proppes were knocked away, the combines must come to an end as a consequence. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Finance Minister could not use his great ability, and the very powerful position which he occupies in this country, to greater advantage than by taking up this matter and dealing with it fearlessly. I do not say that the hon. gentleman will have to abandon any of his theories in favor of protection, but if he finds that his system, in which he had so much confidence, has blemishes and spots in it, and foreign growths about it, surely he ought not to hesitate to apply the knife and make his system, in which he still has faith, more perfect than it is. Surely his long visit to Washington has shown him that a great many protectionist statesmen in that country are now recognising the fact that their high protective system, in some respects at least, must fall to the ground, and that so far as trusts and combines of highly protected articles are concerned, protection must go. The hon. gentleman cannot forget that a great Conservative statesman in another country, and of a former time, who had been strongly in favor of protection, saw that cereals were being protected greatly to the injury of the people of England, and that statesman, Sir Robert Peel, did not hesitate to change his policy in that particular, and let the food of the people come in free. And so I believe that if the hon. gentleman sees that the people are suffering, that the necessaries of life in this country are made dear to them by combines, and leagues, and trusts, he will apply the pruning knife to the Customs tariff upon those articles. If the hon. gentleman would take that course he would do a service to the country; and if the manufacturers, whose profits might be diminished, were to cry out to him, saying he was removing from them the protection to which they were entitled, I think he could very well answer them by saying: Well, as a substitute for that protection, I will assist to throw open the markets to the south of you, of over 60 millions of people, and let you send the products of your manufactures in there. If the Finance Minister would only take those steps which are so much in the interests of the country, I am sure he would be entitled to the gratitude of the people for his action. With the leave of the House, I beg to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

CASUALTIES ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) moved for:

Return of all casualties to trains on the Intercolonial Railway arising from collisions, broken rails or any other cause from 1st April, 1887, to 1st March, 1888; the respective causes and dates; the names of the conductors, engine-drivers or other officials dismissed, suspended or fined for any such collisions or neglect of duty, the amount of damage (if any) to property in such cases, the amount of compensation paid to owners of property destroyed or damaged, as well as amount of claims for loss or damage to property unsettled (if any).

Mr. POPE. There is no objection to the adoption of this motion, but I may say to the hon. gentleman that a considerable time will be occupied in preparing the return.

Motion agreed to.

ROLLING STOCK FOR INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) moved for:

Return showing the quantity of rolling stock purchased for the Intercolonial Railway during the last six months ending 31st December, 1887, giving each kind of rolling stock, and whether purchased under contract or otherwise, the parties from whom bought and the cost of each kind; also a statement of what has been built in Government workshops.

Mr. POPE. There is no objection to the adoption of this motion. The hon. gentleman must know, as he lives at St. John, that it was very late before the Government were aware that ocean traffic was coming that way this year; and although we make very large contracts for rolling stock, we bought some without contracts to accommodate the traffic; otherwise the necessary rolling stock would not be on the road.

Motion agreed to.

THE STEAMER *NORTHERN LIGHT*.

Mr. PERRY moved for:

Return showing the date the steamer *Northern Light* commenced running between Prince Edward Island and Pictou, Nova Scotia; the number of trips made, the number of passengers crossed, and the date of last trip made up to date.

He said: The subject of crossing to the Island from the mainland has been so often discussed in this House that it is unnecessary to make any further statement to show that there has been very little improvement, if any, during the last twenty years, or since Confederation, in the method of crossing the Straits.

Motion agreed to.

CONFEDERATION TERMS WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. PERRY moved for:

Copies of all despatches, telegrams, and correspondence (if any) that may have taken place between the Canadian Government and the Government of Prince Edward Island, having reference to the suggestions of Earl Granville, contained in his despatch to Lord Lansdowne, dated March 31st, 1886, on the subject of carrying out the terms of Confederation with Prince Edward Island with respect to continuous efficient steam communication with the main land.

Motion agreed to.

THE LATE ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, M.P.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before moving the adjournment of the House, I wish to state that the First Minister would have wished to be here this evening to express the deep regret which I am sure we all feel at the sad news of the death of one of our colleagues, the late hon. member for West Hastings. Though the hon. gentleman was of rather a retiring disposition, yet we have all appreciated his kindness of heart and his friendship, and we know that he always took a great interest in the public affairs of the country,

and especially in the advancement of his own Province, particularly the district in which he resided. I am sure I am only expressing the feelings of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House when I say we all regret exceedingly his being carried away from us at a comparatively early period of life, and we shall always remember not only his friendship, but his loyal devotion to his Queen and country. I move that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure that we on this side of the House can fully endorse everything that has been said by the hon. gentleman with regard to our late colleague, Mr. Robertson. It was his and the House's misfortune that while he was here his health never was such as to enable him to take as prominent a part in the debates and proceedings of the House as his natural abilities would otherwise have warranted. But even while laboring under that disadvantage he always occupied a very respectable and honorable place in this House, and I am sure that I am only doing him justice in saying that he had no enemies, but that his adversaries were among his friends. That I am sure was true, not only here, but also where he resided, and the death of such a man is always a loss to his country.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood from the hon. Minister of Finance that he had not yet received the despatches which he expected from Washington. I would ask him whether, should they arrive within the next few hours, it is his intention to have them printed for distribution on Monday.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have not yet received them. I have sent another urgent telegram to Mr. Berne, asking him to forward them with the least possible delay. I hope to receive them very soon, and I shall not lose a moment in having them printed and laid before the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because, as he will see, if they arrive to-morrow morning, it will be a great convenience to have them printed so that they can be distributed on Monday.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing the names of all retired Judges of Superior Courts of Law or Equity in the Dominion of Canada, with the dates of their respective patents, and a copy of the last patent issued to a retired Judge of the Superior Court.—(Mr. Small.)

Return of the Railway accidents which were reported to the Government during 1886, and in respect of which actions are not now pending.—(Mr. Denison.)

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 5th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 11) to empower the Merchants Marine Insurance Co. of Canada to give up its charter and provide for the winding-up of its affairs.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 12) to amend Chapter 127 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled "An Act respecting Interest."—(Mr. Landry.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Ontario Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Ward.)

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McNEILL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 13) to amend the Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada. He said: The Bill is simply the same as the one introduced last Session, and provides that civil servants who entered the service prior to 1882 shall not be subject to examination for promotion in the service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DEATH OF MR. CLAYES.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I feel it my sad duty to inform the House that death has stricken another of its members, Mr. Clayer, the member for Missisquoi, who died last evening. In the person of Mr. Clayer, the House suffers a very great loss—a greater loss, in fact, than the House is aware of. He was only elected at the general election of last year, and he was then suffering from the disease which has carried him off. He had, therefore, no occasion to display in this House his great abilities, but all who knew him will testify to the fact that he was a man of great ability, of uncommon eloquence, of vast information, to which was added great literary culture; and I am sure that if his health had been spared he would not only have been a valuable addition to this House, but would have rendered great services to the party to which he belonged. In addition to that, I may say that he was a man of most warm heart, of generous leanings, who endeared himself not only to those who were his friends but to all who came in contact with him; and, under such circumstances, I am sure that every member of the House will agree with me that his loss is a loss to the country, and I may say also for myself and for those who agree with me on this side, that his loss is an irreparable loss to his party.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Although the hon. gentleman whose death we deplore to-day had been in this House only a short time, and though, as my hon. friend has just stated, his illness prevented him from taking a very active part in the debates of this House, nevertheless we remember that, on the one or two occasions when he did take part in the debates, he showed that he would have become a very useful member, by the knowledge he displayed of the subjects then under discussion. Although I had not the pleasure of a very intimate acquaintance with the hon. gentleman, still such of my hon. friends to whom I have spoken to-day have all agreed that he was a good friend, an amiable gentleman and a member who would certainly have taken a stand in this House and would have done credit to his party.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to enquire of the Finance Minister whether the protocols and other papers in connection with the Fisheries Treaty have been received?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may inform my hon. friend that these papers have arrived. They reached me on Saturday morning, and they are now in the hands of the printer, and I hope to be able to lay them on the Table before the House rises to-day. I will take this opportunity of expressing my great disappointment at the contents of the protocols, and I think it is necessary, after the remark which I made in reply to a question of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) a day or two ago, that

the protocols would be found to contain reference to trade questions, that I should explain for a moment to the House the position of this question. When I left Washington, the question was not finally settled as to what the protocols should contain, and how far the various papers that had been formally submitted to the Conference by both sides should be incorporated in the protocols. During my illness, a message arrived from Mr. Chamberlain saying that it was proposed that they should be purely formal, and my assent was asked to that proposition. I gave that assent, or rather my hon. friends the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, who took the matter up for me, caused a message to be sent to Mr. Chamberlain in reply, expressing my assent, with the condition that at a future period fuller information should be given. But at that time I fully anticipated that these formal protocols would contain the proposals and counter-proposals made by both sides.

Mr. MITCHELL. As to trade?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That they would contain the formal proposals made by the British plenipotentiaries on the one side, and the reply made by the American plenipotentiaries on the other side. I assumed that what was termed the formal propositions to which I gave assent, would contain these papers, and I take this opportunity of expressing to the House my great regret at finding that the protocols contained nothing except the simple statement of the various meetings that were held and the final conclusions arrived at, the treaty and the *modus vivendi*; so that there is no information conveyed in the protocols beyond that which has already been made public by the publication of the treaty and the protocols by the Senate of the United States. I feel it only right that I should take the first opportunity of explaining the disappointment that I feel. I telegraphed immediately to Mr. Chamberlain, at New York, but the answer was returned that the message was undelivered, as he had already sailed. In the telegram I explained to him my great disappointment at finding that even the proposals of the two sides were not contained in the protocols; and I have been considering to what extent I would be justified, under the circumstances, in sustaining the statement which I made to the House that there were proposals for trade submitted to the conference. I think I would be quite warranted, at all events, in placing in the hands of the leader of the Opposition, and of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who has a motion on the paper in relation to this matter, the proposal made by the British plenipotentiaries, and the answer given to that by the United States plenipotentiaries, in reference to greater freedom to commercial intercourse, as it has a very direct and important bearing upon the motion to be made by the hon. member for South Oxford. I feel somewhat embarrassed, as the House will understand, by the departure from the decision which was arrived at in my absence as to the protocols not embodying the proposals and counter-proposals made during the conference.

Mr. JONES. Is it too late to communicate with Mr. Chamberlain?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will communicate by cable to Mr. Chamberlain so that a message may reach him on the other side; and I will also place myself in communication with Mr. Bayard and Sir Lionel Sackville West, in Washington, with a view to obtaining their assent to allow the British proposal for greater freedom of commercial intercourse, and the reply of the United States plenipotentiaries to be made public.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think it is highly desirable that not only the leader of the Opposition and the hon. gentleman who has the motion in hand before the House, but that the House and the country should be made cognisant of the efforts that were made in regard to the trade relations, and

if the matter is to be made public at all for the benefit of any one member of this House, it should be made so for the benefit of all. I imagine that if it is feasible to accomplish the suggestion made by the Finance Minister, to cable to Mr. Chamberlain and to communicate with the Secretary of State of the United States, to get their permission to making these papers public, it had better be adopted, as they will have a most important bearing upon the discussion which is about to take place, and I think it highly desirable that the country should know what these proposals and the counter-proposals were.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree with my hon. friend who has just sat down, that if the Finance Minister lays these proposals before the leader of the Opposition and the hon. gentleman in charge of the motion, of course it would only be for the purpose of making them public to the House and of using them in the discussion of the question before the House. If they are to be so used at all, I think it would be better that they should be made known in the usual manner by being printed and laid before all the members of the House, and that the discussion of the question should be postponed until such time as not only the members of the House, but the public generally who are interested in the matter, should have the opportunity of considering the proposals and of making known their opinions to the members who are about to discuss the question. I hope the hon. gentleman will consider that view of the matter, and if he considers himself authorised, without consulting Mr. Chamberlain, or Mr. Bayard, or anybody else, to lay them before these two gentlemen for the purpose of being made public in the debates, surely he will feel authorised to lay them before the House in the usual manner. I hope he will consider this matter thoroughly, and give the House and the public at large the fullest opportunity of considering the propositions made and the answers thereto, so that we, as the representatives of the country, may be able to shape our action in reference to them. I am not now speaking, of course, in any partisan sense. This is a matter, I fancy, which at present is very ill-understood by the people of the Dominion, and it is essential that the full import of the treaty and the full import of all that has been done should be known by the public as well as by the members of the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that I shall consider that question very carefully. But when I spoke of placing the facts in the hands of those gentlemen, it was scarcely for the purpose of publishing them to the House, but it was for their information and guidance in discussing the very important motion which is on the Order paper. It was in that sense that I felt it was due to them, especially after what I had already said in the House. I am relieved, however, to a certain extent, from the difficulty, by the fact that I find in the *Montreal Star* what purports to be a report of an interview with Mr. Angell, one of the United States plenipotentiaries, in which he is reported to have said:

"The British and Canadian Commissioners were specially anxious to make a reciprocal free trade treaty a part of the treaty, before they would settle the fishery question. More than half the time was occupied in this manner. The real work has been done within, perhaps, a month. We told them over and over again that the tariff was a matter which must be settled by Congress, and that we could do nothing about it."

This is a report of a statement made by one of the United States plenipotentiaries, a very able and accomplished gentleman, Mr. Angell, President of the Michigan University, and I can only say that he could have made this statement with entire accuracy.

Mr. CHARLTON. This is merely a newspaper report.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is a newspaper report, but as I say, it is a statement that could have been made accu-

rately. As the House can see, no person can be more anxious than I am myself—because I conceive it a very important point—to have, at all events, that proposal and the reply to it placed before the House, and I will endeavor, if possible, to obtain such authority as will enable me to take that step. In the meantime I shall, of course, consider that in placing it in the hands of the leader of the Opposition, and the hon. member for South Oxford, it is for their confidential information, as it is information that I feel they are entitled to have before dealing with the question of which they have given notice.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very sorry that my hon. friend appears to forget that there is an element in this House that is not taken into the counsels of the Government on the one hand, nor of the leader of the Opposition on the other. I know there are several hon. gentlemen here who sympathise somewhat with me in the attitude which I assume as an independent member. And I think my hon. friend would do well to bear in mind that that element exists, and that he has a right, as a person who is deeply interested in that matter, to a copy of the paper also. While I am up I may say that I do not see the necessity of waiting to get Mr. Chamberlain's consent to lay these protocols before the House. There is a majority of the British committee on this side, and the Hon. Mr. West can be communicated with in half an hour. The Finance Minister and Mr. West form a majority of the committee, and they can get the sanction of Mr. Bayard, the Secretary of State at Washington. It does appear to me that the hon. gentleman should not keep the legislation of this country waiting—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I concur in that.

Mr. MITCHELL—to suit Mr. Chamberlain's convenience. I do not see the necessity of waiting for him. It is quite possible there may be no other reasons, and I do not say this in a party spirit, but I do say that perhaps it is in the interests of the country that this discussion should not come too rapidly. My impression is, however, that in discussing this matter and dealing with the question of the treaty such as it may be, it is not in the interests of this country that this discussion should take place before the discussion takes place in the Senate at Washington, unless it is too long delayed. My hon. friend opposite who has taken such a leading part in these negotiations knows full well that he will have to make out a very strong case to satisfy this country that Canada has the best of the bargain, and every word uttered will be quoted by the enemies of the treaty on the other side of the line in favor of rejecting the treaty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, I, therefore, do not wish to embarrass the hon. gentleman. I suggest it may be advisable, while the House receives all possible information on the subject, and to that it is entitled, not to have this discussion come on too rapidly. I speak now in the interests of Canada. If the treaty is a good treaty we ought to do nothing to embarrass its passage, or furnish arguments by forcing hon. gentlemen on that side of the House to show how good the treaty is that has been entered into, and thus place in the hands of the enemies of Canada and of the treaty arguments against its passage. What course the Government may adopt I cannot say, but I will not endeavor to unduly press them, taking that view of the case; but all the same the House should be furnished with a copy of the protocols at an early day, not confidential, so that we may be able to see them and discuss them, and I as one member of the House claim that when a copy of the protocols is placed in the hands of the leader of the Opposition and the mover of the resolution, I am also entitled to a copy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the Finance Minister if the papers, to which he has referred as having been sent in by the American plenipotentiaries and reply thereto will cover the whole case, or whether there are counter-proposals? The Minister has only referred to two documents, which he claims did not appear in the protocols sent in. If these two embrace all the documents and information on the subject, well and good; if not, the others should be produced. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, too, what arrangements were made when he left Washington as to what these protocols were to contain—I mean as to whether they were to embody any part of the proceedings?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As I stated, when I left Washington the question was under consideration as to how much should be contained in the protocols. In the first instance, there are the proposals, the formal proposals, and the counter-proposals made on both sides; in the second place, there are elaborate papers and arguments sustaining the views on both sides; and, in the third place, there are condensed reports of the discussions that took place among the plenipotentiaries on both sides upon those various points. Now, the protocols could contain all those; they could contain the formal proposals; they could contain the papers that were put in as arguments sustaining those proposals, or in opposition to those proposals, as the case may be, and they could also embody the leading arguments by which in the conference the views of both sides were maintained. The question was, as I understood, practically settled when I left Washington, that the arguments were not to be embraced, that is to say, the reasoning upon the two sides would not be necessary; but it was a question as to how far the various papers put in, in support of the proposals or in opposition to the proposals, should form a part of the protocols; and when I was asked the question by telegraph to assent to the protocols being purely formal, I assumed and took it for granted that what was termed a formal protocol would contain the proposals and counter-proposals—that that, at all events, would be a part of it.

Mr. MITCHELL. And the answer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I assented to it. Yes, the proposals and the answers. A proposal is put in and an answer is put in in relation to it; and I assumed that those protocols, what were termed formal protocols, would, at all events, contain the proposals and the replies on both sides. When I assented to the protocols being of a purely formal character I took it for granted that was what was meant, and I was very much surprised that, on the contrary, it was meant that they should contain absolutely nothing except the record of the meetings and the results finally arrived at. As has been suggested, I shall take prompt and immediate means to obtain permission, at all events, to lay this paper to which I have referred upon the Table of the House, so as to put it in possession of every hon. member. I may say in reply to the last enquiry, that the proposal and the reply to it will cover the entire case so far as the trade relations are concerned.

Mr. MULOCK. I thank the Minister so far as he has gone; but it appears to me that in order to properly understand the attitude of the various plenipotentiaries in this case it is material that the very words of each proposal and counter-proposal should be laid before this House. As I understand the Minister, the conclusion arrived at when the conference closed was that some persons at Washington were to be charged with the duty of analysing these proposals, and preparing such a proposal as he considered would represent the attitude of the British plenipotentiaries, and also such an answer as, in his opinion, represented the views of the American authorities. Now, that would hardly meet the case. It appears to me that whether those papers

should be laid before the public or not, the House is entitled to have laid before it, every argument advanced by the British plenipotentiaries and the replies made by the American authorities, so far as the American replies are not privileged. I presume none of the communications are privileged communications, or are to be treated as such. The Minister now admits that no return will contain the argument of the British plenipotentiaries; therefore, when the Minister of Finance brings down the protocols he should supplement his return by adding the arguments and answers advanced.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that the protocolists, the gentlemen who prepared the protocols, are the two official protocolists of the conference—Mr. Bergne, the Secretary of the British side, and Mr. Moore, the Secretary of the United States side, and it was their duty to prepare the protocols under the direction of the conference. The United States and British plenipotentiaries agreed, at the commencement of the conference, that the proceedings should be secret, and that only when a result was arrived at should anything whatever be made known; and I may say that course was observed throughout. It then became important as to what the protocols should contain, the proceedings having taken place on an arrangement that the conferences were to be regarded as secret, and only that was to be made known which it was agreed should be made known by the respective parties; and as I said, the question as to what those protocols should contain, was not finally settled when I left Washington, but I had no doubt myself that they would contain the exact words. It was not for the protocolists to give their version at all of what had taken place. Those proposals and counter-proposals were put in writing, and if I obtain the necessary assent, as I hope, on the matter, they will be part of the papers to which I refer, and they will be laid upon the Table of the House in the exact words in which they were made by the British plenipotentiaries and the exact words of the United States plenipotentiaries in reply, which was also put in writing. As I have stated before, that will cover the entire grounds upon which so much interest is felt in regard to the trade relations and tariff arrangements of the two countries. I will endeavor to obtain, as early as possible, permission to make that portion public, and I hope I may be able to lay it on the Table at an early date.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would say from the statement made by the hon. the Minister of Finance, it seems to me those protocols are prepared in precisely the way protocols usually are prepared. I do not remember a single instance in the preparation of protocols, the exact language of the proposals and the counter-proposals have been expressed in those protocols. I would say further, that the functions of the Commission that was appointed to negotiate this treaty are at an end, and it seems to me now that the President and his advisers on the one side, and Lord Salisbury on the other, must give their consent to make public any portion of those documents. It is, Sir, in my opinion, necessary for the hon. gentleman to get the consent of the Prime Minister of England to the publication of the papers to which he refers. I understood him from the statement that he made the other day, that the papers he proposed to bring down did not relate specially to the discussion of the treaty, but it was for the special purpose of discussing the trade policy of this country, and upon the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), it was with reference to that motion that the hon. gentleman proposed to bring down those papers; and while it is most important that we should have the fullest information for the consideration of the treaty, it was also specially important that we should have at once those propositions made by the Government on the

subject of trade. To get that information it appears to me that the proper course is, for the Government here, through His Excellency, to apply to the Prime Minister of England—the Foreign Secretary—

Mr. MACKENZIE. I object to any invitation of the kind. We need not ask Lord Salisbury to interfere in Canadian affairs. I say to the Finance Minister that we ought not to invite Lord Salisbury or any other statesman on the other side to interfere more than in what is absolutely necessary. I entirely object to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he does not think it is desirable that we should invite the interference, any further than is absolutely necessary, of the Foreign Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That is what I said.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In regard to the matter which is so materially affecting ourselves, I quite appreciate the views that the hon. gentleman has thrown out in that suggestion; although, of course, there is a good deal of force in the suggestion made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

BRIDGE OVER WELLAND RIVER.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take possession of the bridge over the Welland River at the village of Chippawa? 2. Whether it is their intention to construct a new bridge?

Mr. POPE. This matter has been pressed upon us very strongly by the member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), and we have given our assent to him, privately, to build a new bridge at that place, and we shall probably carry it out.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, What were the receipts and expenditure of the Intercolonial Railway, from 1st July, 1887, to 1st February, 1888; also to 1st March, 1888? From 1st July, 1886, to 1st February, 1887; and to 1st March, 1887?

Mr. POPE. It would be much more convenient in those questions requiring a good deal of figures that they should be moved by an Address. However, I think I can answer this one. Before I answer the question I would say that this is the worst time of the year at which we could give returns for the railway. The earnings of the railway from this time generally to the 1st of July are much larger than they are at any other part of the year. I would also say that we have a very large accumulation—very large indeed—of ocean traffic. Unexpectedly it came upon us for the first time about November, and that traffic is a non-paying traffic. More than half of our entire through traffic has been of this nature. The figures stand thus: The earnings from 1st July, 1887, to 1st February, 1888, were \$1,691,029.73; the working expenses, \$2,030,385.29. From the 1st of July, 1887, to the 1st of March, 1888, the earnings were \$1,898,153.66; the working expenses are not yet made up. From the 1st of July, 1886, to the 1st of February, 1887, the earnings were \$1,543,709.52; working expenses \$1,943,396.84. From the 1st of July, 1886, to the 1st of March, 1887, the earnings were \$1,696,095.37; working expenses, \$2,036,513.90. I may add that the year which ended in June last was an exceptional year with regard to the quantity of snow which fell. We never had in any previous year so much snow to contend with, and it was estimated that to that item alone was due about \$200,000 of the expenditure.

Mr. CHARLTON. I notice that the hon. gentleman is discussing the question. I would suggest that he lay on the Table his memorandum, which contains the information asked for.

Mr. POPE. If anyone objects to my saying a few words, I will stop.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. POPE. What I was saying was that the expense of handling the snow amounted to about \$200,000. The same circumstance has added to the expenses of this year, because such a season's experience leaves the rolling stock and engines considerably out of repair, and we have had to use all the shops for the purpose of putting them in good order again.

Mr. MITCHELL. Was there not another reason? Last year was election year, and I noticed that a great many people were employed in my section. I merely throw this out as an explanation, as the hon. gentleman seems to have forgotten it.

Mr. POPE. It was done in the interests of my hon. friend. I put on as many as I could to oblige him.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am sorry my hon. friend should be guilty of—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has made a statement not strictly in accordance with the fact. I know he did not mean it. I know he did not mean to convey to this House that I ever asked him to put a man on, and, therefore, I wish to correct him and to say that it was in the interest of my opponent that it was done.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. gentleman lay his memorandum on the Table so that we may consult it.

Mr. POPE. I will send it to the reporter.

THE PURCHASE AND SALE OF LEAF TOBACCO.

Mr. THÉRIEN asked, Whether the Government have received a petition from the manufacturers of Canadian tobacco at Montreal, asking for such legislation as would give them a monopoly for the purchase and sale of leaf tobacco?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No petitions of that kind have been received.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN STRATHROY.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. McMULLEN) asked, Has a selection been made of a site for a public building in Strathroy under the appropriation of \$4,000 made last Session; and, if so, where and at what cost? Have tenders been called for in connection therewith?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I sent an officer of my department to look over the different sites that were eligible, but the department has not selected a site. As soon as we have done so, tenders for the construction of the building will be called for.

Mr. MACKENZIE. As soon as the election is over, I suppose.

COUNTY COURT JUDGES FOR BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MARA asked, Is it the intention of the Government to appoint additional County Court Judges in the Province of British Columbia, at an early date?

Mr. POPE.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is the intention of the Government to recommend to the House an increase in the number of County Court Judges in British Columbia.

YORK-SIMCOE BATTALION—KIT ALLOWANCE.

Mr. MULOCK moved for:

Return showing copies of all applications, letters or other communications to the Government or any department or Minister, in connection with the application on behalf of the York-Simcoe Battalion for kit allowance whilst on service in the North-West Territories, and of replies thereto.

He said: I may remind the House that last Session, in Committee of Supply, I brought this matter to the attention of the Minister of Militia, who then informed the House that he had disallowed the application on behalf of the York-Simcoe Battalion for kit allowance on the ground that they had no claim, inasmuch as he had been advised that the county of York made an allowance to the battalion; but I think that fact in itself does not justify the attitude of the Minister. The battalion in question went to the North-West, served there during the suppression of the Rebellion, and returned home after an absence of about three months. Other battalions did the same; and I find in the report of the Department of Militia and Defence the principle laid down upon which the department made such allowances. The first case in which this claim appears to have been made was in the case of the 90th Battalion of Winnipeg, and at page 72 of the Report of the Commission on the War Claims, appears the following memorandum:—

"This is a claim from the officer commanding the 90th Battalion of Winnipeg to cover the cost of underclothing, boots, necessaries, &c. It appears that this corps was ordered to take the field without having been provided with these articles by the department. The Commission are of opinion that corps ordered on service should be fully provided by the Government."

At the bottom of this report are the words "Approved—A. P. C.;" from which I infer that the Department of Militia and Defence approved of the principle here laid down that all corps that went to the North-West should be supplied by the Government with underclothing, boots, necessaries, &c. The Minister of Militia seems to dissent from that proposition. He may have changed his policy or altered his judgment, but this was the judgment that he approved of on the 5th of February, 1885. You will observe that the allowance in question is not limited to particular items such as underclothing and boots, but applies also to necessaries, &c., and as if these words might not be sufficiently comprehensive, the Commission expresses the opinion that corps ordered on service should be fully provided by the Government. In consequence of this decision, the Government did make an allowance to the Winnipeg Battalion considerably more than what is asked for here, an allowance of \$13.95 per head. The next application comes from the Winnipeg Field Battery, and will be found on page 102 of the Commissioners' Report. It is as follows:—

"Winnipeg Field Battery, expenses of clothing, &c., \$1,260. \$13.95 per man is recommended, being the same as is recommended for the 90th Battalion, amounting to \$378.85, less sums already paid by the Hudson's Bay Company, \$197.46, charged to the Government; and so on."

In this case, following the precedent laid down in the case of the 90th Battalion, the Government made an allowance to the Winnipeg Field Battery. Later on, on page 118, the Winnipeg Troop of Cavalry apply for an allowance in lieu of kit. I do not know what articles of apparel are covered by the word "kit," but it was considered sufficient to entitle them to an allowance of \$13.95 per man. Further on, at page 143, we have the application of the 10th Battalion, Toronto, commonly known as the Royal Grenadiers, and this battalion asked for compensation in lieu of boots and underclothing of \$8.15 per man. I may say, that in the case of the 10th Royals and Queen's Own Rifles, the city of

Toronto made certain grants for the purpose of supplying them with an outfit; nevertheless, that was not deemed sufficient in this case to disentitle them to compensation. Then came the application of the Queen's Own, which appears on page 295, and the report contains the following words:

"It appears this corps were not provided with necessaries—"

In this case the report simply speaks of "necessaries," not of boots and underclothing, so I presume there are other things besides boots and underclothing, with which the men had to provide themselves, and which are not provided by the department,—

"It appears this corps was not provided with necessaries by the department before leaving Toronto, but certain articles had been given to the corps by the City Council of Toronto, similar to what was given to the 10th Royal Grenadiers."

Then it goes on to say:

"In lieu of kit and necessaries, the same allowance as granted the 10th Royal Grenadiers, \$8.15 per man."

The War Commission uses the word "kit" as entirely distinct from "necessaries." If "kit" embraces boots and underclothing, "necessaries" must refer to other articles, because in the case of the Queen's Own, the department consented to payment for the "kit" and for "necessaries." When the York and Simcoe Battalion took the field, as I mentioned before, a certain allowance was made to them by the county of York, and when last Session I asked the Minister why the Government had not made the same allowance to the York and Simcoe Battalion that had been made to the Queen's Own and to the 10th, the Minister replied they had no claim, that they had been supplied with boots and underclothing by the county of York, and that the county having made a claim the men were not entitled also to make one. For that reason, the Minister declined to place in the Estimates an item to pay this money. It was on the 2nd June, 1887, that the Minister gave this House to understand he was disallowing the claim of the York and Simcoe Battalion No 1, because there was at that time before the department a claim of the county of York to be recouped, but I find on turning up the records that on the 5th February, 1886, the county of York had made a claim for this sum which it had paid to the battalion, and that the department or the Commission had reported adverse to the claim, and the Minister approved of their report. Accordingly, some 15 or 16 months ago, I brought the matter to the notice of this House, and the hon. the Minister told us that the reason he would not pay the men was because the county was making a claim, and the Commission had decided not to pay the county claim. I have no doubt on that point. The hon. gentleman had simply forgotten the report he approved of, and was at that time of the opinion that the claim was still pending before the Government. On that occasion he told us he had come to the conclusion that the men in question had made no expenditure in regard to their outfit, that they had been supplied with boots and underclothing by the county, that they had, therefore, made no disbursements and were not entitled to receive anything as they were not out of pocket at all. I asked the hon. gentleman if he had caused enquiry to be made to see if these men had disbursed anything, and he replied that his decision had been arrived at in consequence of a report made by one of the majors of one of the battalions during the troubles of the North-West, Major Windham, and gave me to understand there was in the department a report from Major Windham on this point. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, intimating that he did not give us to understand there was at that time a report from that officer. On page 716 of *Hansard*, the hon. the Minister says:

"The officer who acted as major stated that the men had no claim, as they had been provided for by the county, and if payment were made, it should be to the municipality. Some battalions were given an allowance, but they proved they had expended the amount for the pur-

pose of kits for the men. The York and Simcoe Battalion does not appear to have any claim to such an allowance."

Those are the words of the hon. gentleman. I am reported as having put this question:

"May I ask: Is there any report from the major to that effect?"

"Sir A. P. CARON. There must have been, because it was submitted to me in answer to the enquiry made by my hon. friend."

"Mr. MULOCK. Can the report be laid before the House?"

"Sir A. P. CARON. If the hon. gentleman wishes the report, I will look into the matter and see whether it can be produced. I merely take this statement as forming part of the answer."

Now, if there was no written report from the major, what do you think of a Department of Militia and Defence who proceeds in this irregular way to adjudicate upon claims of men entitled to justice at the hands of the Minister. I do not wish to speak adversely of the department further than the circumstances demand, but, in the first place, it appears to me the hon. gentleman admits that he has been guilty of a gross breach of military discipline in applying to the major commanding the battalion for a report, when there was a superior officer with whom he could have communicated. We know that an hon. gentleman, a member of this House, was in command of the battalion, and I presume he could have been reached; at all events, no explanation has been advanced by the Minister to show us why he did not apply in the proper departmental way, through the commanding officer, for a report in this matter. He chooses to take advice from a subordinate, from one of the majors. Did he also take advice from the other major. My hon. friend from South Simcoe was one of the officers commanding the battalion; and if the colonel was to be passed over and the majors consulted, one major's advice was as good as that of another. In this case, I think we have it on record that the officer commanding that battalion, in his place in this House, last Session, declared he disagreed with the hon. Minister with regard to the alleged facts given by him, and that these men had a claim. Now, did the Minister decide this question on a verbal report of one of the majors? Either there was a written report which he ought to have brought down, or there was a verbal report. If it was a verbal report, it is a very loose and a very unfair way to decide on the rights of absent men on the *ex parte* statement of one of the majors commanding, when his advice and opinion differ from the advice and opinion which the Minister would have obtained if he had applied either to the officer commanding or to the other and senior major in the regiment. I am unable to understand on what principle the Minister of Militia has proceeded in this case, if he is moved with a desire to do justice to the men in question. Did they not do their duty? Were they overpaid, or does not every man who goes into the service of the country make a considerable sacrifice? How comes it then that the battalion in question is to be treated in this manner, and is this a mode of treatment that men are entitled to at the hands of the Minister of Militia. I do not speak in this way of the Minister of Militia merely for the sake of censuring him, but I say that the circumstances demand that he should either explain this matter or do justice to these people. He has not given a valid reason for their non-payment, except that these men happened to be treated with more consideration by one of the counties to which they belonged than by the Minister whose duty it was to do them justice. He now puts the county in a peculiar position. This county—the county of York—is out of its own funds to bear part of the militia expenses. It just stepped into the breach in an emergency and gave these men an outfit, and the Minister will neither recoup the county nor pay the men. That is the position he has taken by his action. The precedent laid down by the Commission in the case of the Winnipeg Battalion has had this result. The Minister of Militia approved of the words of the War

Commission when they recommended that a full allowance should be made to those men for all the necessaries required for their services in the North-West. That report said that, when the pay-sheets were sent in, the payment should be made. That report constituted that precedent, and that was acted upon in the case of other battalions. In the case of this particular battalion, I know that the precedent which was laid down has had its effect. The pay-sheets were prepared and the receipts signed by the men for this kit allowance. I do not say that the department sent out these pay-sheets. I assume that they did not. I assume that they would originate with the battalion; but, at all events, the decision of the Government in one case was assumed to be of general application, and I know that the men have acted upon that; that in some cases they have obtained credit and in other cases have incurred liability, and there has been a considerable amount of embarrassment because they relied on the word of the Government. I hope, therefore, that when the Supplementary Estimates come down, there will be an item doing justice to this battalion. If that is not the decision of the Government, I ask the Minister of Militia to have a proper enquiry made before he decides that these men have no claim. He says that last June he decided that they had no claim, and he based that on the statement of one of the majors. I assert, on information that I have, that these men have a claim. I am told that they did disburse money, and I ask, as a matter of justice to each man, that they should be given an opportunity, at least, to show whether they have a claim or not.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think it would have been very much more convenient to have discussed this matter when the papers were brought down. As the hon. gentleman has stated, the matter has already been brought before Parliament, and I can refer the hon. gentleman to the very words he has quoted, and which explains the position taken by the department in reference to this claim as having been pronounced by myself, quoted from *Hansard* by him. I stated at that time, and I repeat it to-day, that, at the beginning of the troubles in the North-West, hon. gentlemen well know the Government stores were not in a condition to provide—just on an emergency—all that was required for a force going to the front, at the most trying season of the year. The department felt it was necessary, in many cases, to authorise the commanders of various battalions to provide the necessaries required by the men who were to proceed to the front. When these necessaries were provided by the commanding officers authorised by the department, the bills were sent in to the department, and were in every case, without a single exception, paid, as if the necessaries had been issued by the department itself, the department not having been able to provide the necessaries which were required for the troops, and having authorised the commanding officers to provide them at their cost. Those officers were, therefore, afterwards recouped. In other cases, hon. gentlemen will remember that municipalities, counties, and other large corporations, provided for the troops certain necessaries which, without being in the sense of military necessaries, naturally would contribute, and did contribute, very much to the comfort of the men. When claims in reference to that sort of thing came in to the department, they were invariably refused, and they were refused upon this one principle, that the municipalities, or the counties having chosen to exercise their liberality in favor of these battalions, and having provided the articles which they considered they ought to provide for the forces without any authority from the Department of Militia, that was to be looked upon as a gratuitous present made to these men, and the department invariably refused to recoup the municipalities, or the county councils, which had acted in that

Mr. MULOCK.

way. In the case of the York Battalion, I think I can appeal even to the hon. gentleman who has argued their case so ably and so calmly, that it would be quite useless to discuss the point, that I can have no hostile feeling against the York Battalion. That battalion, like all the other battalions which went to the front, did its duty in a manner to do credit to Canada, and to the section of the country from which its members left their homes to go and fight the battle at the front. But in the case of the York Battalion, as I have stated on a previous occasion, and in other similar cases, the goods which had been furnished to the men were furnished by the county council. The hon. gentleman, in discussing this matter, has referred to what I said about one of the majors having stated that if anybody had to be recouped it must be the council, and not the men. I think the major was perfectly correct, from the information which we have been able to collect in the Department of Militia. After having ascertained that the council had invested the funds of the county to provide these necessaries for the men, it seems to me that the claim could only come from the council, and not from the men. Upon that ground we decided that the department could not recoup the council, because in similar cases we had refused to recoup other councils who had acted in a similar way, and we stated that we could not recoup the men because the commanding officers had not received authority to purchase the goods, and the men had not expended their own money in purchasing those goods which had been given them by the council. I am prepared to bring down all the papers, and I will lay on the Table of the House all correspondence, every letter which has been exchanged between the department and various officers who have taken an interest in this matter. But I must disclaim any possible hostility, or any appearance of hostility, on my part, acting on behalf of the Militia Department, against the York Battalion. I had friends who had taken the deepest interest in the militia force of Canada, who were in command of that battalion, and I knew that those gentlemen who had applied to me would see, when the case was fairly set before them, that we have treated the battalion as we have treated every other battalion similarly situated, and I knew they would be the first to accept the explanations which I have given, and I regret to-day that it is impossible for me to make those explanations accord with the views of the battalion. Now, just one word more before I resume my seat. The hon. gentleman censures me for what he calls a gross violation of military discipline, in applying to the major whose name has been referred to. I did not apply to any major to get any report from him. As I understand the report, it was to the effect that the application of the York Battalion was replied to through the general officer commanding, on the 4th January, 1887, he stating that the officer who had acted as major had said:

"The men had no claim, as they had been provided for by the county, and if payment were made it should be made to the municipality."

In the ordinary course I sent that reply to Lieut.-Col. Otter, who communicated it to the parties who were interested in the matter. Now, if the hon. gentleman says that I stated there was a written report from that major, I must confess that I have forgotten it entirely. When the hon. gentleman moved for the returns, which I am perfectly prepared to bring down, I remember stating distinctly that a report had been received at the department from one of the acting majors, stating that the municipality had furnished the money for the purchase of the articles in question. And, Sir, was I not right in supposing that the report was correct, when we had before the department, as the hon. gentleman himself states, the application of the municipality to be recouped for that amount of money the battalion was trying to get from the Department of Militia? It may

have been a written report, or it may have been a verbal report; no doubt the papers, when produced, will show by what means the Department of Militia arrived at that conclusion. The report being corroborated, as it was, by the action of the municipality, was one to which due credence should be given by the department. Under the circumstances I am prepared to bring down all the papers, and to lay before the House the correspondence which has been exchanged between the officers and the department.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I am very sorry that the action of the Minister of Militia should have given any ground for bringing this matter again before the House. I feel a very considerable degree of vexation in reference to this matter, because I very much regret there should be any difference of opinion between myself, feeling as I naturally do, interested in this matter—because these men were under my command—and the Minister of Militia, with whom I desire to act with cordiality, and to give every support I reasonably can. But in this case I think the Minister has failed to meet my objections to the course he has pursued. I would like to ask him how he reconciles the statement that the accounts for clothing were paid, with the statement, as disclosed in the Commissioners' report, that the money was paid on the pay-list signed by the men. Now, these appear to me, in the absence of any further information, to be statements which cannot be reconciled. As a matter of fact, the men were only partially supplied by the county council; they were supplied, in the hurry of the moment, with some things which were absolutely necessary, and the other things they paid for themselves. Nor did the Minister of Militia satisfy me on a former occasion that his conclusions were correct, nor that there has not been, apparently—I do not mean to say intentionally, but certainly apparently—a discrimination between the manner in which this regiment was dealt with and that of other regiments referred to by the hon. member for North York.

Mr. MULOCK. We have the admission of the Government distinctly laid down in the report of the Commission, approved of by the Minister of Militia, that these articles were to be furnished to the men by the Government; and we have further admission made now from the floor of the House, that, as the Government could not supply the things themselves, they were willing to pay the men to purchase them, or to pay for them, when purchased on behalf of the men. We have the further fact that the City Council of Toronto, as disclosed also by the evidence before the Commission, did themselves provide the money to purchase certain articles, and that in some balancing of the accounts between the men and the department, the men were paid \$8 a piece in addition to what the city gave them. Why should there not be an enquiry into the accounts of the County Council of Simcoe, who contributed just as well as the county of York, so as to find out whether these men were entitled to the balance of the money precisely as the two other regiments referred to? I cannot see any distinction. It seems to me that there is no justification, either in common reason or in justice, for the Minister of Militia refusing to recognise this claim. I feel very deeply on the subject. I feel exceedingly annoyed that these men, who naturally look to me to secure them their rights in this matter, should be dealt with from year to year in this manner. I trust that the Minister will reconsider this question, that he will examine into it a little more closely than he has heretofore, and I am confident that if he does, he will find that these men have a strong case which it is exceedingly unwise for him, in the interest of the force, any longer to resist.

Mr. TYRWHITT. I have much pleasure in endorsing everything that has been said by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in regard to the justice of

the claim for the kit allowance. I have from the first been impressed with the justice of this claim; and in proof of that I may say that almost immediately after our return from the North-West, I advertised that on a certain day their medals would be presented to the men of my regiment at a central point. With the view of attracting a large number of men I also advertised that all the men who presented themselves to receive their medals would on that day receive their kit allowance. So firmly was I impressed at that time with the justice of the claim, that I authorised the captains in my regimental division to advance the money to their men. They did so, and gave the money to all the men who presented themselves on that day. Without entering into the question as to what constitutes a kit, or as to what a soldier is entitled to in addition to his pay, I may say that at that time I felt confident that the Government would do justice to us, from the simple fact that when our services were required, when the men were called on to take the field, they did not hesitate to ask what they were to receive or what would be given them; and I think the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurier) will bear me out when I say that, on one occasion, when I had the pleasure of meeting him, many of my men had thrown their boots away and were actually marching in their stockings, being unable to walk in their boots, which were misfits, they being determined to go ahead and do their duty. I am also glad to have the opportunity of bearing testimony to the liberality of the different counties to which I have appealed at different times for assistance towards the volunteer force, the counties of Simcoe, Dufferin and Peel having responded generously to appeals I have made to them for assistance. The county of Simcoe has on many occasions supplemented the pay of the men. We know that the pay of fifty cents is a very small remuneration for their services. Many of those men left good situations, in which they were earning two and three dollars a day, which were not kept open, and I think in simple justice they should receive everything to which they are honestly entitled, and to which they may be supposed to have the slightest claim. It is perfectly true that the county gave a certain portion of the kit; but they gave it as a gift. It was not understood that it was to be a portion of the pay; the county gave it as a gift and, I am proud to say, that the county of Simcoe, at all events, has never asked that to be returned. They gave it as a gift, the battalion accepted it as a gift, and that was the end of it. I can only hope that the Minister of Militia will reconsider his decision. I have lost no opportunity of bringing this matter to his notice. I have written on the subject two or three times during the recess, for the simple fact that I was an interested party. I had already guaranteed the amount advanced to the different captains, and they to this day look to me to make good my promise. I feel a certain amount of reluctance in addressing the department on the subject, for the simple reason that I am personally interested; but I am in honor bound, nevertheless, to make good my promise to the captains under my command, for the simple reason that I had such faith at that time in the desire of the Government to do justice to the men, and meet their claims, that I guaranteed the payment of such sums as the captains advanced. In conclusion, I only hope that the Minister will reconsider his decision and yet do us justice.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Militia states that he thinks it would be better if I had deferred discussing this matter until the papers came down. I do not know how long he desires me to wait. I did bring the matter to his notice on 2nd June, 1887. The House continued in Session over three weeks after that, and it is now nearly nine months since the House adjourned, and we have had no sight of the papers yet. How long must we wait for the papers to come down? If nine months be not proved sufficiently long

to enable the Minister to produce the papers, I am justified in trying to stimulate him through the medium of a discussion in this House. I ask leave to amend the motion by including the words "copies of any reports."

General LAURIE. I do not know that I can add much to this discussion, or speak particularly to the matter before the House; but as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Tyrwhitt) has appealed to me, I feel I must at least afford any information in my power. I had the honor of having his battalion under my command in the North-West. General Middleton telegraphed me that he wished for reinforcements, and he asked me to send that particular battalion up to join him as early as possible. I at once issued the orders, and called on Colonel Tyrwhitt, who was then acting as Major in that battalion, to push his men on. I went out to meet them to expedite the movement, and I saw the men, as the hon. gentleman has said, marching in their stocking-feet. I asked the reason, and they told me they wished to carry out the instructions they had received, and they found they could travel better in that way as their boots did not fit. I mention this, not as dealing with the question immediately before the House, but simply because I have been appealed to, to give my testimony as showing the zeal that stimulated those men in the discharge of their duty.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. A few days ago I had the honor of presenting a petition from the County Council of Oxford, asking that better provision should be made for the volunteer forces of the country. I think this discussion has brought out the fact that not only in time of peace but in time of trouble, the volunteer force is not equipped and supplied as it should be, but it has had to fall back upon the officers of the companies, on the county councils, or on some good friends, for assistance when the time arrived that they need to be properly equipped. I hope the department will take this matter under consideration, and see that officers and men who give their services have those supplies necessary to place them, at least, in comfortable shape in attending camp or going on duty in time of trouble. I know from experience the expense entailed on the officers and the men, and I hope the present discussion, although I know nothing particularly about the merits of the case under consideration, will be beneficial. I take this opportunity to bring this matter before the House, and I trust it will have a good effect.

Motion agreed to.

NAVIGATION AT NAUFRAGE, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. McINTYRE moved for :

Copy of the report of the engineer who was sent to Naufrage, King's County, Prince Edward Island, in 1884, for the purpose of reporting on the feasibility of improving the navigation at that place.

He said: Before reading the motion you hold in your hand, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words by way of explanation. My object in making the motion is to get a survey of the locality mentioned, with the view of having a harbor constructed there by the removal of a portion of sand beach which intervenes between Naufrage and the sea. This sand beach is composed of marshy material, but in course of time, by the action of the sea, it has become covered with sand. The breadth of the beach is thirty or forty yards. The pond itself is a considerable sheet of water, varying in width from 100 to 500 feet, and in length from 2,000 to 3,000 feet, with a depth varying from $4\frac{1}{2}$ to $6\frac{1}{2}$ feet. It is supplied by the Naufrage River, which is a considerable stream, as well as by several streams falling into it. The locality where this survey is asked for is situated on the north shore, and for forty or fifty miles along the shore there

Mr. MULOCK.

is no harbor whatever. The people of the locality are engaged in agriculture and fishing, and they very justly complain of the want of harbor accommodation for fishing boats as well as for larger craft. In 1878 there was a petition forwarded to the then Minister of Public Works. It was the last Session of the then Parliament, and the elections coming on that summer the matter was dropped. In 1885 another large petition was sent to the Minister of Public Works, and in the fall of that year—late in the fall—an engineer was sent down to make a survey. On account of the lateness of the season and the tempestuous nature of the weather it was found difficult, or nearly impossible, to make a thorough survey. Therefore, the engineer had not sufficient data to make an exhaustive or complete report. But notwithstanding this he sent in a report which proved altogether unsatisfactory to the inhabitants of the locality. This winter, shortly before leaving home, there was another large meeting held in the neighborhood of this locality, for the purpose of urging forward another survey. At this meeting certain resolutions were adopted, which I will read. They will perhaps give the Minister of Public Works a better idea of what I have been endeavoring to represent to him. The resolutions were as follows:—

"Whereas in the opinion of this meeting the report of Chief Engineer Perley is based on notes and data furnished by Engineer Shewan.

"And whereas, the time when he visited Naufrage for the purposes of his survey, was most unfavorable on account of stress of weather, which prevented sea soundings from being taken, a precaution most necessary in this connection to render his work complete.

"Therefore resolved, That this meeting do request our Dominion representatives to approach the Minister of Public Works with the view of removing the erroneous impressions this report is calculated to convey.

"And further resolved, That our representatives, acting on the petition sent to the department in 1883, do request the hon. the Minister to send an engineer in midsummer to report anew on this to us important public work."

I have now, Mr. Speaker, laid the case before the Minister of Public Works in as few words and as plainly as I possibly could. I need scarcely remind the Minister that this work is required for the fishermen at that locality. They have no harbor accommodation, as I have already explained, for forty of fifty miles along that coast. In the morning they have to launch their boats from the shore, and in the evening haul them up again. This is a great hardship for the people engaged in the fishery business. I think I have, as fully as I possibly could, explained the matter to the Minister of Public Works, and I trust that next summer he will see the advisability of acceding to the request of those people, and sending an engineer at a proper season of the year to make a thorough and exhaustive survey of the locality.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I would say a few words in support of the motion made by my hon. friend and colleague, and with the intention of bringing before the House and the Minister of Public Works the fact that the report made by the engineer was not complete, and could not possibly be complete, because he came in such an inclement season of the year that it was impossible for him to take the soundings on the sea side of the beach. We simply ask the Minister of Public Works to send an engineer during the summer season to make a more thorough survey. We believe that if he does make a more thorough survey we will get a more favorable report than on the last occasion. In supporting my hon. colleague in regard to his reference to the importance of this matter, I would remind the House again, that for forty or fifty miles there is no harbor of refuge for boats of any description—all the way from Campbell's Cove to St. Peter's Bay. This part of the Gulf is one of the best fishing grounds on the north side of Prince Edward Island, or the Gulf of St. Lawrence. A great number of people are engaged in the fishing business there. They find it a great hardship every morning, when going fishing, to pull their boats off the beach and then carry bal-

last to those boats, and when they return they have to take the ballast out and haul their boats up again. We believe, from local estimates, that for \$5,000 or \$3,000 the work could be done and that the sum would make a harbor sufficient to accommodate the fishing boats of that locality. Considering the importance of this work we simply ask the Minister of Public Works to give his attention to the matter, and we ask him to kindly send an engineer there during the coming summer to make a survey. We feel no doubt that it will be favorable. We wish that at as early a date as possible he will make an expenditure there which will give a harbor of refuge for the boats of the fishermen of the locality. I do not wish to detain the House further than to bring this matter as prominently as possible before the Minister of Public Works.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The report that was made in 1885, which I have here together with the data, was submitted to the chief engineer, and the report that is now before me shows that the work was estimated at a very high figure indeed. I think it was \$38,000. The Government at the time thought that under the circumstances they could not undertake that work for such a large sum of money. When I heard both of the hon. gentlemen who have just spoken say that most likely the time chosen for the survey was not exactly the proper season, that it was rather late in the year, and that they believed that an additional survey, or the completion of the survey which was taken at the time, would be the proper thing to do, I certainly will lay the matter before my colleagues with a view to obtain their consent to have an additional survey made during this summer. I suppose that, under those circumstances, as the report will be of no use if brought down, the hon. gentleman will consent to have his motion withdrawn.

Motion withdrawn.

MANITOBA HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS.

Mr. WATSON moved for:

Returns showing the names and residences of each Homestead Inspector in Manitoba and the North-West; the number of inspections and reports made by each, in each month of the years 1882-83-84-85-86 and 1887. The name of each Colonisation Inspector, his residence, the number of inspections and reports made by each, in each month of the years 1882-83-84-85-86 and 1887, and copies of said reports.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) The hon. gentleman will understand that some of these reports may be of a confidential nature, and those cannot be brought down. But I will bring down all the other information asked for.

Motion agreed to.

NAVIGATION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER— MONTREAL AND QUEBEC.

Mr. AMYOT moved for:

Return showing the amount expended by the Government of the Province of Canada:

1. For the improvement of the harbor of Montreal;
2. For the improvement of the harbor of Quebec;
3. For the deepening of Lake Saint Peter;

The amount expended by the Dominion Government:

1. For the improvement of the harbor of Montreal;
2. For the improvement of the harbor of Quebec;
3. For the deepening of Lake Saint Peter.

The total amount expended by the Dominion Government for the improvement of the River St. Lawrence generally, in order to facilitate the navigation thereof, from the western extremity of the harbor of Quebec to the harbor of Montreal, inclusively.

The total amount guaranteed by the Dominion Government: 1. For the improvement of the harbor of Montreal; 2. For the improvement of the harbor of Quebec.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Might I ask the hon. member if the object of the first part of his motion is to obtain the amount of expenses incurred by the Government in the

Province of Canada? He mentions the Government of Canada. I presume the hon. member means the Government of the Province of Canada.

Mr. AMYOT. I mean the Government which existed before Confederation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In that case I have no objection to the motion.

Motion agreed to.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL COMMISSION.

Mr. BARRON moved for:

Return of copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Commissioners appointed by the Government to take evidence and acquire information relative to the Trent Valley Canal, and the further progress thereof; of copies of all instructions authorising the Commissioners to act in the premises, and defining their powers and authority and mode of procedure; and of a copy of any and all reports of the Engineer or Engineers in charge of the works of said canal, made to the Government since the last Session of this Parliament.

He said: I make this motion because I believe it will be greatly in the public interest, and especially in the interest of the people living along the route of the Trent Valley Canal, that these papers should be brought down at as early a date as possible. The Government of Canada has thought fit to appoint a Trent Valley Canal Commission, for what purpose we do not yet know, and I desire to inform the members of that Government that the appointment of this Commission has created in the minds of the public a feeling of want of confidence in the Government's sincerity regarding the prosecution of that work. At this stage I do not intend to attack the Government for appointing that Commission. Perhaps at a later time I may have an opportunity to do so, if I think it right and proper. But I think it was perhaps a very unwise step to appoint it, for the reason that the Government has promised, time and time again, that the work should be gone on with as rapidly as possible, and the appointment of the Commission has given the impression throughout the country that the Government does not intend to go on with it. I need not remind the House of the promises made by the different members of the Government. I shall not remind it of the visit of the hon. Minister of Finance to the district, and of the impression he left upon the minds of the people that that great work, second only to our railway system, should be gone on with as speedily as possible. Perhaps I may remind the House that the Minister of Public Works, whom I see in his seat, himself promised to the member for East Peterborough, just prior to the last election, not only that the work should be speedily proceeded with to its completion, but that there should be work gone on with between the town of Peterborough and the village of Lakefield. Therefore, I think we have a right to ask the Government to go on with this work as speedily as possible, irrespective altogether of what the report of the Commission may be. I wish to say that so favorable am I to the early completion of that great work that, so far as I can do so with my feeble ability and voice, I shall be always ready and willing to assist the Government in carrying it forward. But there is one difficulty felt by the people along the route of this canal. The general impression among them is that though the Commission has been appointed, it has no powers; and we wish to have the papers laid on the Table in order to see whether they have any specific powers, to obtain evidence, and the mode in which they are going to proceed. So little confidence have the people in the powers of the Commission, that they themselves have been compelled to subscribe large sums of money to procure evidence to bring before the Commission, evidence which, I suppose, was before the Government when they saw fit to make promises as to proceeding with the work. If the Government will allow me to make a suggestion I think it

is only right and proper that they should express their willingness to pay the expenses of the different witnesses who may be brought before the Commission. It may be that many witnesses would be brought before it who would give unimportant evidence, but that difficulty would be easily got over by the Government only paying the expenses of such witnesses as the Commission should certify to be necessary and material witnesses, or to have given necessary and material evidence. I hope the papers will be brought down at as early a day as possible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was not exactly listening to the hon. gentleman, as this matter refers to the department of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, but my attention was called to the speech of the hon. gentleman by one of my colleagues, because the hon. gentleman said that the Minister of Public Works had made certain promises. I think he must have meant the Minister of Railways, if any promises were made, because I am not aware of having made any promise, or of having spoken of this enquiry to anyone except my colleagues in Council. Therefore I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman, and my colleague being absent, he cannot answer. No doubt, when he sees the charge of the hon. gentleman, he will be able to reply for himself, and I do not see any objection to granting the Address asked for.

Mr. BARRON. I, of course, endeavor to be very accurate, and if I have made any mistake it is not mine, but that of the hon. member for West Peterborough, because, on the evening of his election, that hon. gentleman is reported, in the Government organ of that locality, as having said:

"The Minister of Public Works had given him every assurance that the Trent Valley contract between Peterborough and Lakefield would be let during the coming summer. This was no electioneering dodge, because the elections were now all over."

The elections were over about an hour when the speech was made."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will please change "Public Works" into "Railways and Canals," and then he will have an answer from my colleague.

Mr. MULOCK. It is important that the attitude of the Government on this question should be made perfectly clear. I do not wonder that the hon. the Minister of Public Works may be in doubt as to what promises he may have made. It may be that the newspaper report is accurate, or that it has charged him with having given a promise made by his colleague. But I presume that the promise of a colleague involving an expenditure of nine million dollars would at least have been treated with the consideration to which it was entitled, and have had, before being made, the sanction of the Governor in Council, or, at all events, have been made the subject of an understanding among the various Ministers of the Crown. It appears, however, now that the hon. Finance Minister made a promise involving an expenditure of many millions of dollars, and that his colleague, the Minister of Public Works, who will have something to do with the carrying out of the work, knows nothing of any such promise. There have been a great many like promises made in Canada. If there is one thing for which this Government is entitled to credit, it is that there is one thing which their policy has produced, if it is promises. On the eve of elections, whether general or bye, we find a goodly crop of promises. The National Policy is prolific in promises. When a bye election took place the other day in Shelburne, I am told there were promises made, and probably the hon. gentleman who gained his election by their means, will be able to tell us whether there was anything in the promises or not. In a bye election a short time ago in an Ontario constituency, there were also promises made. Were these promises mere election promises, mere shams, with which to delude the public? or

Mr. BARRON.

were they honestly intended to be carried out in the interests of the country? The project now under discussion is entitled to be treated more seriously than to be used as a mere electioneering dodge. No doubt the work can be made of great value to the country, both locally and as a through line. I am not in a position to say what the Government engineers are able to say—whether it is a feasible scheme or not; but the Government have held out the idea that it is a feasible scheme, and one of their supporters, who formerly represented Peterborough in this House, is reported in the press as having said the other day, that the Trent Valley Canal was his policy, first, last, and always, and that no Government who did not support that policy would have his support. He sailed into this House on that canal, and no doubt his successor was equally borne into our midst on its raging waters. Now, we are told, a Commission is to ascertain whether the canal is or is not a practical scheme, or whether it exists solely in the imaginations of the Government. What is the object of the Commission? Is it to enable the Government to escape perhaps from the dilemma in which they have placed themselves, and enable them to retreat in a somewhat dignified manner. If not, why has the work not been proceeded with as promised? Why has not the promised expenditure been made? Why now send forth a Commission clothed with no power except the power of delaying, in the hope that, in time, the people will be out of patience, or, at all events, so impatient that at the next election a good promise made, when they are still warm on the subject of the canal, will bear good fruit at the polls. If this scheme is a practical one, if the Government have any honest views with regard to it, I want to know it. The part of the country in which I am interested, is interested in this scheme. Nothing will be of greater service to the country than a canal system, even if it be only used for local purposes. I do not say it should not be used as a through line as well, but in order to enable the public to escape railway monopolies, a canal system is of incalculable benefit. When you locate a railway it takes possession of the district served, and no matter what regulations you may seek to enforce, the railway will have practically a monopoly of the carrying trade. In opposition to railways a good canal may, therefore, be of great service. Every man can sail his vessel on a canal on paying toll, and the Trent Valley Canal, if it is only to do local work, will serve a great purpose, in protecting the community from excessive railway rates. If connected with the waters of Lake Simcoe, this canal would be able to draw to itself, for local freight alone, vast quantities of produce from the interior of Ontario; and even if the produce did not go by the canal, the canal rates would have a most beneficial effect by keeping down the railway rates. Anyone who looks at the map of Ontario will find that, while it is supposed we have competing lines running east and west, yet, so far as the branch lines are concerned, they have the monopoly, and as a consequence the freight rates on the branch line are exorbitant. The sooner that state of affairs is put an end to the better for the farmers, and I, therefore, trust, if it is possible, that the Government will free them from the thralldom under which they now suffer, by the construction of canals for local purposes.

General LAURIE. I do not rise to speak to the subject before the House, but merely as a matter of explanation, as the hon. member from York has brought my name into this discussion. The hon. gentleman has stated that the Government, in connection with the election in which I recently took a prominent part, were profuse of promises. It has been stated also, not only in this House, but outside, it has been stated in the public press, that my election was largely owing to promises made by members of the Government severally, and also as a body, and also to promises made by myself. I am very glad the hon. member for York

(Mr. Mulock) has given me the opportunity, at the earliest possible moment, positively to contradict this statement. I wish to say emphatically that no promise whatever was made by any member of the Government, or by the Government as a body, except the one that, if I were elected, any representations I might make would receive reasonable consideration. If the Government would not listen to the representations of a member, to whom would they listen?

An hon. MEMBER. How would it be if your opponent was elected?

General LAURIE. I am speaking of what exists at present. I am the member now; and I am happy to say that I find the Government willing to listen to reasonable representations. Then it is stated that I made promises. I made but one promise in that election, and that was that, if I were elected, I would do my best for my constituency. If that is not a right promise to make, I question what position any member can take in his canvass. These were the only promises made during my contest, and I am glad, at this early stage of the Session, to be able to puncture this bubble, this story which has been circulated over the Dominion, that that election was won by promises.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH-WEST REBELLION LOSSES COMMISSION.

Mr. LAURIER moved for:

Copy of all reports of the Commissioners appointed by Royal Commission to enquire into the losses sustained in the North-West Territories during the recent Rebellion, and a statement of all payments made under the recommendation of such reports.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Sometime ago I intimated to the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Macdowall) that it was my intention to lay these papers on the Table of the House at the earliest possible moment, irrespective of any motion. I am happy to tell the hon. gentleman that they are nearly all copied, and will be here within a day or two.

Motion agreed to.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Order for the second reading of Bill (No. 2) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act (Mr. Amyot), read.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I ask the hon. gentleman to allow his Bill to stand. The Government has promised to bring down a Bill on this question, and, if he will let his Bill stand until the Government Bill is printed, the House will be able to see what is proposed.

Mr. AMYOT. I will do that with pleasure, on condition that, if that clause is not inserted in the Government Bill, an opportunity will be given to me to press my Bill during the present Session.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Certainly.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is it intended to bring down the Government Bill early in the Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At an early date.

Order allowed to stand.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DAVIES. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he will lay before the House the report of the Commissioners appointed on the lobster question?

Mr. FOSTER. It was pretty nearly printed when I went away on Thursday, and I think it will be here this week, but I would not like to bind myself to a day or two.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 6th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 16) to incorporate the Chinook Belt and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Perley, Assiniboia.)

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

Bill (No. 18) to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Montague.)

Bill (No. 20) relating to the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 21) respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Eastern Assurance Company.—(Mr. McDougald.)

Bill (No. 23) to reduce the capital stock of La Banque Nationale.—(Mr. Bryson.)

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that I have received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Taschereau, one of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a certificate and report relating to the election for the Electoral District of L'Assomption, by which the election is declared void. An appeal having been made from the said judgment, I have the honor to report that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, the judgment of the said court by which the said appeal was quashed for want of jurisdiction. I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district. I have also the honor to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, judgments of the said court in the following election appeals:—

For the electoral districts of L'Islet and Montmorency, by which judgments the appeals are quashed for want of jurisdiction.

REPORT.

Annual Report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, for the past fiscal year, from the 1st July, 1886, to the 30th June, 1887, on the works under his control.—(Mr. Pope.)

THE RAILWAY ACT.

Mr. POPE moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 24) to consolidate and amend the Railway Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. POPE. It is almost too long to explain, but I will say, that the Bill is intended to make arrangements and to regulate matters between the trading community and farmers and the railways. It is intended that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council shall have more power in dealing with this matter than they have possessed hitherto. Generally, the Bill follows the recommendations, though not

altogether, of the Commission that was appointed to enquire into this matter.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH THE U. S.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, as I understand that the formal protocols have been laid on the Table, and I suppose will be printed sometime to-day and distributed, I would like to know whether the Government are prepared to allow the Order for to-morrow to proceed, by which we have agreed to take the motion of which I gave notice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that, unfortunately, the hon. gentleman was not in his place in the House yesterday when I made some explanations with regard to the protocols. I suppose he has, through the medium of the press, seen substantially what occurred. But I may repeat, that the information which I hoped to be able to lay upon the Table of the House when the day arrived for going on with this discussion, we are not yet in a position to place before the House. I suggested, however, that as the hon. gentleman had a motion having an important bearing upon that question, I would place, confidentially, in the hands of the leader of the Opposition and of the mover of the resolution, the information which I was not at the moment in a position to lay before the House, so that they might have as full possession of all the facts in relation to the question as myself. I may say that I am now in communication with Sir Lionel West, with a view to be able to lay, at all events, so much of the protocols relating to the trade question, which would affect the motion of the hon. gentleman, and would have a bearing on the motion on the paper which the hon. gentleman proposes to go on with, and I hope to be able to lay it before the House. I am prepared to place it confidentially in the hands of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) and in the hands of the leader of the Opposition, and I do not see why the motion should not be proceeded with. I think there is sufficient information before the House in relation to that subject, although in a somewhat indirect way, to avoid the necessity of delay in proceeding with the motion; but I leave that entirely to the hon. gentleman himself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thank the hon. gentleman for the courtesy he proposes to extend to the hon. gentleman and myself. Speaking for myself, personally, I would be very willing to proceed, but I understand that, yesterday, a good many hon. gentlemen expressed a desire to get this information, and if we might be sure of obtaining it within two or three days it might be more convenient, as no doubt from what the Minister has said the information is important, that the House should be put in possession of it. I suppose that at the outside in a couple of days the hon. gentleman will obtain a reply.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think, then, perhaps it will be well to fix a day next week.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I am quite as anxious as he is that the motion be proceeded with.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think, perhaps, under the circumstances, it would meet the views of the House that we should exhaust every means of having in the possession of the whole House the information referred to before proceeding with the motion, and, therefore, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to fix an early day next week, and no doubt we will then be in a position to know what information we can lay before the House.

Mr. POPP.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What day would suit hon. gentlemen opposite?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Monday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then let us say Monday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A good many members are absent on Monday, and I think it might be better to fix Wednesday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very well. We will make it a First Order for Wednesday, to-morrow week, and it will be proceeded with then in any case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

SUPPLY—CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is the uniform practice in the Imperial Parliament to bring under the attention of the House every matter of importance which relates to individuals, or which relates to matters that more closely concern the public in general. I wish to call the attention of the House to the extent to which the subject of the Canada Temperance Act has been made a topic of discussion in almost every constituency, and at every bye-election which has occurred since we last met here. There is, perhaps, nothing better settled in parliamentary government than that in any matter which concerns the administration of public affairs the Government, who are entrusted with the control for the time being, shall be called upon to adopt such legislative measures as will secure a more efficient administration of the law with which they are charged. This principle has been well recognised, both in this country and in the United Kingdom. The hon. gentleman who now leads the Government was, a few years ago, the leader of the Opposition, and at that time the hon. gentleman supported a motion which I will read to the House. It was this:

"That, in the opinion of this House, a prohibitory liquor law is the only effectual remedy for the evil of intemperance, and that it is the duty of the Government to submit such a measure for the approval of Parliament at the earliest moment practicable."

That resolution was proposed by one of the hon. gentleman's supporters, it was seconded by another, and it was supported by every hon. gentleman who was then a follower of his in this House. It will, therefore, not be a matter of controversy between hon. gentlemen on that side of the House and on this, that on a matter of this kind relating to the administration of a law upon the Statute-book, when experience shows that the law is practically defective, it is the special business and duty of the Administration for the time being to take charge of such legislation as may be necessary to render the law perfect and its administration complete and satisfactory. We know that hon. gentlemen who have been favorable to the principles of temperance in this House, both on that side and on this, have during each Session, for the last four Sessions, proposed legislation which they believed would have the effect of securing those improvements. In not one case had that legislation been successful. The hon. gentleman who has given notice to this House of a Bill, I think during the present week, took charge of a measure last year which he failed to carry forward to completion—which, at all events, did not become law; and I think there can be no doubt whatever that the Government either should assume the responsibility of repealing the law altogether, or they should propose such amendments to the law as would enable those entrusted with its administration to carry it honestly and fully into effect. The hon. gentleman has not proposed such legislation, it is not suggested in the Speech from the Throne;

and it seems to me that that duty which he thought devolved upon the Government when he sat upon this side of the House, equally devolves upon the Government at the present moment. At that time there was no such law upon the Statute-book. What the hon. gentleman declared, was something even much broader than what I propose to the House on this occasion. He proposed that the Government should initiate legislation, should put on the Statute-book, with a view to protecting the morals of the country, a measure which had as yet no existence. There was a measure introduced by the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), the succeeding Session. That Government assumed the responsibility of legislation, they took up the question and dealt with it, and they placed upon the Statute-book the measure known as the Canada Temperance Act. Now, experience has shown—an experience extending over ten years—that that Act requires amendment; that certain changes are needed in order to make more efficient the measure, and if it was the duty of the Government, as we at that time admitted it was the duty of the Government, to deal with the subject in consonance with public opinion, it is certainly not less the duty of the Government when the measure has been enacted, to make such amendments as experience has shown are necessary in the public interest. I do not propose to weary the House by a long discussion upon the subject. It is perfectly intelligible to every member of the House and further observations from me are not needed on the subject, seeing that hon. gentlemen upon that side of the House, as well as on this, have put themselves on record on this subject. I move:

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof:—"In the opinion of this House it is the duty of the Ministry to submit to Parliament a measure embracing such provisions as will remove all legal impediments to the efficient working of the Canada Temperance Act."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This motion in its present form may be considered as begging the question. The motion assumes that there are certain legal impediments as to the working of the Canada Temperance Act; in fact, it states that there are those impediments. The hon. gentleman in his speech does not explain what impediments he sought to be removed, or what impediments actually exist, and as we know impediments must be found to exist before they can be removed, all I can say is this: There is a measure on the Statute-book for the past ten years. It has been brought into force in a great many constituencies, and in these constituencies there does not seem to be any legal impediment to the introduction of the Act. If you look at the newspapers and see the number of convictions that have been obtained in all parts of Ontario especially, to which Province my attention has been specially directed, there does not seem, from the returns, to be any impediment in getting the penalties, and there does not seem to be any impediment to sending a man to gaol, in the absence of the penalty. I am not aware, and at all events we are not informed in any way, that there are impediments. The Act is in force, and vigorously in force—so vigorously it would seem in one constituency, at all events, that the people have rebelled against it as being too strongly enforced. They complain there are too many assistants to carry the Act into force, rather than too many impediments to prevent its being brought into force. This question, in my opinion, has proved more than any other the necessity of considering it as a moral question and not as a political question. No party can provide upon that question. No party of sufficient weight can influence it. Though I give every credit to the ability and earnestness of those who are called the temperance party, and look upon the temperance question as a very prominent question in the country, yet this party does not in their numbers seem to be able in any way to control the Legislatures or to get possession of the Administration of

the country. Whether the hon. gentlemen on the other side were here or whether we remain here, as they have found before, they will find again, that the only real way to deal with that question is to consider it apart from politics altogether, and as a moral question, in which men, whether they belong to the ministerial party or the opposition party, can afford to join to carry or feel themselves constrained to oppose. This resolution, from its vagueness and want of certainty, and in its want of anything like a specific statement, it seems to me cannot be received in this House. It is simply a motion made by the hon. gentleman with a most praiseworthy object, an object which we can all understand, and which some of us can quite appreciate or refuse to vote for it.

Mr. LAURIER. It is an old saying that there is no one so blind as he who will not see. If the hon. gentleman does not know what are the impediments to the Scott Act, he would not be so keen and far-sighted as we know him to be. If he will only recollect the depositions which interviewed him, and recollect reading the records of the deliberations of the temperance party, from time to time, he will know that the Scott Act is deficient in some particulars, and is rendered, as the phrase is, unworkable. I agree with the hon. gentleman that this is largely a moral question, which can, to a certain extent, be settled by the moral feeling of the people alone, but the hon. gentleman is aware that though it is largely a moral question, still it has taken a legal aspect, since we have a law on the Statute-book which regulates the liquor traffic. Public opinion has gone so far that though it is a moral question it is still a legal one as well. If the principle of the Bill is right, it is the duty of the Government to enforce it; if it is bad, it is its first duty to repeal it. The Government cannot afford upon such a question as this to have no opinion. It is their duty to have an opinion on this question, and the country expects them to have it. The Government is placed there by the people for the object of having an opinion on all questions which affect the public good, and, for being prepared to take action upon such opinion. It is their duty, therefore, to have an opinion on this question, and I believe that the people of this country, whether the legislation they find on the Statute-book is praiseworthy or blameworthy, expect the Government to take some action on it. If the legislation is blameworthy, it is the duty of the Government to repeal it; on the other hand, if they are of opinion that the law is a good one but deficient in some particulars, it is their duty to take steps to see that this law is put in such shape as to carry out the object for which it has been placed on the Statute-book. The complaint of the temperance body is that the law is deficient at the present moment. We have the law on the Statute-book. If my memory serves me aright, the hon. gentleman did not object to the law when it was before Parliament. When the Bill was before Parliament, and when he could have objected to it, he acquiesced in the principle of the Bill, thereby admitting that the principle of the Bill was good. Under such circumstances, when the principle of an Act is rendered inefficient, because the machinery provided to work it is not as suitable as it ought to be, we claim it is the duty of the Government not to leave such an important matter to individual members of the House, but that the Government should come to the assistance of that legislation and make it as good as it ought to be. That is the duty we think ought to be imposed by the House at once on the Government, and which the Government should not delay to accept.

Mr. JAMIESON. I just came into the House a few moments ago after this discussion had commenced. The hon. member for Bothwell was discussing the question, and afterwards submitted his motion in amendment to going into

Committee of Supply. It was very awkward, perhaps, to meet a motion of that kind in an off-hand way, and it seems difficult to give a reason why one should either oppose or support such a motion. Unless I change my opinion, in order simply to be consistent, I suppose I shall be obliged to vote for the amendment of the hon. member from Bothwell. I see reasons, however, which would justify me in pursuing a different course if I thought proper. Hitherto the question of the amendment of the Canada Temperance Act, as well as the general question of prohibition, has been treated quite aside from the questions of party or politics, and I am sorry that the present movement is not in keeping with the former action of the prohibitionists of this House. For my part, I have been taken considerably by surprise by this motion. In the city to-day, there is a meeting of the Dominion Alliance, and my absence from the House may be accounted for by that fact. The representatives of the two political parties in this House were present at that meeting, discussing the ways and means of best advancing the cause of temperance. Of course the hon. gentleman's action is quite at variance with the deliverance of the Dominion Alliance. Hitherto the course taken by the friends of temperance in this House has been guided by the wishes of the Alliance, and within the past hour the Alliance has endorsed the action which I have already taken of introducing to this House a Bill for the purpose of amending the Canada Temperance Act, and making it more like what the friends of temperance desire to have it. I am at one with the hon. member for Bothwell in reference to the desirability of having all the imperfections of the Canada Temperance Act removed, and improving it as much as possible. It is scarcely fair for the opponents of temperance to say that the Act is becoming unpopular, whilst at the same time it is impossible to secure amendments which would make it more popular and more workable. I may further remark that hitherto, in connection with all actions emanating from the Dominion Alliance, it has been usual to select an hon. gentleman from each side of the House for the purpose of moving and seconding any motion which may be made here either in reference to the prohibition of the liquor traffic or in reference to the amendment of the Canada Temperance Act. Consequently, while I thoroughly agree with the motion which has been submitted by the hon. member for Bothwell, I am bound to say that it is a breach of the arrangement which has hitherto existed between the temperance men in this House belonging to the two political parties. It is not for me, as a supporter of the Government, to say that it would have been right and proper for the hon. member for Bothwell to consult me or any other member on this side of the House, in reference to the action which he has thought proper to take. My own judgment is that if any amendments to the Canada Temperance Act are carried, and if we ever secure prohibition in this country, those results must be brought about by the joint action of both political parties. I do not know that I should follow up this discussion at any length, as other members will no doubt take this opportunity of expressing their opinion on the action of the hon. member for Bothwell. The course which has been taken is so unusual and so extraordinary that I think there ought to be a general discussion upon the question now, so that there may be no entanglement, and so that the defeat of the motion, if it be defeated, may not be looked upon as a deliverance of this House against any proposed amendments to the Canada Temperance Act. It is my intention to press the Bill which is now before the House, and to secure as large a support for that measure as possible, and I have no doubt that its provisions will receive the sanction of this House. Two years ago a somewhat similar Bill was carried through this House, and the calamity which happened to it was at the hands of another body altogether. My own judgment is

Mr. JAMIESON.

that there is a strong enough desire on the part of the members of this House that the Canada Temperance Act should be improved, to give to the measure which has been introduced a careful consideration; I have no doubt it will pass this House, and I trust that it will receive more favorable consideration at the hands of the Senate than the Bill which was introduced two Sessions ago. I may further state that it is the intention of the Dominion Alliance to have the sentiment of this House again tested upon the question of the general prohibition of the liquor traffic. It may be said that that course is somewhat extraordinary, in view of the fact that a resolution of that kind has already been dealt with by this Parliament. It will be recollected that a resolution of that kind was submitted by me at the last Session; but the friends of temperance are so earnest, and are so anxious that this question should be kept to the front, that it is their desire that the question shall be brought before the House at every Session of this Parliament, until we shall ultimately secure, we trust, what we are striving for, the entire suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Those who remember the history of the temperance question in this country will remember that, in 1873, a very large number of petitions were presented to this House from different parts of the country, asking for a prohibitory liquor law. No law was placed on the Statute-book on the subject, however, until 1878, when the Canada Temperance Act was deliberately passed by the Canadian Parliament. Now, if there is a necessity for an improvement or amendment to that Act, I apprehend that the Government is the proper party to amend it, and place it in such a position that the temperance people of this country can operate it to the advantage of temperance principles. Last Session a vote was taken on a motion to repeal the Scott Act, which was lost by a majority of 108 against the repeal, and the hon. member for Bothwell then arose in his place and stated to the First Minister that it was the duty of the Government, in the face of that vote, when the House of Commons by so large a majority decided that the people were in favor of continuing the Act, to bring in a Bill to amend the Scott Act and make it more workable. It is the duty of the Dominion Alliance to bring their influence and power to bear on the Ministers of the day, in order that amendments to the Act may be operated through them, because, if the people desire the continuation of this Act, as it is undeniable they do, they have a right to look to the Ministers of the day as the channel through whom any amendments should come. I believe that the friends of temperance would act best in the interests of their cause, if, instead of bringing in amendments by means of private Bills, they would bring all their influence to bear on the Government, to induce the Government to introduce the necessary temperance legislation. They can say in plain language to the Ministers that, the House of Commons having declared by a large majority that the people are in favor of continuing the Temperance Act, it is, therefore, the duty of the Government to make the necessary amendments. The importance of taking such action should be strongly impressed upon the Government. It would be better that a movement of that kind should be made on the part of the Dominion Alliance, than to continue the policy of every year introducing amendments, by means of private Bills. I am sure that if the amendments we desire were brought in by the Government, they would be carried through this House by three-fourths of a majority, so that the Government would run no risk whatever, in introducing such legislation. But, if the hon. the Ministers are not true temperance men, if they look mainly to political influences, we can understand that they should try to play into the hands of the two parties, those opposed to and

those in favor of temperance. If the Government desire that the cause of temperance should improve, let them bring in the amendments, and they will be supported by every temperance organisation in the country; they will be supported by the Dominion Alliance, and by every hon. member who professes temperance principles, and they will undoubtedly be supported by the great majority of the Canadian people. For these reasons I believe that any amendment to the Scott Act should be made as a Government measure, and I could not let this occasion pass without expressing my approval of the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. FREEMAN. The temperance people of this country will be greatly encouraged by what has passed here within the last hour. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), as he has stated, intends bringing in a Bill to amend the Scott Act. That proceeding was decided upon in the meeting of the Alliance a short time ago, and I remember distinctly, as I took some part in the proceedings, that fears were expressed that a Bill to amend the Act might not find favor in this House, and those fears were based upon the votes taken here last Session. Now, Sir, when the gentlemen who are popularly or generally supposed to be not advocates of the temperance cause or not supporters of it, gentlemen who are generally taken by the public as opponents to prohibition—when they come forward so suddenly, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and his friends have, on this occasion, to advocate amendments to the Scott Act by the Government, I cannot doubt but that there has been a great reformation in these hon. gentlemen.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would remind the hon. gentleman that I was a member of the Government which put that Act on the Statute-book.

Mr. FREEMAN. If I have intimated that the hon. member for Bothwell is not a friend of temperance, and he wishes to say that he is—for I could not hear what he said—I beg his pardon fully, and trust he will forgive me, but I must draw the conclusion that if he is a friend of temperance reformation, if he is a friend of prohibition, he carries his leaders with him in this matter. I must assume that the leaders of the party, of which he is a very prominent member, are certainly with him in this matter, and the application of my observations will be to them if not to him. As an advocate of prohibition, as a member of a temperance society for some 30 years, and having observed the drift of opinion on this temperance question during that time, indeed, for years before, I have been led to regret that, within the last few years, at all events, there has been a tendency to introduce politics into this temperance question; and I have frequently, at meetings of the friends of temperance, expressed the opinion that, however guarded gentlemen may be in their expressions with regard to this temperance cause, this political animus, this political feeling is continually sticking out, if you will allow me the expression. I regret exceedingly whenever I see this to be the case, for, as a friend of temperance, as an earnest, and, I believe, honest supporter of prohibition, I feel that if ever we are to carry prohibition in this country, we must carry it independent of politics, and I regret exceedingly whenever I see any introduction of this element into the question. If the hon. gentlemen opposite are honest, as I presume they are, and if, as I presume he does, the hon. member for Bothwell carries his friends with him, if the Opposition party in this House are prepared to support their leader or one of their leaders, there will be no trouble carrying the Bill which the hon. member for Lanark intends to introduce. I feel satisfied the hon. gentlemen opposite will set a good example to the hon. gentlemen on this side who did not support us last Session. There are a number of hon. gentlemen on this side, whom I would have gladly seen

voting with us on this question, who voted against us last Session, and I feel satisfied that if the hon. gentlemen opposite are sincere in the statement that the leader of the Government would carry three-fourths of this House with him in a measure such as has been proposed, and that statement is well grounded, then I must conclude that the leaders of the Opposition would carry a like proportion of their followers for such a measure. If the leader of the Government has such influence with this House, certainly the leaders of the Opposition have great influence, and I feel satisfied, if they vote in a body, we shall have no trouble in carrying those amendments which are necessary to the proper carrying out of the Act. Another point I wish to make is this: The prohibitionists feel that the legislation of the country should be in the hands of the friends of prohibition, the tried friends of prohibition, the men who in years past when it was not so fashionable and not so favorably received as now, fought the battle of temperance and prohibition; they feel that at this time of day there is no excuse for leaving the carrying forward of this work in the hands of lukewarm men, who may be perhaps their enemies, and they, therefore, feel that legislation in this matter should be directed by the friends of temperance in this House, and I feel sure that hon. gentlemen opposite will quietly acquiesce in the work that has been laid out by the Dominion Alliance, and that, if they are honest in this matter, they will say to my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson): Bring in your measure and we will support you; we will not press the leader of the Government to take this work upon himself; bring in your Bill and we will support you and support the amendments which you propose. That is the course which the Opposition should take in this matter, and I think they ought not to press the matter where we do not want it pressed.

Mr. SCRIVER. Like my hon. friend from Lanark, I had the pleasure of being present a short time ago at the meeting of the Dominion Alliance. I noticed what passed there, and I do not agree with him in saying that the action taken by that body is at all inconsistent with the motion presented to the House now by my hon. friend (Mr. Mills). I suppose the resolution to which my hon. friend (Mr. Jamieson) refers was one approving of an early presentation to this House of legislation in amendment to the Scott Act, and also a motion favoring the presentation of a resolution similar to the one my hon. friend brought before the House last year in favor of prohibition; but I feel quite confident that, if my hon. friend or any other member of the Dominion Alliance had brought forward a motion to-day asking that the Government should bring in legislation in amendment of the Scott Act, that motion would have been carried unanimously—I will not say enthusiastically, because, from our knowledge of the past, I think no one would have felt confident that it would have had any effect. But I would remind my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) that, two or three years ago, that body did pass a resolution instructing or requesting the members of the temperance party in this House to ask the Government to introduce legislation in amendment of the Scott Act, and I would further remind my hon. friend that several members of the House, who, like himself, were active and consistent temperance men, did wait upon the Government and did urge them to bring forward such measures as the temperance members of the House and the members of the Dominion Alliance thought necessary to make the Scott Act effective. My hon. friend knows very well what was the result of that mission. He knows that we were kept without an answer for some time, and that at last we were given to understand that the Government did not propose to interfere in the matter. I have not been a member of this House for the many long years during which I have enjoyed that honor, without knowing that it

is next to impossible for a private member, however earnest, however consistent and however eloquent he may be, to succeed in getting amendments made to an Act of this kind which is on the Statute-book. I have learned that, unless the Government introduce desired amendments to Government measures, it is difficult and almost impossible to get amendments passed. And we know very well—those of us who have been members of this House for some years past—what result has always attended the efforts which have been made by my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) and others to get amendments made to the Scott Act. We know that those attempts have resulted in defeat in every instance. I think I may claim from those who have sat with me in the House for many long years past, that I am not assuming too much in claiming that, upon the whole, my political conduct has been characterised by candor and by honesty, and therefore, when I make the declaration which I do, that it is my honest and firm opinion that the amendments which my hon. friend indicates he is going to introduce at a later stage cannot be carried without the intervention of the Government, and without his Bill being made a Government measure, I think my hon. friends will believe that I am honest in the statement I make.

Mr. FISHER. Unfortunately, I was not in the House at the time when my hon. friend made the motion which is under discussion at this moment. Unfortunately, also, in consequence of a sad duty which I had to perform last evening, I was not able to be present at the discussion in the Alliance council this forenoon, and, therefore, perhaps I am not in the same position as that of my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) and my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), in discussing this question, but I venture to say that this is a question in which the best interests of the temperance people of this country are seriously involved, and that it is very important that this question should be discussed from all sides here when it is presented to us, it matters not by whom or at whose hands it comes before this House. As I understand the hon. member who sat down on the other side of the House a few moments ago, he said that if this was before the House in the way which he thought right, he would be prepared to support it and vote for it; and I understood from what he said that if it had been presented by hon. gentlemen on the treasury benches he would have supported it, but that as it was moved by an hon. member on this side of the House, who was a member of the Government when the Scott Act was made law by the Parliament of this country, he could not support it and could not endorse the resolution. If such a temper as that is displayed by the temperance people in this House, and the representatives of the temperance constituencies in this House, there is evidently an impossibility that party differences can be sunk, and that temperance legislation can be successfully carried through; but I was surprised, I must confess, to hear him say that he believed that temperance legislation in this House must necessarily and only be introduced by the temperance men, implying thereby that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was not justified in introducing legislation on this question. I do not know who is better qualified to introduce amendments to the Scott Act or to improve that measure than the members of the Government who forced that measure through Parliament at the time that it became law. We owe it to the Government of my hon. friend, the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), that we have now in existence a local option law so perfect as the Scott Act, and if it was not then made quite as perfect as we would wish to see it now, it was because the experience which the promoters of that Bill had at that time was not so great as the experience of its working is to-day. We know that the temperance people throughout this country hailed the

Mr. SCRIVER.

appearance of that Act with pleasure at that time, and that it met with the approval of all the advocates of temperance; but, in the course of years, difficulties have cropped out in the working of the Act, and no one knows that better than the members of the Government of the day, because, unfortunately, these difficulties have been laid before them from time to time, because the committees of the Alliance have, collectively and individually, explained to the Government what these difficulties are over and over again, and have asked the Government of the day to remove those difficulties; and the reply we have invariably received has been that they would not do it. When that has been the result of our efforts and the applications we have made to the Government, how are we to proceed and gain our object unless independent members of the House, who may not be connected, perhaps, with the temperance movement, take up that question? And I am glad to see that it is a leader of mine and a leader of the party to which I belong, who has seen that it is in the interests of the country at large that the Scott Act should be made perfect, and that the violations of that Act, which are bringing discredit, not upon the temperance people or the temperance sentiment of this country, but upon the administration of law and good order in this country, should be put an end to, and that we ought to have power to enforce this Act as it should be enforced. I am informed that, some time before I came into the House, the right hon. the leader of the Government intimated that there were no difficulties in the way of enforcing the Act, that he asked what were the imperfections which existed, and why he and his Government were asked to amend it. I can tell the right hon. gentleman very easily what are the difficulties in enforcing the Act; and I am glad to say that the Local Government of Ontario has stepped into the breach and is doing what it is his duty to do. The Local Government of the Province of Ontario has distinctly declared that they believed it is not their duty to do this work, but the Government of that Province, in the interest of the people of that Province, have stepped into the breach and are doing that work. Unfortunately, Sir, all the Provinces of the Dominion of Canada are not in that happy position; unfortunately, the Province of Quebec has not yet been able to induce its Local Government to do this work; unfortunately, until lately, the Province of Quebec has been in the hands of a Government who, when asked by the temperance people to enforce the Scott Act, replied to them: The Scott Act has prevented us from getting a revenue from licenses in your counties; and with that fact in view, we will not aid you to enforce the Scott Act. But as a different Government is in power in the Province of Quebec to-day, I trust that when the temperance people go to that Government for assistance to enforce the Act they will obtain it. Sir, I believe it to be the duty of this Government to enforce an Act which is on the Statute-book in consequence of their own action. I am not a lawyer, and I cannot pretend to discuss the constitutional question, but it seems to me to be in accord with common sense that when the Government pass an Act, it is their duty to enforce it. I believe that the temperance people of the country have a perfect right to demand that special facilities be given them for the enforcement of this Act which is, in its essence, a special law. The natural conclusion would be that this law should be enforced, just as other laws are, by the ordinary authorities of the land. In the first place this law is a particular and special one; it is slightly different from all other laws with which I am acquainted, in its bearing upon good government and order, and therefore we have a special claim upon the Government in asking that special facilities be given for enforcing this law. I contend that the facts of the case and statistics will bear me out in saying that wherever the Scott Act is

in force to-day, the ordinary expenses of the county in connection with criminal prosecutions in that county are decreased in consequence of the operation of the Act.

Mr. HAGGART. Not so.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman says it is not so. I will refer him to the report of the Criminal Statistics of the Province of Ontario. I have not those Criminal Statistics in my hand at the moment; I hoped to have them before the debate on this question came up, so that I might be able to refer to them. But I can tell the hon. gentleman that persons who have seen them and studied them, declare that they prove conclusively that in Scott Act counties general crime and violations of the law, in proportion to the population, have decreased, and that in comparison with those parts of the Province which are not under the Scott Act, those statistics show a glorious exhibit in favor of the Act.

Mr. HAGGART. Crime has increased in my county.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman particularise, and as soon as I can get hold of these statistics, I shall make it a point to study them in relation to his own county. But, Sir, it is a well known fact, which has been publicly stated in many places, that in the county of Halton, for the last eleven sessions of the courts there, the judge has been presented with a pair of white gloves in celebration of the fact that there was no criminal case before him; and I do not believe that there is another county in the Dominion of Canada where a similar state of affairs exist. I know it will be said that the Scott Act was defeated there, and I am free to confess that I consider it a very serious blow to the progress of temperance in this county, although I do not believe that that result is due in any sense to a weakening of the temperance sentiment of Halton, but it is due rather to the fact that the temperance people have not organised themselves so as to be able to watch the voters' lists, and to bring their entire forces to bear in the same way as is done by the ordinary political organisations. But, taking the country as a whole, I believe it has been conclusively proved many a time on the floor of this House, by hon. gentlemen advocating total prohibition, that the result of prohibition wherever enforced, has been to reduce the ordinary criminal expense and to reduce the expense for the enforcement of criminal laws in general. That being the case, I believe we have a fair ground to ask that the Government of our country should make the necessary expenditure properly to enforce the temperance laws. Now, Sir, there is another very important point in connection with this question of the enforcement of the Scott Act. The right hon. leader of the Government, I understand, stated that there were no defects in the law which the Government could remedy. Well Sir, I must condemn the right hon. leader and his Government for not having, in the immediate past, assisted the friends of temperance in enforcing the Scott Act. Two years ago, a request was made that an Order in Council should be issued applying the fines in Scott Act counties in a particular way, a way which was pointed out by the temperance people through the Dominion Alliance. I, myself, was member of a deputation who waited upon the Minister of Justice, asking that the fines be applied in a particular way. Resolutions were passed at various meetings of the Alliance, which were laid before the Ministry, pointing out the way in which the application of the fines would best promote the interests of temperance. The Government replied by passing an Order in Council which did not at all accord with the resolutions of the Alliance, or with the wishes of the temperance people of the country. On the contrary, that Order in Council directly militated against the successful enforcement of the Act. Sir, we consider that the Government

of the day, by that Order in Council, in a matter which was entirely under their own control, in which they had not to consult the representatives of the people, showed that they were not desirous of assisting the temperance people in enforcing this Act. I regret that was the case; I regret to find that the Government of the country to-day has shown by their acts that they do not desire to assist us. The result of that Order in Council has been to throw back the enforcement of local temperance laws entirely into the arena of municipal contests and municipal governments. One of the great advantages which we believed we had gained by the Scott Act was that, by its provisions, the enforcement of those laws was withdrawn from the arena of municipal politics and relegated to the general Government. I believe that was a wise provision of the Act. I believe it was important to the successful carrying out of the wishes of the people in reference to that Act, and I regret that this action of the Government, in passing that Order in Council, has thrown back once more the question of the fines and penalties, and, incidentally, the whole question of the enforcement of the law, into the arena of municipal politics, which fact I consider to be a very serious obstacle to the proper enforcement of the Act. In consequence of the fact that I was not present in the early part of this debate I may have said something that has been already stated. Unfortunately, I am not prepared to speak at great length on this question, but I feel confident that the resolution now before the House is in the true interests of the temperance legislation of this country, and that it is absolutely necessary, if the Act is to be enforced throughout the length and breadth of the land and carried out in a uniform manner, that its enforcement should be entrusted to the Dominion House and the Dominion Government. It is important that the enforcement of the Scott Act, which is a Dominion law, should be under the control of the Dominion Parliament, which is empowered to amend that law. It is important that the regulations regarding the enforcement of the Act should be uniform all over the Dominion, because it would seriously impede the work of the temperance people if they were obliged to work under different regulations, laws and arrangements in Ontario and Quebec, and again in the Maritime Provinces. To-day the Provincial Government of Ontario is doing this work; to-day, I understand, the Provincial Governments in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island are assisting in this work, each doing it in their own way and each doing it according to their own light; but it is in the true interests of temperance that the work should be done on one line, in one manner from one end of the country to the other, and it should be done by an authority which is amenable to the power of the House which passed the law. Believing this to be the case, I have great pleasure in thoroughly endorsing the motion before the House, and will certainly support it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I do not desire to occupy much of the time of the House in discussing a matter of this kind. If we find there is friction in the working of the Scott Act, if we find that any of the machinery is deficient when we come to put the Act in force, I consider it is the bounden duty of the Government to come to the rescue, and so amend the Act as to make it efficient. The question then arises whether the machinery provided for working the Act is efficient, and is such as it ought to be, and by the vote of the House in previous Sessions it has been shown that there is a feeling that the machinery is not ample for the efficient working of the Act. True, it is said that the Act is complete in all its parts, that there is machinery whereby it can be enforced; but we find that hon. gentlemen opposite complain that the Act is not satisfactorily enforced in the various counties where it has been carried. That being so, I repeat that it is the duty of the Govern-

ment to come to the aid of the advocates of the Act, and so amend it that it may be enforced. It is very true that some of the hon. gentlemen opposite say that this is not just the proper time to bring a measure of this kind forward, that they would be inclined to support it if it came at the proper time and in the proper way. Sir, am I to understand they consider the opportuneness of a motion of this kind of more importance than the principles of temperance? Am I to understand that they ignore the principles of temperance in consideration of advantages to be gained to their own party? Am I to understand that the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Freeman) could so forget the principles of temperance that he could totally ignore them if a motion was made on this side of the House with a view to amending the Scott Act? That is what he stated to the House. Again, we find the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) stating that the Dominion Alliance is not in accord with the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I certainly think that the Dominion Alliance is sincere in the welfare and success of temperance. I believe they feel it is the duty of the Government, and not of any private individual, so to amend the Act that it will meet with the approbation of the people of the country; and, feeling that this is the duty of the Government, this is a proper motion, and all those who feel anxious for the success of temperance, and for the efficient working of the Scott Act, will record their votes in favor of the motion presented by the hon. member for Bothwell. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) also stated that the number of crimes committed in his county had increased since the passage of the Scott Act. Such, I think, is not the report of the Inspector of Prisons for Ontario; in fact, I find, on looking at the report, that it presents quite a different statement in regard to the hon. gentleman's own county. The Ontario prisons report shows this: In the counties of Durham and Northumberland, Elgin (including the city of St. Thomas), Kent, Lambton, Lanark, Lennox and Addington, Leeds and Grenville, Ontario, Peterborough, Victoria and Wellington (including the city of Guelph), there were in 1885, under license, 399 commitments for drunkenness, and in the next year, with only five months of Scott Act, the number fell to 200—nearly one-half. The statement made by the hon. gentleman is, therefore, not supported by the report of the Inspector of Prisons, and although I am not inclined to discuss the relative merits of success following the Act in the various counties in the Province, I think statistics will show a diminution of commitments wherever the Scott Act has been put in force, even in an inefficient manner. Believing that to be the case, and believing, as I do believe, and as I have before stated, that if the Act cannot be efficiently enforced it should be amended, and the House having by an overwhelming majority expressed its views that it was not in the interests of temperance that a private individual should have charge of the legislation affecting such an important subject as the Scott Act, I consider it is the bounden duty of the Government to take charge of this measure, and holding that opinion, I shall with great pleasure vote for the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I only wish to say a few words upon this question. It will be borne in mind by those hon. gentlemen who seem to covertly, if not openly, find fault with the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in introducing his resolution, that he has held the views to which he has given expression in his resolution for some time. I think it will be in the memory of members of this House that last Session, at all events, he spoke in the same direction and very strongly, as he has done to-day, though he did not follow up his speech with a motion. If I am not mistaken, in the preceding Session, he spoke in the same

Mr. WILSON (Elgin.)

manner. I think the hon. members may judge from that as to his sincerity in the motion which he offers. It cannot be termed a new motion that he has just devised and sprung upon the House, because hon. members must know that he has pressed this view upon the House on previous occasions. Now, Sir, with reference to the duty of the Government in this matter. It appears to me that it is one of the laws of the land, one of the statutes. The Government, I suppose, view it as a law that ought to remain on the Statute-book, and that being the case, as has been said by previous speakers, the question arises, is it a law that requires amendment at the hands of this Parliament or not? The right hon. gentleman, the First Minister, professed ignorance of any improvements that could be made, but I think that he ought to remember the fact that this House—I am not sure whether it was this House or the preceding House—passed upon that question, as the member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) has told us, by a large majority, declaring that amendments were requisite to make the Act efficient, and also embodying the necessary amendments in the Bill which passed this House, but which, as he tells us, did not succeed in passing in another place. We have then the authority of the member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) we have also the authority of the majority of the members of the late Parliament if not of this, that the Act does require amendments, and if that be the case the proper course for the Government is to deal with it. Has the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) initiated some novel procedure in this matter? Do not the Ministers themselves recognise the facts of the case that if the laws of the land which are on the Statute-book, are found to be inefficient whether by legal impediments in the proper enacting of them, do they not recognise and act upon the fact that it is their duty to make those laws efficient? Let me call your attention to what we are invited by the Government to do as legislators this Session. In the speech that was delivered from the Throne if you will take the trouble to read it, or without reading it you will remember, and every member of this House will also remember it, the only legislation we are asked to give any consideration or thought to is the amendment and perfection of measures that are upon the Statute book at the present time:

"The extension and development of our system of railways have not only rendered necessary additional safeguards for life and property, but have given greater frequency to questions in which the interests of rival companies are found to be in conflict, and to require authoritative adjustment. As further legislation appears to be needed for these purposes, a measure will be submitted to you for the consolidation and improvement of 'The Railway Act.'

"Experience having shown that amendments are required to make the provisions of the Act respecting Elections of the Members of the House of Commons more effective and more convenient in their operation, you will be asked to consider a measure for the amendment of the statute.

"The Act respecting Controverted Elections may likewise require attention, with a view to the removal of certain questions of interpretation which have arisen and which should be set at rest.

"My Government has availed itself of the opportunity afforded by the recess to consider the numerous suggestions which have been made for improving the details of the Act respecting the Electoral Franchise, and a measure will be submitted to you for the purpose of simplifying the law and greatly lessening the cost of its operation."

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will see that, as I said before, nearly all the legislation that we are asked by the Government to give our attention to this Session is in the direction of amending laws that are upon the Statute-book, with a view to their improvement. This amendment refers to the improving of a law in which is taken a deep interest by the vast majority of the people of this country. My hon. friend has pointed out the fact that private members have introduced legislation, and that they have not been successful in it. He pressed last year his motion with regard to this question. To-day he repeats his views. He affirms it by resolution, and he asks this House to concur with him that it is the duty of the Government, in view of the fact

that this Act requires amendment, and, if they propose to let it remain on the Statute-book, to take measures to render it effective. The member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) cannot lose sight of the great advantage he would have in supporting this resolution in preference to pressing the Bill which he has introduced himself. He has told us that he succeeded in the House of Commons in carrying his amendments, that he succeeded in carrying the Bill embodying the amendments he thought were necessary, but that in another Chamber it failed. Has he any intimation from members in that other Chamber, that their views have changed in this direction; has he any reason to suppose that legislation initiated by him will succeed any better there this year than it has succeeded before? I would be glad to hear if he has any such information, but I do not think he will venture to say that he has. I will then ask him this: If he would object to laying the duty of bringing in those resolutions upon the Government? If the House lays such duty on the Government, I suppose the Government will undertake it. If my hon. friend lays the duty upon the Government of taking up the Bill and making it a Government measure, then it would prevail in that other place where it was not carried before. That is the way we have to look at this, and it is the only way that the question which has agitated the community so much can be successfully carried through. I do not see why the Government cannot take up this question and deal with it as they are taking up and dealing with many other amendments to the laws of the land during the present Session.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have had one or two rather extraordinary statements in the course of this debate. We had first the statement from the First Minister that he is not aware that any amendments are called for, or necessary to the working of the Canada Temperance Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Those were the words as I took them down. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us what he did say?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said the hon. gentleman, in moving the amendments, had not shown any objections in his speech.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course we cannot expect the hon. the First Minister to take advice from this side of the House, or the advice of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), as to the amendments. The general principle is, whether it is the duty of the Government or not to amend an Act which has given rise to more expensive, teasing, and harassing legislation during the last ten years than all the other Acts on the Statute-book put together, I believe. The hon. the First Minister must know of this, and as my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. Fisher) has told us, he has been interviewed and deputed on the subject time and time again, and has had all kinds of suggestions made to him. It is strange, under those circumstances, that he does not know what amendments are wanted. Another declaration made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Freeman) was of a remarkable character. The hon. gentleman, when my friends here proposed to entrust the amendment of the Scott Act to the Government of Canada, declares that he, speaking on behalf of the Dominion Alliance, does not think it desirable to trust the amendment of that Act to a lukewarm and, perhaps, unfriendly body. I do not doubt the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Freeman) knows whereof he was speaking. He might have given us his reason; he might have told us in more detail why he would not entrust the administration of that Act to a lukewarm and unfriendly body, or entrust to them the proper amendment of the Canada Temperance Act.

I think the First Minister and his colleagues beside him, are precluded from taking the least exception to the impeachment of my hon. friend. I remember in 1877, I think it was, that those hon. gentlemen insisted on our taking up a question which was more a moral and a purely moral question than the amendment of the Act now on the Statute-book, because they wanted us to declare that it was the duty of the Government to act on the question of prohibition throughout this Dominion, and I think he will find, on the vote which took place on that occasion, the names of the First Minister, of the Minister of Finance, of the Minister of Public Works, of the Minister of Militia, and such others of their colleagues who happened to have seats in the House at that time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a mistake.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Which?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What you said just now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say that I recollect the motion made by Mr. Schultz, who was then a member of the House—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,—that we should declare it, and I recollect that all the friends of the hon. member in this House pressed upon us very strongly the necessity of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When the amendment was moved I am aware the motion was not voted on directly. But the hon. gentlemen did their best to insist upon our voting on it. That is quite true.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The motion was made in amendment to Mr. Ross. The hon. gentleman will remember that it was stated the question was a matter of doubt as to jurisdiction, and therefore it was inexpedient to press it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know the motion quite well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I voted for that amendment because I had the opinion then, although it has been overruled since, that we had the jurisdiction.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman gave countenance and support to Mr. Schultz's motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not in any way whatever.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The country will understand when they look at the vote and find the hon. gentleman and all his friends negating the motion of Mr. Ross, who was an advocate of temperance. They will understand quite well that the hon. gentleman then, as he said in the case of my hon. friend, for his own purpose wished to compel the Government of Canada to take up the question of prohibition. I think there will be no doubt outside of this House, whatever there may be inside of it, as to that. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman tells us that it is very difficult for them to understand what the temperance people want. Why, Sir, have they not got one of their own colleagues there expressly for the purpose of advising them what the temperance people want, or for the purpose, perhaps, of counteracting those other gentlemen who are not exactly supposed to represent the temperance interest? Now, Sir, I say there is one practical fact which every man within the sound of my voice knows quite well, and that is, as we have seen proved time and again on the floor of this House, that if these amendments, whatever they may be, which the friends of temperance say are necessary to make that Act workable, are to be got through both Houses of this Parliament, they will only be got through when the Government puts its

hand to them and insists that they shall be carried. They will be got through then, and not before; and it is well that the temperance organisations throughout Canada should understand that thoroughly.

An hon. MEMBER. They do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope they do, and will remember it. Let me say in conclusion that there has been only one Government since Confederation that put an Act on the Statute-book which has really and substantially promoted the cause of temperance in Canada. Let me ask those who remember—and there are a good many in this House who do remember—whether at the time that question was under discussion, the Mackenzie Government did take charge of that Act and make it a Government measure. No temperance man, whatever his politics might be, whether he was a Conservative or a Reformer, had any doubt as to whether or not it was the duty of my hon. friend and his Government to do so. From one end of Canada to the other my hon. friend was deluged with remonstrances and petitions from temperance men, wholly irrespective of party, asking him to take charge of that Act and pass it; and now my hon. friend asks that hon. gentlemen opposite should follow in the line of my hon. friend and make that same Act more practical and workable. I ask, have the temperance organisations throughout Canada one line and one measure to apply to the Mackenzie Administration, and another line and another measure to apply to the Macdonald Administration? Let the temperance organisations answer as they see fit. I ask the temperance men in this House, on either side, to do as the temperance men did in 1877, and insist that the defects in this Act and the obstacles to its effective operation, which experience has shown to exist, shall be removed by the only power that can remove them, and that is the Government of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the vote is taken on this question I have a word or two to say. I think I might congratulate the temperance people of the Dominion on this new access of zeal which has been to-day demonstrated on the opposite side of the House in favor of the Canada Temperance Act generally. I hope this is not an evanescent feeling that will rapidly pass away, but that it has come to stay.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It came ten years ago as far as we are concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. Much has been said about the Canada Temperance Act having been put on the Statute-book by the Mackenzie Administration, and about the honor which is due to an Administration for having done so. So far as that is concerned, I am quite free to give it, and to let it rest there. This fact, however, remains, that that Administration did put a certain Act upon the Statute-book; that was the Canada Temperance Act about as it stands to-day. That Administration was a wise one in the opinion of its own friends; it had carefully and thoroughly studied the matter; no one who supported that Administration then, or who supports that party now, will deny that it understood the province of making law and the province of enforcing much of law just as well then as the country understands it now; and yet that Act was put on the Statute-book with the very defects in it that these hon. gentlemen to-day point out. And when that Act was put on the Statute-book there was not a single suggestion of the position that the Dominion Government as a Government was obliged to carry out that law in its entirety in the different Provinces. Some of my hon. friends say that it is the duty of the Dominion Government to carry out this law. Well, if they look back a little while, they will remember that when the law of 1883 was being passed, some of the temperance people, I think I myself was one of them, tried to get a clause placed in that Act which would make it im-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

perative on the Dominion Government to carry out the law; we were successful in getting the Government to insert such a clause; and machinery as free from partisanship as was possible to be devised, was provided in that Act for the carrying out of the Canada Temperance Act. And yet from the very moment it was introduced into this House until the time when it was hounded out of existence by legal decisions, from the first moment to the last, there was not an hon. gentleman on that side of the House who did not howl against that clause as much as against any other clause of that Bill.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, they did not.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) says there ought to be a uniformity in the Canada Temperance Act. There ought to be, especially in a certain respect. An Act which is intended to be adopted by any municipality in the Dominion, ought to be interpreted in the same way by every municipality the wide Dominion through. There is one method by which this Act can be adopted, and that is the same for Ontario, for Quebec and for the Maritime Provinces. That is the uniformity that it possesses; but when that law is adopted, it is the duty of the Provinces to carry it out. And I can state to the hon. member for Bothwell that a lawyer equally as high as he, one as strong in his allegiance to the party opposite as he, and a man who stands before the country with less probability of political exigencies about him than the hon. member for Bothwell—that is, Mr. McLaren, a Q. C. of undoubted reputation—has made it his express duty to go with a deputation from the Dominion Alliance to Mr. Mowat, and has placed himself on record before that Government and the country at large, as being of opinion that it is not the duty of the Dominion Government, but the duty of the Provincial Government to enforce the law. Now, what has happened in the past? There has been one policy ever since I have had anything to do with temperance organisations in regard to legal temperance, it has been the policy to place it on a non-partisan basis. It has been the design, steadily observed from the very first, to carry on everything in the way of legal temperance, with the support of both parties, and without putting one party against the other. I think there is no gentleman in this House who will dispute that that has been the policy of the Alliance from the first hour of the Alliance's birth until to-day. It has been declared there: Do not let us put party against party, do not let us use this question as a football for parties to play with. Let us rather endeavor to gather the best sentiments of each party on this question and bind them together so as to get exactly what is needed. Is there any doubt that this has been the basis on which the Dominion Alliance has always acted? Take the resolutions of that body year after year. Take the action predicated upon them in this House by gentlemen on each side, fairly representing each party, as shown in the measures laid before Parliament which seemed to them best suited to carry out the object of the Alliance. That object has hitherto always had a leading place in every temperance measure brought before this House. But what do we find here to-day? We find an hon. gentleman, who has not, as far as I know, attended the meetings of the Alliance, who has not been very active in furthering the aim of that great temperance organisation; he has not been noted, as far as I am aware, for superabundance of temperance zeal, but we find that, without deigning to ask the opinion of the members of this House, who are strong supporters of the cause of temperance, as to what is the best plan to take, without having even consulted the two hon. members, the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) and the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), who stand as the mouthpiece of the Alliance, which is the mouthpiece of the best temperance sentiments of the country, without even

taking them in his confidence, he proposes this measure in a way calculated to obtain for it the least support. On the motion of the Government to go into Supply, my hon. friend moves an amendment; he moves that that motion be defeated and his taken up in its place. In other words, he proposes that he shall dictate to the Government what business the House will consider. Well, if that is not a motion of want of confidence, my hon. friend knows well it is as near a motion of want of confidence as can be brought and is often treated as such. Is that the way to go steadily, calmly and earnestly to work to get the best expression of the temperance sentiment of the House? I say it is not. I say it is a transparent method to raise a political cry, and the hon. gentlemen who followed the hon. member for Bothwell argued, as from a brief, against the Government, thus showing that what the hon. gentleman intended by his amendment was an indictment of the Government and of the hon. gentlemen who follow the Government, and an endeavor to place them in the wrong in the country at large. I used to be frightened occasionally at that kind of pettifoggery, but I am not frightened any longer. I intend to do what I consider best in the matter, and will leave the country to judge of my action, as it has judged of my actions in the past. I am not afraid of my record. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) tried to throw odium on the Government because of the Order in Council that they passed. The Ontario branch of the Alliance wished what? They wished to have the fines disposed of in a certain way. They put their petition before the Government; there were other petitions and representations before the Government on the same subject, and the Government, on considering the whole matter, passed an Order in Council which placed the fund on its proper basis. It is the county and it is the city that has to do with the law and that puts it in force. It is the county and the city which must bear the onus of carrying out the law. It is the municipality which alone has power to bring the law into and take it out of force. It is they who receive the funds which arise from the enforcement of the law, according to the Government's decision, and which are to be applied in order to carry out the law. That was the proper principle, and my hon. friends must be aware that although gentlemen in Ontario may have wanted that money to be placed in the hands of the Provincial Government, there were gentlemen, just as strong and good temperance men, in other Provinces, who did not want the money to go into the hands of the Provincial Legislatures, but to remain in the hands of the municipal authorities, who alone have full control over the operation of the law. Under all these circumstances, I intend to vote against the amendment of the hon. gentleman. When the Bill which is to be proposed, when the measure which is to be brought before the House as an outcome of the recognized sentiments of the country, is laid before us, you will find just where I stand upon it; but as to this amendment, brought in as it has been, contravening the policy of the temperance men of this country, the policy which they have followed for years past, and made with a motive apparent to any one who studies out its object, I shall oppose it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Whether the hon. gentleman had good grounds for charging that my hon. friend for Bothwell and those acting with him were prompted by a new access of zeal for temperance or not, is a question which can be fairly debated. I must say that since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, I have always seen my hon. friend moving, speaking, and working in the one direction as regards temperance; but whether that charge can be brought against my hon. friend and his supporters or not, it is perfectly apparent that the charge cannot be made against the hon. Minister of Marine, that he has got any new zeal in the temperance cause.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not need any.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If any charge were made, it would be rather that he has fallen from his former position and become a backslider. Not many years ago I heard the hon. gentleman lecture the Government which he supported, and supporting the Opposition to which he was opposed on main political grounds, for not taking action in the temperance question, which, he said, was one so important that every individual member should make it the one prominent question and the test of his political allegiance. All other questions, he said, should sink into insignificance, and this moral temperance question was the one they should stand by. He was prepared to mould his political life on those principles, and to sink all other questions in order that he might promote the temperance cause. He contended then with great force and volubility that it was the duty of the Government to take steps to carry out the temperance legislation on the Statute-book, and that if they could not do so, they overlooked their duty. He spoke for hours in that strain, and cited authorities home and abroad, to prove that such was the duty of the Government; and when he was asked to accept a seat in the Government, it was his duty, if he believed in the principles he had taught for years, to say: yes, I agree with you on general principles, but unless you are prepared to accept the principles I lay down on this great moral question, which is above all others, I cannot join you. He did not do that, but he swallowed his temperance principles in order to take a seat on the Treasury benches. What does the hon. gentleman say to-day when a proposition is made laying down the principle that it is the duty of the Government to amend and carry out the law of the land? He says: I will not vote for that, because, forsooth, it might be construed into, or the Government might say it was, a vote of want of confidence. The hon. gentleman knows his leader has not said so. It is perfectly competent for the leader of the Government now, as leaders of Governments have done in times past, if he believes in the principles embodied in the resolution, to say that he accepts it. I remember reading, a few years ago, when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was leader of the Government, that on an amendment being made to the motion to go into Supply, that the House should take up instead the boundary question, the proposition was accepted by the then leader of the Government. He did not treat it as necessarily a vote of want of confidence, because it was moved as an amendment to going into Supply, but when the principle was one of which he approved, he accepted it. Therefore, the attempt made by the former temperance advocate, now the Minister of Marine, to move his followers to vote against this amendment, on the ground of its being a motion of want of confidence, falls to the ground. I wonder if he agrees in the reason I understood to be advanced by the leader of the Government, viz, that he was not aware this Act required amendment at all. The leader of the Government said he had been looking at the returns of those imprisoned and the fines collected under the Act, and he failed to see from any of these evidences there were any defects in the Act at all. If the hon. the Minister of Marine does not understand from that, that the Government will not amend the Act but are perfectly satisfied with it, then his understanding falls far short of what it used to be. What means the recommendations made, year after year, by the Alliance? Is it all a farce? Are they merely playing with the question when they come to the House year after year, and say that the great experiment connected with prohibition, contained in the Scott Act, has not been successful, because that Act is defective in certain respects? The Minister of Marine says, you put that Act on the

Statute-book with all its defects. The hon. gentleman knows full well that, when the Act was put there by the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), it was put there as a tentative measure, he knows that at the time it embodied the best views and the best wishes of the temperance people of that day; he knows that it was fought by the opponents of the temperance cause from court to court, he knows that some courts held it to be unconstitutional and that it was years before the attempts made to set aside that Act in the courts of law were ended, because the law was declared by the Privy Council to be constitutional and right. Then, after that law was declared to be constitutional, the hon. gentleman's friends came into power. Its defects became apparent from year to year, and the Dominion Alliance, of which he has been a member, presented those defects to this House from time to time. He has seen private members struggling for years in the useless effort to try to amend those defects, and, sitting there as a supposed representative of the temperance people and as their supposed mouth-piece in the Government, he has been silent and has never pretended to say: We will settle this matter, we will amend these defects, we will put an end to this farce by the strong hand of the Government laying hold of these amendments and making them law. If the hon. gentleman was sincere in the statements he made some years ago in regard to the great importance of this matter, he would not have acted in this way; and he knows full well the course which ought to be followed when a junior member or any other member of a Government differs from his leaders on a matter of such importance. He is not prepared to take that course, but he is willing to let the temperance legislation slide in the future as it has slid in the past; and I am afraid that the attempts, the abortive attempts, which the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) is making in this matter from year to year will fail, and, if they do fail, upon the Minister of Marine and upon those who have claimed to be the leaders of the temperance party in this House let the responsibility fall. I could not understand the leader of the House when he said that, because this is a great moral question, the Government should shirk its responsibility in relation to it. Have not the Government a right to deal with great moral questions? Why, if there was anything which the Minister of Marine threshed out in this House, it was the contention that, because this was a moral question, the Government were bound to take it up. Because it was a moral question, because great moral truths were involved, the party which alone had the power to carry it into effect, was the party to take hold of it. The hon. gentleman has fallen from grace. He says now that he will not be a party to what he calls pettifoggery legislation. In the first place, coming from a member of the Government especially, that was unparliamentary language, and he should have withdrawn it; but I want to know on what ground he dares to charge that the hon. member who moved this amendment was not sincere. Was he not one of those who were advisers of His Excellency as members of the Government, who put this law on the Statute-book, and has he not spoken here every year in favor of every amendment which has been proposed to improve that Act? Has there been any occasion on which he has not recorded his vote in favor of what are popularly called temperance measures, and in the face of all that, the hon. gentleman who has turned his coat says, I will not follow you, because I do not believe your motives are right. Why, Mr. Speaker, he is the last man in this House who should talk about motives. He is one who was once the apostle of temperance, and now is—I was going to say, if it were parliamentary to do so—its apostate.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not my intention to discuss whether it is expedient to introduce amendments to the Scott Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Act or not. I interrupted the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), when he said that crime had not increased in Scott Act counties, and that figures would prove it. I said it was not so, that I knew that crime had increased in the county I represent. I understand that, when I was absent, the member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) quoted statistics to show that crime had not increased in the county of Lanark. I was not here at the time, and, of course, did not hear his remarks, but I state plainly and openly that it is known to my constituency, and known to that section of the country, that crime has increased. I do not know what the returns are under the Criminal Statistics Act, but I do know that the gaol of the town in which I live is full. I know that trials before the magistrate have increased to an extent never before known in the constituency; I know that trials are continuously taking place from week to week; I know that parties are brought up, some of whom are convicted and some not, for infringements of the Scott Act; but what I state openly is that crimes of other kinds, offences against morality, and against the law, and against everything that is good in the community—perjury, divisions amongst people who ought to be friendly—are greatly on the increase. I consider the present time inexpedient for the discussion of the question whether it is proper that amendments should be made to the Scott Act or not, or whether it is necessary that a prohibitory law should be enforced or not. My hon. friend the member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) intends to introduce a Bill to make the Scott Act more effective if possible, and I shall take an opportunity, when that comes up, to speak as to the expediency of a prohibitory liquor law, and as to whether the Scott Act, as now in force, tends to the morality of the community, or is better for the community in which it is in force.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mills (Bothwell):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Guay,	Perry,
Barron,	Hale,	Préfontaine,
Beausoleil,	Holton,	Purcell,
Bernier,	Iunes,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Jones (Halifax),	Robertson,
Bowman,	Kirk,	Rowand,
Brien,	Landerkin,	Ste. Marie,
Burdett,	Lang,	Scriver,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Langelier (Montm'cy),	Semple,
Casey,	Laurier,	Somerville,
Caagrain,	Livingston,	Sutherland,
Davies,	Lovitt,	Trow,
Doyon,	Macdonald (Huron),	Turcot,
Edgar,	Mackenzie,	Watson,
Eisenhauer,	McIntyre,	Weldon (St John),
Ellis,	McMillan (Huron),	Wilson (Elgin),
Fisher,	Mills (Bothwell),	Wright, and
Geoffrion,	Mitchell,	Yco.—57.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Ferguson (Renfrew),	Mara,
Audet,	Ferguson (Welland),	Masson,
Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Mills (Annapolis),
Baird,	Freeman,	Montague,
Bergeron,	Girouard,	O'Brien,
Bowell,	Godbout,	Patterson (Essex),
Boyle,	Gordon,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Brown,	Guilbault,	Perley (Ottawa),
Bryson,	Guillet,	Pope,
Cameron,	Haggart,	Porter,
Carling,	Hall,	Prior,
Carpenter,	Henderson,	Putnam,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Hesson,	Reid,
Chapleau,	Hickey,	Robillard,
Chisholm,	Hudspeth,	Ross,
Chouinard,	Jamieson,	Royal,
Cimon,	Joncas,	Rykert,
Cochrane,	Jones (Digby),	Scarth,
Cockburn,	Kenny,	Shanly,
Colby,	Kirkpatrick,	Small,

Oostigan, Coughlin, Coulombe, Couture, Curran, Daly, Daoust, Davis, Dawson, Denison, Desaulniers, Desjardins, Dessaint, Dickinson, Dupont, Ferguson (Leeds & G.),	Labrosse, Landry, Langevin (Sir Hector), Laurie, Macdonald (Sir John), Macdowall, McGulla, McDonald (Victoria), McDougald (Picou), McDougall (O. Breton), McKee, McKeen, McLellan, McMillan (Vaudreuil), McNeill, Madill,	Smith (Ontario), Temple, Thérien, Thompson, Tupper (Sir Charles), Tyrwhitt, Wallace, Ward, Weldon (Albert), White (Gariwell), White (Renfrew), Wilmot, Wilson (Argenteuil), Wilson (Lennox), Wood (Brockville), and Wood (Westm'd).—109.
--	--	---

Amendment negatived.

Mr. JONCAS. The hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Fiset) has not voted.

Mr. Fiset. I paired with the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Grandbois).

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I only propose to take a single vote, after which the Committee will rise, as I believe it is not intended that the House should meet to-night.

Governor General's Secretary's Office..... \$9,750

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a little increase here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are four statutory increases.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance whether he proposes to pursue the same practice that we have heretofore pursued, that is to say, to take the separate estimates up in due rotation, unless he gives notice the day before that he intends to depart from it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; the practice of last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it is understood that we take them up in rotation, and if for any reason you want to change, you will give us notice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 7th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that I have received notification of a vacancy in the representation of the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Hastings, by the decease of Alexander Robertson, Esq., and I have issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 25) to confirm the charter of incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 26) to confirm a certain Agreement made between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Canada Southern Railway Company, and the London and Port Stanley Railway Company, and a certain Agreement made between the London and South-Eastern Railway Company and the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

HORSE BREEDING IN CANADA.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether the pamphlet intitled "Horse Breeding in Canada," has been translated into French, printed and distributed in like numerical proportion with the English edition to members of this House who take an interest in the subject. If not, is it the intention of the Government to cause the same to be so distributed, and when?

Mr. CARLING. The pamphlet entitled "Horse Breeding in Canada," has been translated, and I expect it will be distributed to members in a few days.

MILITARY BOOKS.

Mr. AMYOT (Translation) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to publish a French edition of the following official books:—1. The Field exercises now in force; 2. The Musketry instructions now in force; 3. The Regulations and Orders for the Militia of Canada, 1857. And when shall such French editions be published and distributed for the use of the Force?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (Translation). The printing of the French translation of the drill hand-book, School, and the by-laws and orders for the use of the Canada militia, was begun in 1881. Owing to a misunderstanding between the translator and the Department, it was discontinued for a time. Since then a new edition of these works has appeared in England, and the Department has made arrangements to have a translation done in the course of the present year.

WATER FOR THE QUEBEC DRILL SHED.

Mr. AMYOT (Translation) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to supply the drill shed at Quebec with the water necessary for the use of officers and men and for the improvement of the ground which serves as a paving; and will this water be supplied in time to enable the several volunteer corps to perform the yearly drill which they are now empowered to make?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (Translation). The intention of the Government is to supply the drill shed with the water necessary for the use of officers and men and for the improvement of the ground which serves as paving. But as the Government have not yet determined on the establishment of a corps of marines, their yearly drill cannot be held in those waters.

VETERANS OF 1837.

Mr. PURCELL asked, Whether the Government have reconsidered their objections to granting pensions to the veterans who served the Crown in 1837, and whether they intend to make provision therefor in the Estimates for the present Session?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not the intention of the Government to make provision in the Estimates for the veterans who served the Crown in 1837.

POST OFFICE AT EIGHT ISLAND LAKE, N.S.

Mr. KIRK asked, Has a post office been established at Eight Island Lake, in the county of Guysborough, N.S., agreeably to the request of the people of that district? If not, is it the intention of the Government to establish one? If so, when?

Mr. MoLELAN. Instructions have been given to establish that office.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY SECTIONS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the total amount claimed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for work done, or required to be done by them on the several sections of the Canadian Pacific Railway constructed by Government in British Columbia, in order to bring the road up to the proper standard alleged to have been agreed on?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of the Minister of Railways, I may say that no amount was suggested.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In that claim

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

THE COLLECTION OF CRIMINAL LAWS.

Mr. RINFRET (for Mr. CHOQUETTE) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to furnish to members of this House who make application therefor, the collection of Criminal Laws?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is the intention that the volume in question shall be distributed in the way the statutes have ordinarily been distributed.

TIGNISH AND MIMINEGASH BREAKWATERS, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is the Government aware of the amount of damages done to the Tignish and Miminegash Breakwaters, in Prince Edward Island, by the storms in the fall of 1887?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH P. E. I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is it the intention of the Government during the present Session to place a sum in the Estimates to meet the sum of \$5,000,000, or any part thereof, as compensation to Prince Edward Island, for non-fulfilment of the Terms of Confederation on the part of the Government of Canada, with respect to continuous efficient steam communication with the mainland, as asked for in a Joint Address of both branches of the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, during the Session of 1884?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention of the Government.

ST. JOHN HARBOR.

Mr. ELLIS asked, Has Mr. H. F. Perley, of the Public Works Department, who was sent to St. John early in 1887 to confer with the Board of Trade of that city as to certain suggested improvements in the harbor there and along the harbor front, made a formal report upon the improvements proposed and upon the conferences which he held with the parties interested?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Perley has not yet been in a position to make a formal report.

DUTIES ON LOGS.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, What amount of duty has been collected during the past year up to 1st January last, upon pine and spruce logs, shingle bolts, cedar and pine, and cedar logs, in the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick respectively?

Mr. BOWELL. The amount of duties collected and the articles embraced in the question of the hon. member for St. John are as follows: From Ontario, pine logs, \$10,643.82; spruce logs, \$3; shingle bolts, \$88.50. From Quebec there was no export duty collected on pine logs; on spruce logs, \$18,397.88; no duty upon shingle bolts. New Brunswick, no duty on pine logs; \$8 on spruce logs, and \$272 on shingle bolts. There was no duty collected on cedar logs.

THE LOBSTER INDUSTRY.

Mr. FLYNN moved for:

Report or reports of the Commissioners, or any member thereof, appointed to enquire into the condition of the lobster industry of the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. FOSTER. The documents asked for by this motion are already printed and are being bound. They will be laid on the Table of the House in a few days. Under the circumstances the hon. gentleman might as well withdraw his motion.

Mr. FLYNN. In view of this statement, I consent.

Mr. KIRK. I hope, however, there will be no delay in laying those reports on the Table. This matter is of vital importance to many thousands of people in the Maritime Provinces, and they are very anxious to know upon what grounds and upon what reasons the Government have acted for restricting the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces—a large proportion of whom are engaged in the lobster fishery industry—to two months or six weeks in order to enable them to procure food for the whole year. For that reason I sincerely hope we will not be left without those reports for any length of time.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt the speech of the hon. gentleman will facilitate the bringing down of those reports much more speedily than would otherwise be the case.

Motion withdrawn.

COMMERCIAL INTERCOURSE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In accordance with the understanding arrived at yesterday across the floor regarding this resolution (on largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse between the Dominion of Canada and the United States), I move that this resolution, which was the First Order of the Day for to-day, be made the First Order for Wednesday, the 14th instant, after Questions. I think that will bring it up in due form.

Motion agreed to.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LAWDOWN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, a copy of the Fishery Treaty between Great Britain and the United States, in relation to the Fisheries of Canada and Newfoundland, signed at Washington, on the fifteenth day of February, 1888; and the Protocols of the various conferences, together with the Protocols from the British plenipotentiaries offering to make a temporary arrangement for a period not exceeding two years in order to afford a *modus vivendi* pend-

ing the ratification of the Treaty, and the protocol of the American plenipotentiaries expressing their satisfaction with the *modus vivendi* communicated by the British plenipotentiaries.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 5th March, 1888.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be able to inform the House that I have obtained from Sir Lionel West and from Mr. Bayard their consent to lay upon the Table of the House the proposals made by the British plenipotentiaries, and the reply of the United States plenipotentiaries to those proposals, in regard to greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the two countries. These are now being printed and will be placed immediately in the hands of every member. I may, perhaps, be permitted to read this proposal and the answer. The following is the proposal from the British plenipotentiaries:

"That with the view of removing all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the Fishery Articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of a mutual arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada and Newfoundland."

The answer to that proposal is in the following terms:—

"While continuing their proposal heretofore submitted—on the 30th ultimo,—and fully sharing the desire of Her Britannic Majesty's plenipotentiaries to remove all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, the American plenipotentiaries are constrained, after careful consideration, to decline to ask from the President authority requisite to consider the proposal conveyed to them on the 3rd instant, as a means to the desired end,—because the greater freedom of commercial intercourse so proposed would necessitate an adjustment of the present tariff of the United States by Congressional action, which adjustment the American plenipotentiaries consider to be manifestly impracticable of accomplishment through the medium of a treaty under the circumstances now existing.

"Nor could the American plenipotentiaries admit that such a mutual arrangement as is proposed by Her Britannic Majesty's plenipotentiaries could be accepted as constituting a suitable basis of negotiation concerning the rights and privileges claimed for American fishing vessels. It still appears to the American plenipotentiaries to be possible to find an adjustment of differences by agreeing on an interpretation or modification of the Treaty of 1818, which will be honorable to both parties and remove the present causes of complaint, to which end they are now—as they have been from the beginning of this conference—ready to devote themselves."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. May I enquire of the Minister of Finance whether those comprise all the papers and details that he is able to bring down?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. These papers comprise everything regarding the trade relations between the two countries, or regarding any proposal of the nature of a reciprocal or tariff arrangement; and they comprise all the papers which it is in my power to lay on the Table of the House.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman, the other day, spoke of a lengthy argument which he submitted to the Commission in support of the proposition laid before them, and he said he hoped to be able to lay that argument before the House together with the proposition.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman did, I understood him to say, present a lengthy argument in support of the proposition. He certainly said that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; what I stated to the House was that it was a question whether the protocols should contain the proposals and counter-proposals, or the proposals

and the replies of the other side, and, in addition, the lengthy arguments on various points that were submitted to the conference. I had always supposed that even a formal protocol would contain the proposals and counter-proposals, but it was a question whether those papers which were submitted by both sides, embodying lengthy arguments on various questions, would also form part of it. But I did not state that I expected to lay those papers on the Table, because it had been decided after I left Washington that the papers should include merely the formal protocols, which were considered by the American and British Plenipotentiaries still remaining in Washington to be simply the dates of meeting and adjournment, contrary to what I understood the formal protocols would contain. I assumed that they would contain, at all events, the proposals and the answers of both sides.

Mr. MITCHELL. I presume that in addition to that written protocol, some considerable discussion must have arisen between the hon. commissioner and the gentlemen representing the American interests on that occasion; and it would be very satisfactory—because these protocols contain practically very little—if the hon. commissioner felt himself at liberty to inform the House what he meant by those trade relations—whether he meant trade in natural products or whether he included certain classes of manufactured articles. That is a point which, if he is at liberty to tell it, I would very much like to be informed upon, in view of the discussion which is to come up on Wednesday next. Of course I do not wish him to say or do anything that will embarrass the fishery question, but I think the country would very much like to know whether, in the proposition the hon. gentleman made, there was anything more than is described in general terms in the papers as a mutual arrangement for promoting greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada. That, of course, is a very vague expression; it may mean a great deal or it may mean very little; and if he is at liberty to tell us the exact details of what he proposed to cover by these terms, I think the country would feel relieved.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will see, if he looks at those terms, that there is nothing vague about them. The proposal was a bald proposal to meet the settlement of the existing difficulties between the two countries by an arrangement for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the two countries. That proposal was made in the most broad and general terms, and the hon. gentleman will see that it was then open to the United States plenipotentiaries to say, "Well, we will discuss that question with you; what greater freedom do you ask in order to remove those difficulties?" But we never reached the point as to the extent to which that freedom of commercial intercourse would go, because we were met by a categorical refusal on the part of the United States plenipotentiaries to entertain the question of trade arrangements at all, and for the reason, which they assigned, that both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, in Congress, had determined that they would not permit any treaty arrangement with any other country which should interfere with the uncontrolled power of Congress to deal from day to day with the tariff. So that my hon. friend will see that instead of our putting any specific proposal before the United States commissioners, we placed the question before them in the broadest terms, so that if they were willing to entertain it, however extended or however narrow, we could then discuss it. But we were met, as he will observe, by a categorical refusal on the part of the United States commissioners to entertain the question at all—not because they were indisposed to take up the question, but because it would be impracticable to deal with it in that way owing to the attitude of Congress. And the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), who asks

whether there were lengthy discussions, will, I think, find the answer in the statement I have laid before the House, purporting to have been made by President Angell of Michigan University, one of the United States plenipotentiaries, in which he declared that a great deal of time was consumed by the determined efforts of Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries to obtain reciprocal trade arrangements, and that the United States plenipotentiaries told them over and over again that it was utterly impossible for them to deal with the question in that way.

Mr. MITCHELL. The very statement which the hon. gentleman has made shows that what I have all along suspected is very likely to have been the case. He admits that President Angell made the statement that a very large amount of time had been taken up by the determined efforts of the Canadian commissioners to get a trade arrangement. I never had a doubt that the hon. gentleman would use every means at his disposal to induce the American commissioners to consent to it; but when he was met by the bald refusal at the outset to deal with it, on the ground that the commissioners had no power to deal with that question, but only the Congress of the United States, I cannot conceive how those continued negotiations and that pressure of arguments on the part of the hon. gentleman could have been kept up and maintained. That is the point. I value the abilities and efforts of my hon. friend opposite, very much more than he might suppose, by the bald statement he has laid before this House, and I fail to see how every effort could be used, because he could not be continually repeating what I call a very bald demand for a mutual arrangement for promoting greater freedom of commercial intercourse; and I cannot conceive that days and days would be taken up by a repetition of that bald statement. I could quite understand the hon. gentleman stating at considerable length and in detail the proposals that Canada was prepared to make. I do not want to embarrass the hon. gentleman, but I think it is due to this House and to the country that if such arguments were used, whether they are contained in the protocols or not, we should be informed whether the proposals were confined to natural productions, or whether they extended to the larger and more desirable arrangement of opening up reciprocal markets for the manufactures of both countries. That is what I want to get at if we can. I do not know that we will be able, as perhaps the hon. gentleman is not at liberty to tell us at this stage, but I would like to know what is the extent of these proposed trade arrangements, and what were the offers made. They may not be contained in the protocol; but if the hon. gentleman, in his capacity as commissioner, made specific offers, I should think we are entitled to know what these offers were.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman whetted our curiosity very much on Monday by referring to the minute statements of which he has spoken. In the first place, he said there were formal proposals and counter proposals made on both sides; and in the second place, there were elaborate arguments sustaining the views on both sides.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no question now before the House and no discussion can go on.

Mr. CASEY. There is just as much question as there has been for the last few minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER. There has been simply explanations.

Mr. CASEY. I will then move that the House adjourn, and I make this motion simply for the purpose of reading what the hon. gentleman said on Monday in regard to this question. There were proposals in the rough, and there were formal proposals in which these rough proposals were, after some discussion, boiled down, and then there were elaborate

papers and arguments, as the hon. gentleman has said, sustaining the views on both sides. After having been given this peep into the penetralia of the Commission Chamber, we are naturally curious to hear what these elaborate papers and arguments were, and whether they contain specific proposals or not. It is quite impossible to suppose that a discussion could have taken place without specific proposals having been submitted on either side; and before we can intelligently discuss the matter here, we ought to know what our representative proposed. I beg leave to withdraw the motion for the adjournment of the House.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Office of the Receiver General, Halifax. \$10,000

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no specific reduction in this. The item is simply as large as was the expenditure.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Is not the work on the Halifax branch larger than on any other branch in the Dominion? I think the receipts and payments are very much larger in that branch, and the Assistant Receiver-General there is hardly paid as well for his services as those in other places. The hon. gentleman should remember that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No doubt that is true, but I have taken the same amount as that which was expended last year. It is not proposed to increase the amount.

Auditor and Assistant Receiver-General, Winnipeg. \$3,800

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here is a considerable increase.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At Winnipeg, owing to a readjustment of the salaries and the increased cost of management, a larger amount is required than was asked last year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I could not exactly catch what the hon. gentleman said as to the necessity for the increase, but I understood he said there was more work. In what way was there more work? There is not, I should suppose, any very large increase of business, and the salaries at Winnipeg were made large some years ago in consideration of the alleged additional expense of living.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think there was an additional officer required at Winnipeg.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does that come about? And who is the additional officer?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will make a memorandum and give the hon. gentleman the information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope we will be given the information when we next take up Supply, because it is not convenient to wait for concurrence, in view of the way in which concurrence is generally rushed through.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No; I will give it at the next sitting.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has set a very excellent example in bringing down his Estimates earlier than any of his predecessors did—as early, I believe, as I did myself. I hope he will also follow my example by giving a reasonable time for the consideration of the items in concurrence. I do not think that our habit, which has prevailed for some years back, of rushing through concurrence, sometimes at a single sitting, is either decorous in itself or right for the House to indulge in, and I trust

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

that the hon. Minister will make a note of that. I understand that, when next we go into Supply, he will give the information with reference to this particular item?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. On that understanding, I will let it go. I see that in the country savings banks in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and British Columbia, you are making a reduction of \$1,000. Are any of these offices shut up?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are transferring, as far as we have the opportunity, the savings banks under the control of the Finance Department, to the Post Office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand that the Minister intends to completely abrogate the savings banks under the control of the Finance Department?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. As far as we find it practicable. Of course, in some cases, it is not practicable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How far does the hon. gentleman think that can be done?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are some cases in which it cannot be done. In some cases a postmaster may be a very good postmaster, but he may not be adapted for the management of a savings bank. As far as it is practicable, it is our policy to dispense with savings banks in connection with the Finance Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I dare say that will work well. At all events, it will be better to have these under one head. About how much has the hon. gentleman in the country savings banks, apart from the amount at the credit of the Receiver General?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We agreed to make some alterations and restrictions in regard to deposits in the Dominion savings banks, and whether that has effected it or not, I do not know, but there has been a decrease. We have received \$724,583.35 less from the 1st July to the 29th February, than in the corresponding period of the previous year. There is an increase in the receipts of the Post Office savings banks in that period amounting to \$539,331.14, leaving a net decrease of \$185,252.21 in that period.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the Minister of Finance what percentage of the moneys received in the saving banks in these Provinces is taken to pay these charges. I see that he is asking for \$18,000 to pay the cost of management in these three Provinces. What is the amount of money received in the saving banks in these Provinces?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman can hardly expect me to answer that question across the floor, but the Public Accounts will give the information.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The sum is very considerable, and I think the hon. gentleman should give the information to the House.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If I had known that any question of the kind would have been asked, I would have been ready to give the information.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to have some information in reference to the commission on the payment of interest on public debt.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will be glad to find that there is a decrease in that of \$534.09. That arises from the fact that the commission on the interest payable in England has decreased with the diminution of our funded debt there.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is a commission which we pay to our agents there?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. To whom is it paid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is paid to the financial agents.

Mr. MITCHELL. There are no other agents now, are there?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Sir John Rose is not one, is he?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, he is not.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, I am glad to hear that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Last year I asked the hon. gentleman as to what was intended to be done with that large amount of sinking fund which has accumulated under the old 5 per cent. loan, and he told me that the matter was under negotiation. As I understand, that is still in our books. We have not written it off on both sides of our account as yet?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman what he proposes to do about that, and whether the amount of interest on that continues to be reinvested in the purchase of our various securities?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is so up to the present time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister will remember that I expressed, across the House, the opinion which in former times, I expressed to the agents, that I thought that sum ought to be completely written off, and our sinking fund diminished to that extent. It is not a profitable employment of our funds, and has the effect of raising the prices of our own bonds when this large sum is devoted to the purchase of our own securities. As I understand, we have the option of purchasing any securities under par.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are obliged to purchase our own securities unless they are above par. The obligation to purchase our own securities ceases when they are above par. That is the present arrangement.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What, then, becomes of the money?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Either we must go on and invest in our own securities, which is a very unprofitable business at present when they are at the high premium they are, or the Government would have to become speculators in stocks, neither of which course is desirable; but if the hon. gentleman will defer that question, I propose to raise it in my financial statement, when I will discuss it fully.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By the way, I presume there has been some correspondence on the subject with our financial agent. Will the hon. gentleman be able to bring that down?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will look at it and see how far it can be submitted. I think I will be able to state the result, at all events.

Printing of Dominion Notes..... \$10,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is rather an expensive item.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that the amount asked for in previous years has always been too small. In 1885-6, the expense was \$61,503.71; in 1886-7 it was

\$37,556.58; so it will be seen a larger sum is absolutely necessary in order to cover the expense.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who does that printing at the present time?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is done by the contractors, Burland & Co., I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman give me, or give the House, a statement showing about what quantity of notes of the several denominations will be obtained with this \$40,000? The question, I may tell him, has been raised, and he probably has seen some discussion about it in the papers, as to whether Messrs. Burland & Co. have not been receiving a very much larger sum than the work could be done for by other parties who are supposed to be well qualified. That is a point upon which, perhaps, in another place, we may have some discussion; but, at any rate, the hon. gentleman can tell us, I suppose, about what quantity of notes, and in what denominations, an expense of \$40,000 might represent.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, I will get that information.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the contract is from year to year, or for a term of years?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is a contract for a term of years.

Mr. DAVIES. When will that contract expire?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it has about four years to run; but I am speaking from memory.

Mr. DAVIES. Does it include this last year?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was made previously, I think. They have had the contract for a long time. I think a new contract was entered into about two years ago; but I will get the information. I think it has something like four years more to run.

Office of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada ... \$25,462 50

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say that there are here ten statutory increases of \$50, making \$500; one at \$25, and two at \$30. We have effected a reduction of \$1,050 in differences between the salaries of new and old appointments; and as there is an increase of \$885, the net decrease is \$165.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, who is now Clerk of the Crown in Chancery? I understood that the gentleman who held that office had last year taken some other appointment, and that another party had been appointed. Is that so?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; Mr. St. Onge Chapeau.

Mr. MILLS. Is that the gentleman who was formerly in the Public Works Department?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. I understood the hon. gentleman had dismissed him from the Public Works Department, for some reason. Was that dismissal founded upon some misapprehension? Was Mr. Chapeau not an offender, as the Government supposed? and what reasons had the Government, after having dismissed him from one office, for appointing him to another of still greater importance?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not aware he was dismissed.

Mr. MILLS. Well, Sir, there was a statement given to the public by the Government organs, if I remember
Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

rightly, by members of the Government themselves. I think the Finance Minister will be able to answer that question. I think, if I remember rightly, that there were certain charges made—that he had revealed tenders deposited with the Minister of Railways—that information which it was necessary should be kept secret, was disclosed, and was disclosed for a consideration; and that upon that information the Government had dismissed this individual. Is that so or not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I answered that question already.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; I said the gentleman was not dismissed.

Mr. MILLS. Then I understand the hon. gentleman is not dealing candidly with the House, for if that individual was not dismissed, did not the Government insist upon his tendering his resignation? Was he not given a choice between resigning and being dismissed by the Administration?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will give notice of that question, we will bring down the information.

Mr. MILLS. I think I am not called upon to give notice. We are discussing the public expenditure; we have a right to know how the Government are dealing with the funds of which they are the trustees on behalf of the country. We have a right to know whether the Government are entrusting important public functions to parties whom they themselves have besmirched; and if there has been wrong done them, I think the House is entitled to know what the wrong was. Certainly, I think I am entitled to ask for information on this subject. If there is one thing which concerns the representatives of the people in Parliament, I think it is the expenditure of the public money. Their control over the expenditure of the country is even more ancient than their control over the legislation of the country. This is the special function of those who represent the people, and we are entitled to know who the Government has appointed to office. We know that, last year, in this very office, they proposed to increase the salary of a man who disregarded the law, who disregarded his solemn obligations, and wronged at least eighty members on this side of the House. Now, we understand that another official has been appointed to whom the Government themselves gave the choice between resigning and being dismissed. I say that full information on that subject ought to be given to the House, and any member is entitled to ask for it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, Mr. Chairman, we must have a Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. He draws the same salary this year as he did last year. The hon. gentleman says that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the present occupant of that office, was dismissed from another office. I say he was not dismissed; I say that he resigned. I say that afterwards he was appointed a sheriff of the North-West, and that Parliament has been voting him a salary—

Mr. MILLS. He was sent into exile.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—in the North-West, and that on the reorganisation of the administration of affairs in the North-West, he was legislated out of office, and was appointed Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. If the hon. gentleman has any charges to bring against that official, I think he ought to give notice, and the matter should be discussed. We have no objection to discuss it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I cannot agree with the doctrine laid down by the First Minister. No place is

more fitting than Committee of Supply to discuss charges made against any man who is in the public service. It has always been done, it is the clear right of every member to do it, and I myself must say that, remembering what occurred with respect to this gentleman, I cannot but regard his appointment as a most unfortunate one. There can be no doubt whatever that his resignation, or his permission to resign I should say, or his dismissal was for an offence against those rules which ought to dominate the Civil Service, and was very great. Nor can there be anything calculated more to demoralise the Civil Service, more to degrade the Civil Service, I will add, than the sight of a man who is known to have deliberately disregarded the obligations which ought to bind every member of the Civil Service, being promoted to a high office, over the heads of men who have sustained an unspotted record for a great many years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not at all disposed to object to the hon. gentleman bringing up the matter or speaking as he has just spoken, but I say in fairness to the officer that, after the remarks that have been made, the item should stand over; because that officer has rights, and we will regard those rights, and I am sure the hon. gentleman who has spoken will do so. We must in the meantime have a Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to issue writs, and he must have a salary.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I should like to know something more about this item. It was said at the time, that Mr. Chapleau was dismissed from the public service. If this was brought about by asking him to resign, I should like to know it. If after that had taken place, he was brought back and appointed to another office, we should know that also. Then I might ask, what has become of the late occupant of that office, Mr. Pope? Has he been dismissed, or, if not dismissed, has he been removed? It was considered by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House last year that his offence was sufficient to cause his removal from the office of Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and to forever remove him from the service of the country. I believe it is the duty of the Government and of this House to see that the officials attend to their duties and perform them faithfully, and not waver either to the right or left, but that in such an event the Government will order that their services be dispensed with. A decision should be arrived at as to the position occupied by the House towards this office. It is a very important one, for the dignity and privileges of the House are to some extent placed in the hands of that officer, and it is therefore important to know if this officer has committed a grievous offence against the Civil Service of which he was a member, and if the offence was so grievous that the Government asked him to resign. We think, we are morally certain, that such was the case, and now without any penance being shown on his part, he is placed in another position to which large privileges belong; and we would be violating the obligation we took at the beginning of this Parliament if we allowed an officer to be reinstated against whom charges were made, and in reference to which nothing has been said to palliate or deny. We would like to know about this matter. We feel we have a duty to perform; and if the officer acted unworthily on one occasion, it is probable that if another occasion presents itself he will repeat the offence, and perhaps in a worse form than before.

Department of Justice \$19,925

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In this department there are five statutory increases of \$50 each, and an amount of \$62.50 short estimated last year, which makes the amount \$312.50, and there is a decrease in the messengers of \$60, leaving a net increase of \$252.50.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has there not been a change in the *personnel*?

Mr. THOMPSON. Within the last two or three weeks a new Deputy Minister has been appointed. That is the only change.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the gentleman?

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Robert Sedgwick.

Mr. MITCHELL. One thing very flattering about this Department of Justice is, that when they want a really able and clever man they go to the Maritime Provinces for him. I am very pleased this course is followed, and I believe Mr. Sedgwick to be a very able and clever man.

Penitentiaries Branch \$6,150

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is an increase of \$400 to Mr. Moylan's salary, a statutory increase of \$50, and a new messenger at \$300; total increase, \$750.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is rather a heavy increase to make. Does not Mr. Moylan receive allowances in addition to his salary?

Mr. THOMPSON. No allowances except the ordinary travelling expenses, which are not sufficient, considering the amount of travelling he has to do, to make any important addition to his salary. His duties, as the hon. gentleman knows, are very important, and he has direct supervision over a number of wardens who receive a salary nearly as high as we now propose to give him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see the hon. gentleman makes his salary as large as that of a deputy head.

Mr. THOMPSON. He stands in relation to this work in the position of a deputy head.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To my mind we are appointing too many deputy heads; and although I do not object to paying high officers well, I think as the matter stands the practical multiplication, which I take this to be, of deputy heads is likely to lead to some inconvenience. They will not stop content, they will all be clamoring for higher salaries. I think, too, looking over these Estimates, that it is tolerably apparent that we pay pretty high allowances, more than the work is worth, for a great deal of the purely clerical work done, and I would rather see purely clerical work paid at its market value and the higher officers better paid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is very apt to take one-half of our advice and not the other. He is very apt to make the increases, but forgets to decrease the expenditure at the other end.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a libel.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It may be a libel under the ancient law, that the greater the truth the greater the libel.

Mr. MITCHELL. I cannot agree with my hon. friend that it is not in the public interest to appoint more deputy heads. When I had the honor of submitting a plan for the organisation of the Marine and Fisheries Department I recommended a deputy head for the Fisheries branch as well as for the Marine branch, but the proposal was pooh-poohed, and the department was considered too unimportant to have those officers. I am glad to find that, in these later days, the service has been remodelled in accordance with the report I then made. Moreover, when the right hon. First Minister was Minister of the Interior he created four different branches with four different deputy heads, some of whom were, I think, a little unnecessary, and the branches might have been a little amalgamated; but no doubt where there are different branches in one department, the performance of the duties of which is inconsistent with the performance of duties in another branch, it is desirable to separate the

branches under a main head, and therefore I would not object to the increase to the deputy head.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know as a matter of fact that Mr. Inspector Moylan is very constantly away, and I fancy but little of his time is spent in Ottawa. I see in this branch now there is practically but two officers, an accountant and a third-class clerk. And the Minister of Justice proposes to attach a messenger. That seems rather a surplussage. They would hardly want a messenger for dancing attendance on two or three gentlemen all the time, one would think.

Mr. THOMPSON. Ever since I have had charge of the department and for some years before there were three messengers; two of them under the head of Department of Justice, and one of them was paid out of contingencies of the Penitentiary branch. Although this appears to be an increase it is not an actual increase either of the staff or expenditure. The messenger is not exclusively at the disposal of the officials of the Penitentiary branch, but the three messengers are at the disposal of the department for all messages.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I don't observe any decrease in the items of contingencies for the Penitentiary branch, which was \$2,250, for 1888, and is also \$2,250 for 1889. It seems to me that if the hon. gentleman is taking \$300 which was formerly paid out of contingencies, he ought to decrease the contingency by that sum.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. Minister says that some time before he took possession of the department there were three or four messengers.

Mr. THOMPSON. Three.

Mr. MITCHELL. I see there is only two in the Department of Justice, and one in the Penitentiary branch. He now charges the three men to the Penitentiary branch.

Mr. THOMPSON. This messenger has been paid heretofore as contingencies of the Penitentiary branch. The three messengers continue to do duty for the whole department. Instead of paying one out of contingencies of the Penitentiary branch, we put it in the Estimates.

Department of Militia and Defence..... \$42,600

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are in this case thirteen statutory increases of \$50, and the difference between the salary of a first-class clerk from \$1,550 to \$1,400, that is \$150, leaving an increase of \$500.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to ask how it happens that the messengers in this department are paid so much more than in the Department of Justice? They are paid \$500, I see, in the Militia Department, and only \$300 in the Department of Justice.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. They may have been a much longer time there.

Mr. EDGAR. All of them?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think so; they are all very old messengers, and they are getting the maximum of what is allowed to messengers.

Department of Secretary of State \$31,037 50

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In this case there is promotion from second to first-class clerks, \$87.50. From third to second, \$100. Ten statutory increases at \$50—\$500. Three at \$25, making \$75; two at \$30, that is \$60, making in all \$822.50. There is less the difference in the messenger's salary, \$200, and in Mr. Morgan's salary from chief to first-class clerk, \$600, a decrease of \$800, leaving a net increase of \$22.50.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This can hardly pass without some explanation. I see that Mr. Morgan was Mr. MITCHELL.

chief clerk, and that he is apparently reduced to first-class clerk. For what reason has that been done? Some explanation ought to be given as to that, I think.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to that case I would state that there were certain irregularities reported upon by the Secretary of State to the Government connected with Mr. Morgan's performance of his duty. It was considered that those irregularities were not sufficient in their quality or amount to make it necessary to dismiss him, but we thought that those irregularities should be marked with the disapprobation of the Government, and so his position was reduced one step and with the necessary complement of reduction of salary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What were the irregularities?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The irregularities are contained in rather an elaborate correspondence. I cannot carry it in my memory sufficiently to venture on an explanation of it. If the papers are wanted they will be brought down.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery... \$22,620 82

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here are a large set of increases. We should have some explanation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In the Department of Printing and Stationery there are seven statutory increases of \$50, making \$350, and one at \$30, and one at \$15, making \$395 in all. There is an increase to the deputy of \$800; promotion of two clerks from third to second class, one \$100 and the other \$150, \$250. Promotion of one first-class clerk to chief clerk, \$300, making \$1,350 in all. New appointments: Three at \$300, one at \$500, one at \$800, one for eight months at \$1,400, and one at \$1,800, making in all \$6,678.82, less the difference between the late Mr. Robertson's salary and new appointment, \$50, and the late Mr. Mousseau's salary of \$1,262.50, the increase being \$5,365.82.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All this, no doubt, is connected with the new departure of doing our own printing, I suppose. Perhaps, if the hon. Minister can do so, it would be as convenient at this time as at any other, to tell us generally what this is likely to cost, and how it would compare with our contracts?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is a new branch of the department. There is a chief clerk at \$1,800—appointed under the Act for the establishment of a Bureau of Printing and Stationery—who will be Superintendent of Printing. A first-class clerk will be assistant at a yearly salary of \$1,400, and there will be two third-class clerks, one at \$800, who is a new officer; the other is an officer already in the department, the first will be a typewriter and a special correspondent for the Superintendent. In the accountant's branch, the chief clerk at \$1,800 is also appointed under the statute. That officer formerly occupied the position of first-class clerk, at a salary of \$1,500. I may inform the House that after the present incumbent, that office will be regulated by Order in Council; but it is proposed not to take away the rights of an officer who has been already twenty years in the service. The second-class clerk was already in the department; one of the two third-class clerks was before in the department, and appears as suppressed in the Queen's Printer's staff, the other is necessitated by the establishment of the Department of Printing. The House will observe that in the department forty-three officers were employed last year, and forty-one would be entitled to an increase of \$50 a year; but it will be seen that under this arrangement the yearly increase in the correspondence and registry branch, with twenty-six employes, is only \$22. That has been accomplished by transferring some of those officers to this new branch. The Printing and Stationery Department shows

an increase of about \$5,000. That is necessitated by the establishment of the new department, but the total increase in the whole department is not more than \$3,000, not counting the statutory increases.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. gentleman give us any idea about what will be the sum total which will be required for starting this printing establishment, and how the cost of it will compare with the expenditure under the old system?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The cost of the building will largely exceed my expectations. The officers at the head of the Department of Public Works thought that a building which would be suited for the work and would be a lasting building, would cost a good deal more than I anticipated. I do not believe I exaggerate when I say that even after the first year, counting the interest on the cost of the building and the material necessary for establishing the Printing Department, the expenditure will show a reduction calculated at \$20,000 a year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the Minister of Public Works tell us what he expects that building will cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say, but I will give all the information to the hon. gentleman a little later on.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We would like at this stage to have some general idea of what this new department is to cost. I observe there is to be a vote taken of \$65,000 for plant, of which about \$70,000 is a revote. The cost of the building I can form no idea of.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the building is completed, the whole cost, with heating apparatus, I think will be \$140,000 or \$150,000; but I do not wish to be bound to these as the exact figures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I presume we shall have a further vote for plant, which is already standing us \$165,000, and apparently \$58,000 more, amounting to \$220,000 in round numbers. Judging from old experience, I suppose we may put down \$250,000 for plant and about \$150,000 for the building, making \$400,000. It looks as if it were going to cost us half a million dollars to start the experiment. I shall be very glad if the project results in saving \$20,000, but I must confess I have my doubts about it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The plant is not only for the original project, but it will include also what is necessary for the printing of the voters' lists, and I hope to be in a position to show to the House that in that item a reduction in expense will be effected.

Mr. EDGAR. As the hon. gentleman has mentioned the printing of the voters' lists, can he give the House any idea of what the cost of the plant for that work will be?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I shall give all the statements in detail in due time.

Department of Interior..... \$126,757 50

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are forty-four statutory increases at \$50 each, \$2,200; two at \$37.50, \$75; one at \$30, and one at \$25, making a total of \$2,350. There is one new third-class clerk at \$562.50, making an increase of \$2,892.50, less \$500 for a messenger, or a net increase of \$2,392.50. The Geological Survey Branch—twenty-four statutory increases at \$50, \$1,200. The total increase is thus \$3,592.50, less the difference of \$100 in the salary of one clerk, which was voted last year at \$1,200 and this year at \$1,100, or a net increase of \$3,492.50.

North-West Mounted Police. \$8,580

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are four statutory increases at \$50, \$200, and one at \$30; total, \$230.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where does the comptroller reside?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At Ottawa.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that not rather an inconvenient arrangement. I should imagine that the officer who has control of the North-West Mounted Police should be a resident of Winnipeg.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think not. The comptroller is a civil officer altogether. He is comptroller in the accountant sense of the word. All the payments and all the contracts made with respect to the supply of the Mounted Police, everything of that kind, the provisions, everything connected with the organisation, management and the maintenance of the force, is attended to here, and, *ex necessitate*, there must be an officer here to look after that. The organisation in the North-West is in the hands of a commissioner, Colonel Herchmer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The matter is a question of departmental management and administration, and I asked the question because, *prima facie*, it would appear to me that, being at the great distance we are from the headquarters of the Mounted Police, unless this officer be kept a very great portion of his time on the road, he could not properly carry out his functions; and it would be a much better plan, for the purpose of promoting an efficient inspection, if the matter could be so arranged, that he should reside in Winnipeg rather than here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, but he has nothing to do with that. He is a civil officer altogether.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood from the hon. Minister that he was largely concerned with the supervising of the contracts, which are submitted to him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, this is a large item of the expenditure. Quite \$800,000 a year are required for this service, perhaps more. Last year, I think, we spent \$800,000, and very often we have expended a million. It looks to me almost as if it would be more advisable in the public interest to have transferred the comptroller to a nearer point than Ottawa, if we want him to do his work efficiently.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Experience has shown that the present system is more advisable. The contracts are let after tenders are received. Then tenders are sent here, and are put in months before the time when they are to begin, and there is more immediate supervision by the comptroller here at headquarters than there could be if he were up there. We must have an officer here to look after that machinery, and the comptroller is that officer. Just as in England, the paymaster of all the forces is in London, to compare small things with large.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would rather reverse the comparison and say it was comparing great things to small, because, as far as extent of jurisdiction and territory is concerned, that is greater here than in England. Under whose control is this officer? Under the First Minister's?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman laid down a different rule altogether with regard to the expenditure necessary to be incurred on behalf of the Indians. He complained, when my hon. friend was in office, that he tried to centralise the management of Indian affairs at Ottawa, and held that the expenditure should be looked after by an officer on the

ground. The hon. gentleman, I think, gave that as a reason for entrusting Indian affairs to the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories to the extent he did. I would like to know upon what theory a different rule applies to the Indian expenditure, from that which applies to the Mounted Police expenditure. The contracts are let, I suppose, in the same way, and the supplies are somewhat similar. The distribution and everything of that sort would be in the one case about the same as in the other; and it would be interesting to the Committee to learn why the hon. gentleman lays down one rule with regard to the supervision of the supplies for the Mounted Police, and a different rule with regard to those matters which relate to the Department of Indian Affairs.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not lay down any rule at all. With respect to Indian matters, I took the management as I found it left by the hon. gentleman, after a great deal of care, no doubt. The commissioner for managing the Indian affairs in the North-West was Mr. Laird, I think, but he resigned, and, following the system adopted by the hon. gentleman, we appointed a commissioner in his stead. At that time, in the infant state of the North-West, we thought it would be extravagant rather to pay a salary for a Lieutenant Governor of the North-West who had only that to do, so we united the two offices, the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs and that of the Lieutenant Governor, with the salary of the Lieutenant Governor. That system has been continued ever since; but I do not think it can be continued much longer. The business has so largely increased there, I think eventually the two offices will have to be severed. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs has a great deal more to do than the mere issuing of tenders for supplies. He is responsible for the organisation and management of the whole system, and he has to supervise the acts of all the Indian agents, so that the two cases are not analogous at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was simply talking of the matter of expenditure in the two cases.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The matter of expenditure, the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs looks after, I think, very closely. My hon. friend behind me does, whether I did so or not, and the tenders, as a general rule, are examined here. All the important tenders certainly are. There may be exigencies occasionally, but I am not aware that there are any, and the hon. gentleman will quite understand that in a special case, such as starvation for instance, it may be necessary to act promptly on the spot. The system in respect to the Indian Department, is just as the hon. gentleman left it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And which you thought all wrong.

Mr. MITCHELL. I recollect, when we were passing the Estimates last year, I called the attention of the First Minister to the manner in which the estimates were asked for the supply, not only of the Mounted Police but of the Indian Department were asked for; and I pointed out the difficulties that existed under the present system, under which some three or four large monopolists got all the contracts, and the merchants, traders, and manufacturers in different parts of the country were prevented from tendering for the supply of the articles they could furnish. As to the delivery of the articles, I suggested that in place of requiring that they be delivered at the ranges or Indian reserves, they should be required to be delivered at certain specific points on the railway. The hon. gentleman said the suggestion was a good one, but that the department was not quite in a position to adopt it; that, however, in a year or two it might be carried out. I would like to know whether he proposes to alter the present arrangements or not?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Eventually, I think the delivery might be made at certain specified points along the railway, but I fancy the same state of things exists now as existed when I spoke last year. It would add greatly to the expense of a contract, if in the case of supplies for places 200, 300 and 400 miles away from the places of the original deposit along the line of railway, there had to be separate contracts made by the Government with the contractors to carry the supplies to the various points throughout the country, from the points along the railway. The contractor who undertakes to deliver these articles at the different reserves or the different stations, can always make cheaper contracts for delivery than the Government can, as the hon. gentleman can well understand, and hitherto I think a great saving has been caused by the pursuance of that system. Of course, with the railway extension in that country, a different state of things will obtain, and, whenever the supplies can be delivered near the places of consumption, the hon. gentleman's plan should be carried out.

Mr. MITCHELL. That was the same argument which was used five years ago when I raised this question. Then we had not the railway in full blast in that country. Now we have a good many railways in that country; and, in reply to the remarks of the right hon. gentlemen, I may say that the effect of the present system, which has prevailed during all the time since the country was opened up, has been to put the contracts into the hands of two or three large corporations, such as the Hudson's Bay Company and Baker & Co. They have monopolised the whole matter, the supplies and the transport as well. I have nothing to say against those corporations. I have nothing to say against the way in which they do their work. I believe they have done it well, but, instead of giving these contracts to large firms, the Government might give contracts for supplies at a distance of 20 or 40 or 100 miles from the stations, and that more particularly in regard to the Indian supplies, because the police stations are much nearer to the railway, except, as I understand, in one place. But, instead of giving the farmers the right to tender for the transport of these supplies, it is given to these large corporations or companies, who become the middlemen between the Government and the people of the country. In that case, the profit goes to these large companies which should be divided amongst the people of the country. Instead of coats, and boots and shoes, and flour and so on being given all in bulk contracts to these large companies, the Government should give the manufacturers of coats, and the manufacturers of clothing, and the other manufacturers who are in Toronto, Hamilton, Montreal and Quebec and elsewhere, the opportunity of tendering without making them pay a tribute to the middlemen, who are the only contractors that the Government deals with. The right hon. gentleman is not quite correct when he says that the facilities for transport by rail are not such as would meet the suggestion which I made five years ago, and have made frequently since. I suppose that three-fourths, certainly two-thirds, of the supplies which are required by the police and the Indians can be supplied within fifty miles from certain points on the railway; and I ask, why should this system be carried on, year after year, of throwing this amount into the hands of these monopolists? I have nothing to say against these corporations. I hope they have made a good deal of money out of their contracts; but it is time that it should be given to the people, that some opportunity should be given to them to tender for these supplies, not in bulk, but in detail.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As to the Mounted Police, the supplies are very small in comparison with those of the Indian Department. They are very small, insignificant, but a change has been introduced in that respect in regard to

the supply of hay, vegetables, and food generally, so that the people in the neighborhood supply the different Mounted Police stations by tender. Tenders are asked for in the immediate vicinity of the police station. As to the Indian Department, that is quite a different affair. The whole principle upon which the Government proceeds, upon which every Government proceeds, is to get its supplies and to get work of every kind done as cheaply as possible. The whole principle which pervades, for instance, the Board of Works is that everything should be put up to public tender, and that the lowest should get it. That is the principle in the Indian Department. It was when I was the Superintendent General, and I have no doubt it is the principle now when my hon. friend behind me is the Superintendent General.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not want to protract the discussion, but the hon. gentleman has admitted that he has adopted my suggestion made some years ago and repeated since in regard to the police service, and I think he might adopt the same principle with regard to the Indian Department, with good results to the people of this country.

Department of Indian Affairs..... \$40,647 50

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are twenty-four statutory increases at \$50, \$1,200, one at \$37.50, one at \$25, one at \$30, one promotion from second to first class, and an increase in one case, making a total of \$2,915 increase. Then there is a decrease in Mr. Plummer's salary of \$1,800 and Mr. McKenna, \$262.50.

Office of the Auditor General..... \$25,750

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a considerable increase here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are sixteen statutory increases, making \$800; there is one paid at \$500 in 1887-8, which should be \$600; there are two additional clerks to be provided for, one at \$800 and one at \$400; a messenger, who was dropped because he was ill, but has since recovered, \$250; making a total increase of \$2,350.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the work increased largely?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board..... \$53,980

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are twenty-two statutory increases at \$50, \$1,100; one of \$27.50, one of \$30, making \$1,157.50, less the difference between the salaries of one officer who resigned and Mr. Sanders, which account for the total increase of \$1,105.

Department of Inland Revenue..... \$41,175

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are nineteen statutory increases at \$50, \$950, two at \$30, one at \$25, making \$1,535, less the salary of Mr. Measam, superannuated, \$1,800, making a net decrease of \$765.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What were Mr. Measam's duties?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He was a first class clerk.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What superannuation did that gentleman get?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He got the ordinary allowance under the Act. I forget the amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see there is one officer less, a first-class clerk. Is it expected that this will be maintained, or are we to look at a little later date for an additional first class clerk? Will these twenty-nine officers do the work? Usually speaking, when a man is superannuated, another, or for that matter, half-a-dozen others are ready to take his place.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, there is to be no increase.

Expenses of the Department of Agriculture..... \$51,220

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are nineteen statutory increases at \$50, three at \$30; two new chief clerks, one at \$2,250, and one at \$1,800; one additional clerk, \$400; one new messenger, \$300; promotion of first class clerk to chief clerk, Mr. Jackson, \$150; promotion of Mr. St. Denis, \$150; making \$6,900 of increases. Less over-estimate in 1887-8, \$75; difference between the salary of a new second class clerk, Mr. Jarvis, and the estimate of last year, \$100. There are some other reductions, amounting on the whole to \$3,095, leaving a net increase of \$2,995.

Mr. MILLS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us what these divisions are—the second division, in which a second class clerk has been appointed at \$1,800, and the third division, in which a chief clerk has been appointed at a salary of \$1,800, and the new office of chief clerk of the Patent division, \$2,250. Now, I understand that the party who was formerly Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, has been transferred to this new office of chief clerk of the Patent division, and that it is, to a certain extent, to be made a judicial office, with the duties which sometimes devolve upon the Minister at the head of that department, as Commissioner of Patents, and that they will hereafter devolve upon that officer as deputy. Is that the case, and is there any further increase to this salary contemplated? Is the chief clerk of this division to be raised to the rank of a deputy?

Mr. CARLING. The chief clerk whom the hon. gentleman has mentioned just now in the Patent Office, was Mr. Cambie. He was appointed last year at a salary of \$2,400. Now we propose to transfer Mr. Pope from another department to this department, at the same salary which he has been receiving.

Mr. MILLS. How about the other two?

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Brymner, who was at the maximum of his class, who has charge of the archives, has been put into the first class at the minimum salary; Mr. Jackson, who is also a very efficient officer, is the other clerk.

Mr. MILLS. I suppose we are to understand that the eminent services of this officer who is now chief clerk of the Patent Office, performed last year, in his devotion to the Government, in withholding the returns from being gazetted of eighty members on this side, are to be recognised in this kind of a way.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was one of those gentlemen whose returns were held back by the gentleman who has been promoted to this position with an increase of salary; and when a motion to increase his salary was brought down last year, I objected to giving it to a man who was arraigned by public opinion, and arraigned by this House, for what was, and practically, a malfeasance of office. I say that such a man ought not to have been transferred to so important a position. I have heard it stated by some one here—I do not speak from the book, as I do not know whether the law gives to this gentleman the functions and powers that were formerly vested in the Minister of Agriculture in relation to patents, but I say that it would be very unwise to allow questions relating to patents to come before a man of that character, involving, as some of them do, hundreds of thousands of dollars. Why, Sir, there was a case before the late Minister of Agriculture where he sat for days and days with some nine or ten of the brightest lawyers of this country arguing before him, upon a matter in which the parties could afford to pay these lawyers \$25 to \$50 a day—even \$250 a day, as my hon. friend beside me (Sir Richard Cartwright) states. I say that if the statement of my hon.

friend is true, that the powers which were formerly vested in the Minister are to be vested in that man, arraigned by public opinion, and by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, for his misconduct—I say, Sir, that a mistake has been committed. I ask if it is right that such great power should be given to a man with that reputation and with that record? I do not think it is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The gentleman, Mr. Pope, who was put in Mr. Cambie's place, has the powers that Mr. Cambie had, and no other.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to hear he has no more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. State what the duties are?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Cambie was head of the Patent Office, but he did not try cases in any way whatever.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He advised the Minister.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Every employé advises the Minister at the head of his department, I take it. No, he has strictly executive and administrative duties, he has no judicial duties whatever, and the salary is the same as that he had when he was Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has given notice of a Bill for the purpose of appointing a deputy commissioner, who will have no judicial functions; and if the House does not choose to pass that Bill, there will be an end to it; and if they think there are improper appointments made under that Bill, then the House can object to them.

Mr. MITCHELL. As a public journalist, questions are brought before me very frequently in relation to the Patent laws. We know that Mr. Pope made a very serious mistake in relation to his duties of publishing the returns of a great many members of this House—most remarkably, my own, which he kept back for nearly three weeks; for what purpose I do not know—whether it was under instructions or not, I do not know. But if he makes similar mistakes in the dates of patents, there will be special benefits conferred on special individuals. I am satisfied that \$100,000 or \$200,000 would not have been any consideration in obtaining a favorable decision in a patent case that came before the former Minister of Agriculture. If we are going to give powers to this gentleman such as were formerly enjoyed by the Minister, or exercised by the Minister, it appears to me we are running a great risk, and I hope Mr. Pope will not make any mistake in the patents in his charge.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I desire to say further that this officer was guilty of dereliction of duty, that he was guilty of malfeasance in office. This matter was brought before the attention of the Government. He was also guilty of making a false statement to the House, a statement that bore on its face evidence of falsity, a statement in regard to which it was only necessary to examine the returns to which he referred to see its falsity; and in the face of the wrong done to nearly one-half of the members of this House, and known to the Government, the Government, instead of dismissing that officer from office, have undertaken to promote him. They have transferred him from one office to another, and, as the Bill shows, it is proposed to give him the rank of Deputy Minister, and impose on him duties of a far more serious and responsible character than he has shown himself capable of performing in the office he formerly held. I say, if the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches had done their duty in this matter, that, without any motion on the part of the House, and without any formal complaint having been made, they would have dismissed that officer; but, instead of dismissing him, they have undertaken, by his transference, to give him promotion.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. EDGAR. Do I understand from the Minister of Agriculture that the Deputy Minister of Agriculture is to be relieved of the duties of Deputy Commissioner of Patents?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. EDGAR. Then what is the Bill for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will discuss the Bill when it comes up.

Mr. EDGAR. I think we have a right to ask what the policy of the Government is, and I intend to stop here until I get some answer. What I want to know is this: Whether the deputy head of the Department of Agriculture, whose salary is provided by this vote, is to continue to perform the duties which, under the statute, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture has to do, the duties of Deputy Commissioner of Patents; or whether another officer is to be appointed in his place?

Mr. CARLING. I can only say that this item before the House gives no increased power to this officer; he will have exactly the same power as Mr. Cambie possessed, and he has no power similar to the power of the deputy commissioner. The Deputy Minister is Deputy Commissioner of Patents at the present time, and there is no change at present in the law. That is a question for the future. Mr. Pope holds exactly the same position as chief clerk as Mr. Cambie held.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you not propose making a change by the proposed Bill?

Mr. CARLING. That is another matter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not object to the removal of Mr. Pope from the position of Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, because he has proved himself to be utterly and entirely unfit to perform those duties, and had not performed them. But it is a very remarkable proceeding that he should be substantially promoted, as I understand he is about to be; and it is the more remarkable because this House will very well recollect that when, again and again, we demanded to know whether Mr. Pope was acting in the way he did act under the direct authority or at the instigation of members of the Government, but one hon. gentleman on the Treasury benches, if I recollect rightly—and that was the Secretary of State—rose to deny that he had any conversation with him; and, therefore, when we see this, we are justified in supposing that Mr. Pope, in what I must call the scandalous malfeasance of office that he committed in postponing the publication of the returns of nearly eighty members, contrary to law, and contrary to his manifest, if not his sworn duty, was acting at the instigation and instance of his masters, the Government of Canada, who now take the opportunity of rewarding him.

Department of Fisheries..... \$15,425

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are these changes, statutory?

Mr. FOSTER. They are statutory increases.

Department of Public Works .. \$43,510

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are eighteen statutory increases of \$50 each, decrease in messengers \$120, leaving a net increase of \$680.

Department of Railways..... \$47,930

Mr. POPE. By some accident there is an item of \$400 inserted for Mr. McLaughlin, that was formerly paid by the Public Works. The item is entered as \$1,800, whereas it should be \$1,400 as before.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Last year the Minister of Railways asked for those two sums of \$1,400 and \$400.

The committee thought it was desirable that they should be put under the same head, and, therefore, this was done; but my colleague does not desire to have the amount voted for his department increased by \$400. It can be arranged by inserting \$1,800, and making a note that \$400 has to be paid annually by the Department of Public Works.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see there is another item touching Mr. Schreiber's salary. Does that still continue?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because I thought he had done all the work an engineer required to do in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. POPE. He is still at work in settling up matters connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway and consequently it will continue for this year.

Mr. MITCHELL. I had a little business, not very large, to do with the Railway and Canals Department, and I did not get very much satisfaction out of it. When I spoke about snow-shovelling the other day the hon. Minister said that he put the men there in my interest, when he knew very well it was in the interest of my opponents. Do I understand that Mr. Schreiber gets \$2,000 besides \$1,500?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. He is the biggest paid officer in the whole service. I hope the hon. Minister will attend to those two or three little trifles I spoke to him about the other day.

Mr. POPE. It is very hard for me to attend to those trifles if the hon. gentleman is going to pitch into my engineer.

Mr. MITCHELL. We will see to that on concurrence, if you are not considerate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Let the hon. the Minister of Railways recollect Mrs. Murphy's cow, and he will be considerate.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 8th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Report of the Royal Commission appointed to enquire into losses sustained by settlers in consequence of the rebellion in the North West Territories.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Bronsons & Weston Lumber Co.—(Mr. Perley.)

Bill (No. 28) to repeal an Act intituled: "An Act for facilitating navigation of the River St. Lawrence, in and near the harbor of Quebec."—(Mr. Guay.)

Bill (No. 30) to enable the Town of Kincardine, County of Bruce, to impose and collect certain tolls in the harbor of the said town.—(Mr. Rowand.)

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Mr. BROWN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 29) to make further provisions as to the prevention of cruelty to animals. He said: The introduction of this Bill is to make certain provision for the prevention of cruelty to animals, not provided for by law at present. This Act is asked for by the various Humane Societies throughout the Dominion. When the Bill comes before the House again I will fully inform the House as to the details of the measure.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ST. CHARLES BRANCH.

Mr. CHOQUETTE asked, What is the total amount expended up to date on the St. Charles Branch of the Intercolonial Railway, and what is the amount of claims not yet paid?

Mr. POPE. The total amount expended is \$1,274,620; the amount of claims presented by claimants, whose claims have not been disposed of, amounts to \$721,650.

THE FENELON RIVER.

Mr. BARRON asked, Is the water in the Fenelon River, at the outlet of Cameron Lake and above the lock at Fenelon Falls, of sufficient depth to permit of free navigation by steamboats, vessels and barges passing through the lock? If not, does the Government propose making the river navigable in time for this year's navigation? Will the bridge across said river above the lock impede navigation? If so, when is the same to be reconstructed so as to permit of uninterrupted navigation?

Mr. POPE. There is at present a small rocky bar at the entrance to Cameron's Lake (which lake is about $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles long), from the River Fenelon, the removal of which is necessary to clear navigation. The railway bridge across the river being a fixed structure does impede navigation. The department, however, are now in correspondence with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the operators of the road, with a view to the substitution of a swing. The department are also constructing a swing in place of an existing fixed road bridge over the lock. The works will not be in readiness for next season.

Mr. BARRON. I think the hon. gentleman misunderstood the question. I did not refer to the bridge over the lock at Fenelon Falls, but to the river above the lock at the outlet at Cameron Lake. The question was if the obstructions at the outlet at Cameron Lake are going to be removed in time for navigation. There is no trouble across the bridge. The trouble is at the outlet of Cameron Lake.

Mr. POPE. Yes, there is.

Mr. BARRON. At all events there is where I am advised they want the obstruction removed from.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT.

Mr. McMILLAN (South Huron) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to amend the Weights and Measures Act so as to define the weight of salt in barrels, bags and packages? Is it the intention to adopt a standard similar to that in the United States?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Notice has been given of a Bill to deal with that subject. There is no uniform standard established in the United States.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LABOR.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether it was the intention of the Government to cause the evidence taken before the Labor Commission, prior to the meeting of Parliament, to be laid before the House; and if so, when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not the intention of the Government to lay the evidence taken before the Labor Commission, before this House until a report is made by the Commissioners.

REPORT OF GENERAL STRANGE.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether the Government have taken cognisance of the following letter:—

"MILITARY COLONISATION RANCHER,
"P. O. GLEICHEN, ALBERTA, N.W.T., 26th July, 1886.

"To the Editor of *La Presse*,
"Montreal.

"SIR,—An article in *La Presse*, Montreal, 17th July, called my attention to the Report of the Minister of Militia for the past year. I obtained a copy through a friend, as the department did not honor me with one.

"I am pained, but not surprised, to see the extraordinary injustice done to the gallant troops I commanded in the late campaign, especially to the 65th Battalion. Though they are not alone, as 'Steel's Scouts' and the 'Alberta Mounted Rifles' are absolutely omitted in the list of troops engaged in the campaign, as shown in the statement on the back of the map from which the locality of 'Frenchman's Butte' has been erased.

"In the Deputy Minister's Report, page xi, no mention is made of the casualties in the action at that place, 'Frenchman's Butte,' the very existence of which has been so carefully suppressed.

"For myself it does not trouble me that the rank and title of Major General, which Her Majesty did me the honor to confer, has also been suppressed. This occurs in the case of no other officer mentioned in the report. Part of the report in question purports to be based on extracts from newspapers.

"It is a novelty to base official reports of military operations on disconnected and unauthenticated extracts from newspapers, when the official reports of the officers themselves are at hand.

"The singular egotism of the report in question ignores the first advance of the Alberta Field Force for the relief of Edmonton, and would make it seem that the force, having miraculously appeared in Edmonton, commenced operations on the 20th May, the words being: 'May 20th. Strange leaves Edmonton with 65th by boat; rest by trail.' As a fact the 65th did not leave Edmonton by boat, but marched to Victoria.

"The object aimed at is evident to any casual reader of the report, and you will not be surprised to hear that a part of my official report has been omitted altogether. As it concerns the reputation of the soldiers I commanded, it is to be regretted that an official report to Parliament must become the basis of history which it will falsify by its omissions, which answer the same purpose as perversion of facts.

"I thank you for the justice with which you treat me. It is a contrast to the injustice I have suffered at the hands of Her Majesty's Imperial Government, which has deprived me of my pension for the half year during which I left my home and sacrificed my private business, as did many others, to save this fair Province from desolation and bloodshed.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"J. B. STRANGE,

"Major General, late Com. Alberta Force.

"P.S.—I regret that I have not written in French, but translation will be less troublesome to you than to me. I fear that half a dozen years' absence from my French Canadian friends, among whom I passed so many happy years, has rendered my French a little rusty, though my gallant French Canadian soldiers always responded to it on the march, the bivouac and the battle-field."

2. Is it true that a part of the report of General Strange was omitted, as stated in the above letter?

3. If it was so omitted, do the Government intend to remedy such omission?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON (Translation). The Minister of Militia had cognisance of General Strange's letter at the time of its publication. The unpublished portion of General Strange's report was not published through any representations made to the Minister by the Major General commanding the forces, stating that that portion of the report should be set aside. It is not the intention of the Government to reconsider this question and to publish the unpublished portion of the report.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

COPYRIGHT.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Is it the intention of the Government to propose any measure of legislation this Session upon the subject of copyright?

Mr. THOMPSON. The matter is still under consideration, and will be dealt with probably during the Session at an early day.

MAIL SERVICE IN LOTBINIÈRE.

Mr. RINFRET asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant a mail three times a week, in place of twice a week, to the post office of Armagh, in the county of Lotbinière?

Mr. McLELAN. It is not the intention of the Government.

MR. LYNCH'S WORK ON BUTTER-MAKING.

Mr. COUTURE asked, Whether the French edition of Mr. Lynch's work on Butter-making has been printed? If not, when will it be?

Mr. CARLING. The translation is already printed, and will be circulated among the members next week.

MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN QUEBEC AND DEQUEN.

Mr. COUTURE asked, Whether the Government has made arrangements with the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company for the transport of the mails between Quebec and Dequen. If it has done so, whether orders in accordance therewith have been issued to the Post Office Inspector at Quebec?

Mr. McLELAN. Arrangements have been made with the Railway Company for the transmission of the mails.

THE ONDERDONK ARBITRATION.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, What number of locomotives and cars and what quantity of other railway stock were taken by the Government under the award made by the Arbitrators on the matter in dispute between Mr. Onderdonk and the Government? What quantity of such railway stock and how many locomotives and cars are now employed on the Intercolonial Railway or elsewhere, and what amount has been expended on the same for repairs or otherwise? What amount was paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the transport of such locomotives, cars and railway stock from British Columbia? What amount was paid for similar services to the Grand Trunk Railway Company? What was the total cost of transporting the said locomotives, cars and railway stock from British Columbia to New Brunswick?

Mr. POPE. I would much prefer that the hon. gentleman should move for this information as an Address, though I will get the information as soon as I can and lay it on the Table.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Government whether the papers brought down yesterday with regard to the Fisheries Treaty contain all the information which the Government intend to lay on the Table of the House regarding that treaty?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be able, I hope, at an early date to lay on the Table of the House the correspondence on the fisheries question down to the present period. Some delay has

taken place in connection with the arrangement with the Imperial Government as to what papers should be brought down, but all the papers that can be brought down in connection with that subject will be laid on the Table at an early date. It is not the intention to lay on the Table anything further connected with the conference of the plenipotentiaries at Washington.

Mr. LAURIER. I think it will be a very disappointing announcement to the House. From what the hon. Minister himself stated the other day, the House was not at all prepared for the statement he now makes, for I understood him to state distinctly that during his illness the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice had agreed that the protocols to be laid before the House should be only formal, but that at the same time his assent to that arrangement was conveyed; but it was also stated that at a future period further information should be given, and I claim that nothing will be satisfactory except absolutely full information. The Government have thought proper, for some reason of their own, to bring down a part of the proceedings of the conference, that is to say, a part of the propositions submitted by the British plenipotentiaries, and the answer made by the American plenipotentiaries. From the very terms of the papers which have been laid before the House, it is evident that the offer which was made on the part of the British plenipotentiaries came after, and in consequence of some previous discussion, because at the beginning the paper reads thus: "Sir Charles Tupper therefore hands in for consideration," &c. What is the meaning of "therefore?" What had come before that? The proposition made here came in consequence of something that had previously come before the Conference. Under the circumstances I submit with full confidence that all the precedents are on my side, that it was the duty of the Government to lay before the House everything that took place before the conference. What are the protocols? They are not merely the headings which we have before us: "The conference met, all the plenipotentiaries being present; the protocol of the previous session was approved, and after further discussion of matters under consideration, the conference was adjourned till the 21st of January," and so on in similar terms. These are not the protocols; they are only extracts from them. The protocols are the *procès-verbal* of the meetings of the conference. I submit that it is the right of this House to have everything that took place before the conference—the proposals made on our side and the answers on the American side, together with the proposals made on the American side and the answers on our side; and that is in accordance with all the precedents. We had all the protocols of the Washington Treaty, and the whole information, brought before the House in 1872. Under such circumstances I think the House will be very much disappointed if we are not given the whole of the proceedings that took place on that occasion; and it seems to me, in view of the statements made by the hon. Minister himself the other day, that it is the right of the House to have all the protocols in their entirety.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I share with my hon. friend the great disappointment which I think will be felt not only in this House, but outside of this House, in finding that all the protocols, which I supposed would include the results which had been arrived at, if not the arguments on both sides, are contained in twenty-five pages of just such a bald and meagre statement as my hon. friend has read. Here we have a formal treaty, and a *modus vivendi*, and the official confirmation and authority to treat, and then for five and twenty pages this is presented to us as the record of the protocols: "The conference met, all the plenipotentiaries being present. The protocol of the previous session was approved, and the conference adjourned;" and this goes on for five-and-twenty pages. They might just as well have

sent down but one page and put down in one line that the conference met twenty-five times, that the protocols were read and that adjournments took place that number of times. I am quite sure the hon. the Minister of Finance, in his heart of hearts, must entirely disapprove of this, what I must call a very discourteous mode of treating the Parliament of Canada. The Parliament of Canada ought, before they close this treaty, to have these protocols before them. That is my opinion, and that is what was done respecting the first Treaty of Washington. There we had, not the lengthened arguments by which the intentions of the various plenipotentiaries were supported, but the results as embodied in the usual diplomatic protocol form and the various proposals in detail that were made. I think that every consideration of reason, and every consideration of deference to this House, aye, Sir, and of deference to the people we represent, requires that we ought to have these protocols in full as they were laid before the plenipotentiaries, or, at least, as they were approved by the plenipotentiaries, before we are called on to discuss this treaty. I must say that, up to the present moment, no sort of argument has been advanced, either by the right hon. the First Minister or by the hon. the Minister of Finance, why this should not take place. I am inclined myself to acquit the Minister of Finance of this. I think he desired, and for his own sake he was right in desiring that what he had done should be shown, that it should be shown how he had striven to secure better terms for Canada; and I think he will find in the course of this discussion that he will be placed at very great disadvantage, unless, sooner or later, we receive the protocols to which my hon. friend has alluded.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I share the disappointment as I have already stated to the House, that both those hon. gentlemen have expressed, at the protocols not being fuller but they are protocols all the same. Any person who knows anything of negotiations of that kind, knows that the protocolists, under the direction of the commissioners who are engaged in an international conference, prepare the protocols. They are the official secretaries on the two sides, and they prepare the protocols under the direction of the Commission. As I have already stated, when I left Washington the matter was not finally determined as to what the protocols should contain, and, as I have also explained to the House, the message which was sent asking my assent to the protocols, being of a purely formal character, and which was answered in the affirmative, was assumed by me to mean that what were called purely formal protocols would contain the proposals made on both sides. I state that very frankly, because I have taken the House entirely into my confidence in this matter. There is nothing which I wish to withhold from it in the slightest degree. I regret very much, I do not hesitate to say, that these protocols do not contain what I expected they would, when I agreed that they should be purely formal. But all the same it was not so decided by the British plenipotentiaries who remained in Washington, and by the United States plenipotentiaries. It was decided by them that all the protocols should contain was the statements contained in these papers laid before the House. There is no disrespect to the Parliament of Canada in this, that is not equally a disrespect to the Parliament of Great Britain. Every word in relation to this matter that will be laid before the Parliament of England, every word that has been laid before the Senate of the United States, as contained in the protocols, as the results arrived at, is precisely the same as is laid upon the Table of this House. I observe that Mr. Bayard has, since these protocols and the treaty were submitted to the Senate of the United States, sent down further correspondence upon this subject, but not anything further in relation to what took place in the Conference. The further correspondence contained, as hon. gentlemen who have seen the New York papers will see,

in full the letter addressed by Mr. Bayard to myself, and the answer to it, upon which this conference was originated.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You mean the conference that took place last Easter?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I mean the letter from Mr. Bayard which followed my visit to Washington last Easter, and my reply; and upon the communication of that correspondence to Lord Salisbury and Mr. Phelps the American Minister, the international conference at Washington in regard to the fisheries was arranged. I see that further papers have been submitted to the Congress of the United States, being a letter by Mr. Bayard, with correspondence upon the subject, which he has brought down. As I have said, further correspondence will be brought down to this House, but nothing has been submitted to the United States, and nothing will be submitted to the Parliament of Great Britain, that will not be precisely the same as that submitted here. I have personally expressed my regret that the decision arrived at was not to furnish further information than these protocols contain, but I believe it is within the province of international commissioners to decide how far the public interest and the objects they have in common will be subserved by giving more or less extended information upon the subject of the deliberations which have taken place. I am unable to say more than that, and I do not think that there will be any deficiency of information; in fact, I may say, that more information has been submitted here than has been anywhere else, because at the time, when I supposed these protocols would contain a statement of all the proposals made on both sides and the replies, I stated to the House that the question of trade would be found to have been referred to, and in order to deal with that subject I was able to obtain the assent of my colleagues and of the American representatives to laying upon the Table of the House further information than is contained in the protocols, by giving all the proposals and the replies that had relation to anything which would touch the fiscal arrangements of the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just ask the hon. gentleman when he is going to lay the letter he refers to on the Table? Of course I have seen the letter, but it has not been laid officially before us as yet.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I stated to the hon. gentleman that the correspondence was now being prepared to be brought down to the present time, and the letter will be contained in that correspondence. Further correspondence will also be laid before the House at an early date. This matter is in the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has arranged to lay the correspondence before the House as early as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman tell us when he thinks we will get it—to-morrow or Saturday?

Mr. FOSTER. You mean those papers in connection with the general fisheries correspondence?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I particularly refer to is the papers the Minister of Finance refers to, including the full text of the letter from Secretary Bayard to himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Those, I suppose, will be included in the general correspondence which is being prepared, and which will be brought down as soon as possible.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is very indefinite.

Mr. FOSTER. No more satisfactory information can now be given. We cannot bring down the papers until we have the assent of the Governor General.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is not necessary in the case of the letter of the hon. Secretary Bayard

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

to the hon. the Minister of Finance. That was, as I understand, an unofficial letter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There would be no difficulty, if the hon. gentleman desired it, in laying that correspondence upon the Table of the House at once, and I will have great pleasure in doing it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose you can do that to-day or to-morrow?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. To-morrow.

Mr. MITCHELL. What I imagine my inquisitive friends on this side want is to know the grounds which the hon. the Minister of Finance took before the Commission. What I said yesterday, and what my hon. friend took exception to, was, that the protocols are extremely barren and bald, as to the course which my hon. friend proposes to take. It is true that this protocol refers to the general disposition on the part of Canada to offer extended commercial and trade relations to the United States as a compensation for the consideration of the fisheries question. That was refused by the United States. They refused to consider, that until the rights of American citizens, under the Treaty of 1818, were considered and decided by the Commission. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, says that he pressed the matter day after day, and I have no doubt he did. No one will have any doubt—no matter on which side of the House he may sit—that he did the best he could for Canada, but what we find fault with is that we have so little information as to what he did. I do not know what these gentlemen who have preceded me on this side have in view, but what I have in view is that before we discuss the motion of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), we should know to what extent the proposition went, whether it referred to natural productions alone, or to some of these extensive manufactures which are carried on alike in the United States and in this country. That, I take it, is what my hon. friends on this side of the House want to get at. At all events, it is what I want to get at, and it is of vast importance to the House to have that information before we enter into a discussion of the question. I was in hopes yesterday that, while the protocols did not mention anything in regard to the trade relations, there might have been something in regard to the interchange of natural productions, of manufactured articles, or of only natural productions, or of only a limited extent of natural productions, but they seem to be framed in such a way as to cover everything generally.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend knows that the very question which is now agitating the country is that of more extended relations with the United States. There is one class of men, the manufacturers of this country, who desire to make the consumers pay what they choose by means of their rings and their combinations. There are others, and I am one of them, who desire to open the markets of this country in such a way as to get the cheapest products from abroad, and to throw their markets open to our products; and perhaps the hon. gentleman can quiet our minds by telling us what he did say in his argument, to what extent he went, whether he was prepared to open up the markets of Canada for the products of the United States, on condition that corresponding advantages were given to the manufacturers of Canada in the markets of the United States? Perhaps he could quiet all this enquiring turn of mind on this side of the House if he would tell us just to what extent he went. Of course, I do not know if diplomacy would permit him, but, if it would, it would be very satisfactory to us to know how far he went in his propositions towards the settlement of this question.

Mr. EDGAR. If the Finance Minister cannot give us the particulars of his proposal, perhaps he can give us, at all events, the date at which this proposal was made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The 3rd of December. I think the answer says the 3rd instant.

Mr. EDGAR. One date is the 30th ultimo, and the other the 3rd instant. I find in the protocols that there were meetings on the 30th November, and the 30th January, and also meetings on the 3rd December and 3rd February, so that this does not help us at all, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us what the date was.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The 30th referred to is the 30th November, and the 3rd is the 3rd December.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It will be seen that the Parliament of Canada stands in this matter in precisely the same position as the Senate of the United States. Of course it is a departure from the ancient practice in the negotiation of treaties, but it is in accordance with the modern tendency in England to the other portions of the Empire as well as in regard to Canada. It was adopted in connection with the South African Free States, and in that case the fullest information was communicated to Parliament, and no action was taken without the sanction of Parliament. In this case, it is necessary that Parliament should have the fullest information to enable it to take action on this matter, and, before asking for the assent of Parliament, before asking Parliament to consider the matters pending between the two countries, the hon. gentleman no doubt remembered that he was not only the representative of Great Britain, but was the representative of this country as well, and therefore he will understand that it is in his own interest, as well as in the interest of Parliament, that Parliament, before being called upon to ratify that treaty, should know what he has done on behalf of the people of this country. The hon. gentleman had there a certain official position. He has acted there on behalf of this country, from time to time, during a period extending over nearly three months. The hon. gentleman, it is clear, from correspondence which has been laid on the Table of this House, has departed, in the final conclusions at which he has arrived, from the position taken by the Government a little over a year ago. Why those concessions were made we would like to know. Why he has made unnecessary concessions we would like to know—whether it has resulted from the position taken by the Government that these concessions should be made without any adequate consideration; and that we can only know by knowing the communications which passed between him and the representatives of the United States. I apprehend that the Senate of the United States will have before it the whole of the proceedings of this conference. I have no doubt about that. If it is not so, that body will be placed in a different position from that which it has occupied for a hundred years past. It is a responsible body under the constitution for the discharge of a certain duty in the ratification of treaties. We are a responsible body in the growth of public opinion and in the exactions of the people we represent, to the same extent, although not formally in the same way, as the Senate of the United States; and we are entitled to have before us, before we are asked to pass upon what was done at Washington, the proceedings of that conference; and I trust that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues will see that we have an opportunity of carefully considering what was done at that conference before we are called upon to pass finally upon the treaty which was negotiated.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has not answered the question whether he would give us a little intimation of the arguments he used. I do not wish to press him, if he thinks that is contrary to practice.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am afraid I will have to ask my hon. friend to wait until I have heard the motion from the other side of the House, and then he will probably have an opportunity of learning what my views are on the whole question.

ASSUMPTION OF TELEGRAPH LINES BY THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. DENISON moved :

That a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into the desirability of the Government acquiring all the electric telegraph lines in Canada, and that the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to hear such telegraph, railway companies and proprietors as may wish to be heard, by themselves, their counsels or agents, and to report to this House.

He said : In making this motion I would like to take the time of the House for a few minutes to explain it. The importance of this question first forced itself upon me when, within a year, we had an agitation in this country in favor of Commercial Union, started by a few strangers and possibly by a few Canadians. But the agitation was conducted chiefly by a person living in a foreign country, and who was at the same time the head of a large monopoly there—I refer to the Great North-Western Telegraph Company. We find that this gentleman, living in a foreign country, was enabled, by means of what are called dead-head telegrams and associated press despatches, to convey the idea all over Canada and abroad that the Canadian people were hungering for Commercial Union. I think, Mr. Speaker, the sequel has proved that these telegrams and reports which were sent broadcast throughout the land were untrue, because it has been shown where one or two gentlemen ventured to test public opinion in favor of the question, they were defeated when they went to the polls. The contrast was all the greater to me when I reflected that in Europe the telegraph system is everywhere under the control of the Government; I believe I am correct in saying that in every country in Europe the Government control the telegraph systems. I know that, in 1868, the telegraph system was controlled by the Governments in Belgium, Switzerland, Russia, Denmark, France, Austria, and also in Victoria and New South Wales. As the telegram is an instrument of conveying correspondence, it seems to me that since the Government take upon themselves the transmission of correspondence by letters, it is also right that they should assume the transmission of correspondence by telegram. As showing the importance of this question, I will read some extracts from an article that appeared recently in an American review in reference to the telegraph system :

"Its control over the press is, therefore, absolute. It has the power of life and death, for the telegraphic news is the vital breath of a daily newspaper. Such a power cannot exist without its exerting a pernicious influence on public affairs, and every observant public man has long perceived the demoralising influence of this powerful but subtle agency."

Again it says :

"The man who rules the associated press is master of the situation, for, if he has the ability to wield it, he has an instrument for shaping the opinion of millions, which, by the constancy, universality and rapidity of its action, defies competition."

Then it goes on to say :

"Because, in an era when public opinion is omnipotent, it can give, withhold or color the information which shapes that opinion at its pleasure, and the reputation of the ablest and purest public men may be fatally tarnished, in every town and village on the continent, by a midnight despatch."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that shows how important it is that this power should not be in the hands of a company—I might almost say, of an individual. Of course, the question comes up whether it will pay the Government to undertake the ownership of the telegraph system. In England, since 1870, the Government has controlled the telegraph system, and I find that up to 1885, when they had a shilling telegraph tariff, the system yielded a revenue; the rate was

then reduced to sixpence, and since then there has been a considerable annual deficit. But I believe it is the general opinion there that, in time, even at that low rate, the amount realised will be sufficient to pay the interest on the capital invested. We find that in Belgium, in 1862, at the rate of one and a-half francs, the messages sent were 105,278. In 1865 the rate was reduced to one-half franc, and the next year the messages were 692,536; and in 1871 the number sent was 1,560,673. This increase was made not only by business men and merchants, but by all classes of the people. Of course, in a compact country like Belgium, where the distances are so small, the time saved by the telegram over the post is small, and is much less than it would be in Canada, where, from the Island of Prince Edward to Vancouver, some eight or ten days might be saved by the transmission of a telegram instead of a letter. The fact of the Government owning the telegraphs no doubt cause the business to increase, and it has been found in the old world that while the business increases, the expenditure does not increase in the same ratio. I have the figures for north Germany, Belgium and Holland. In north Germany the increase in messages was 259 per cent., while the increase of expenditure was 83 per cent. In Belgium the increase in messages was 252 per cent.; increase of expenditure, 61 per cent. In Holland the increase of messages was 152 per cent.; increase of expenditure, 62 per cent. In Denmark the increase of messages was 149 per cent.; increase of expenditure 38 per cent. There is another reason why I think it is desirable to have the telegraph system placed under the control of the Government. We find that we have now two companies besides some lines already owned by the Government, and if a person sends a telegram by the C. P. R. line to a station on the Great North-Western, he is obliged to pay a double rate, no matter how short the distance may be. That would be remedied by the change proposed in the present system. Before closing my remarks I desire to give the House the increases in England during recent years. The telegraphs were taken over by the Government in 1870, at which time the number of messages sent was six millions. The old companies' average charge was two shillings for a less number of words than at present. In 1876 the messages sent had increased to twenty millions. In 1875 the Government in England reduced the rate from one shilling to sixpence. In 1887, the last year for which I have a return, the number of messages was 50,243,639. I had hoped to be able to lay before the House figures showing the financial results of the Government acquisition of the telegraph system, but there is a difficulty in obtaining these figures as the business is divided into two heads, one commercial and the other foreign. I understand, however, from the gentleman who obtained the information for me in England, that the department hope soon to be able to have a good surplus, sufficient to pay dividend on capital.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman who has made this motion did well to bring the subject to the attention of this House and the country. I have no doubt that hon. members will feel obliged to the hon. gentleman for his researches into the subject. The hon. gentleman refers to the post office system, which is in the hands of the Government, and he assimilates, to a certain degree, the telegraph to the post office system, and thinks that the post office being in the hands of the Government it is proper that the telegraph system should also be in their hands. This question is one that has been called to my attention more than once, and in regard to which a good deal may be said on both sides. I may at once say that, although the Government have already studied the question and have had it before them, they do not think at present they are in a position to give effect to the suggestions of the hon. gentleman. Nevertheless, he has called the attention of Parliament to the matter. No doubt it

Mr. DENISON.

will be discussed in the press and by the press, and also by public men who take a great interest in such questions, especially one of such magnitude requiring a very large sum to be voted by Parliament, if we were either to take one of the present lines of telegraph or to establish a Government line from one end of the country to the other. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman, having attained the object he had in view in calling the attention of Parliament to the subject, will be satisfied with having done so, and withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

LAND VILLA POST OFFICE, MONTMAGNY.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved for (Translation):

Copies of all papers, documents, petitions, &c., respecting the resignation of the postmaster of Land Villa, in the county of Montmagny, the appointment of another postmaster, and the change in the location of the post office.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the special attention of the Government on the motion I am about to make, because in spite of many personal representations made by myself to the Post Office Department, and petitions sent in by tax-payers, the matter was not taken into consideration. This is the reason why I lay the matter before the House. This particular post office has been pretty well knocked about in different political storms, and it has shifted its residence already once or twice. What the interested parties wanted by their petitions, and what I myself desired, was that the post office should be replaced where it stood before. Formerly this post office lay in St. François parish, in the same county, and when my predecessor in this House took up his dwelling in St. Peter's parish, he caused the post office of St. François to be transferred thither, I might almost say for his personal interest. Since his departure, this post office has been carried a few acres further on, on another party's farm. The former postmaster had resigned, and a person, keeping a little shop at the place, made application for the post office. Contrary to the wishes of a large number of tax-payers of the parish, his request was granted, and the post office transferred a few acres further on, instead of being brought back to its former site, where there are mills, stores, and a business centre. The best proof I can advance is that formerly the post office paid its expenses, whereas in the place where it now stands, according even to the Postmaster General's report, the Government are the losers by the sum of \$23.54 annually. The income of the office last year was \$38.46, while the outlay stood at \$62.00. I make no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that if this post office were returned to its original locality, it would fetch at least \$100 a year, and instead of a deficiency and a perfectly useless post office, in nowise meeting the wants of the public in that portion of the parish, the Government would have a surplus and the post office some usefulness. In the petitions submitted to the department the name of a certain party was put forth as postmaster of the place. This man runs a mill, and if the appointment were made in pursuance of the petitions, the revenues of the office would be larger and its utility enhanced. Where it now stands, it were best to close it for two reasons—first, because it is useless, and next, because the Government sustain a yearly loss of \$24. Of course, the sum is not great, but there are so many post offices throughout the country that the Government would lose quite a sum every year, if such a leakage occurred in each. Under the circumstances, I thought it best to lay the matter before the House and Government, with the view of a satisfactory solution, and I trust that justice will be done to the petitions which have been handed in. I hope that when the Government shall have looked over the papers which have lain a long time in the department, they will do the proper thing in the pre-

mises. Personally, I am indifferent to the matters, but I know that the tax payers of the locality, irrespective of party, have asked for the change, and that they have named in their petitions a party thoroughly qualified for the post. I feel certain that if the post office is removed to that spot, it will yield a considerable income and meet the wants of the residents.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As my hon. friend, the Postmaster General, is not as familiar with French as he is with English, I will reply for him by saying that it is possible the place chosen for the post office in question is not quite suitable, but that the Postmaster General is not aware of the fact. If representations have been laid before the department I am convinced that my colleague will attend to them fully, and do, in this instance, what he always does, give justice to all localities that are interested. The hon. member says that this post office has been knocked about by political waves and storms. Perhaps it is one of these waves that is now turning the mill. At all events, whether this be the case or not, the hon. gentleman may rest assured that the Postmaster General, now that his attention has been called to the subject, will see that the representations made to the Government are properly dealt with.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I had no intention of insinuating that the present incumbent of the post office does not do his duties, nor that the locality itself is unsuitable. I mean only that the site is not so favorable, because not meeting the views of the resident tax-payers. The hon. Postmaster General will be convinced of this himself on reading the petition, signed by persons of the two political parties indiscriminately, wherein they ask the removal of this post office, and point out, as well qualified to discharge the duties of postmaster the party mentioned in the text. I have no personal interest in the said locality, and have no hint to make against the present postmaster. I judge that he has done his duty, and that if he has not turned out more money it is because the post office does not afford more.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON TRADE COMBINATIONS

Mr. BOYLE moved :

That the powers of the Select Committee appointed by this House to examine into and report upon the nature, extent and effect of certain combinations be extended so as to include the alleged combinations of Fire Insurance Companies doing business in Canada.

He said: I may explain that the object of this motion is to permit the committee appointed by this House to extend their enquiry to this very important matter. Most of the members of this House are aware of the very powerful and very arbitrary rules which exist amongst the insurance companies doing business in Canada. If the powers given to the committee appointed by this House are insufficient to include these companies in their enquiry, I think the House should remove the restriction. The committee, in taking stock of their powers, discovered that they were not able to undertake this enquiry, and I, therefore, move this resolution to enable them to do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman deserves our thanks for his proposal to examine into this very important matter, but I would suggest to him that in view of its importance and in view of the very large amount of work that this committee will already have, that he would attain the end that he desires much better by having a special committee appointed for this subject itself. The hon. gentleman will see that, beyond all question, the investigation already assigned to the committee will probably occupy the greatest part of this Session, if not the

whole of it, and I presume that the subjects first assigned will take precedence. If this motion carries, his enquiry can hardly be brought on until a late period, and evidently it is a very important enquiry. I would suggest to him that it deserves a separate committee for itself.

Mr. BOYLE. I have no objection to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The only reason why, perhaps, my motion might be more convenient is that witnesses examined on other subjects may possibly give evidence on this subject also, and without additional expense we might be able to reach the object in view. If the wisdom of the House thinks that a Special Committee would be better, I certainly would have no objection to amend my motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Motion carried.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Which way is the motion carried. Has the hon. gentleman consented?

Mr. SPEAKER. Carried as it is.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CAPITAL ACCOUNT.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) moved for :

Return giving details of the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway charged to capital account for the years 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887.

He said: In moving this motion it is my object to obtain, if possible, from the Department of Railways a correct account in detail of the expenditure of public money which has been charged to capital account during the years mentioned in the notice. The hon. the Minister of Railways will, no doubt, remember that a somewhat similar motion was made on a previous occasion, and that on more than one occasion during that Session I called the attention of the hon. gentleman to the advisability of complying with the Order of the House. The hon. gentleman was disposed to put it off from day to day, until a few days previous to the rising of the House, he brought down what he might just as well have left where it was. He brought down simply a statement giving the gross amount charged to capital account during the years mentioned in the notice. That was not what I was aiming at at all. I say, without reflecting on the hon. gentleman or his Department more than is necessary, that there is an impression in this country that a large amount of money has been charged to capital account on the Intercolonial Railway which ought to have gone to the ordinary expenses year by year; and I know that opinion is shared by many on both sides of politics in this country. I have had conversations with gentlemen who are strong supporters of the present Administration, and I have had statements from them respecting the administration of that department which, if true, would show that the Government in many cases have been disposed not to repair the rolling stock where the expenses would have to be charged to the ordinary working expenses of the year, but have broken up or disposed of that stock and have replaced it by new stock which they can charge to the capital account instead. I will give to the hon. Minister of Railways a statement of that in private, which I do not wish to make public, because it came from a source to which I attach a very great importance, and upon which I place very great reliance. It was from a gentleman an active supporter of the Government of which the hon. gentleman is a member. Under those circumstances I think it would be desirable if the hon. the Minister would at a very early date comply with the Order of the House and produce here, as he will be able to do, a return giving the detailed expenditure on all branches of the Intercolonial Railway during the years referred to in the notice of motion. It cannot be a very long account, and even if it is long we are entitled to have

it because it will relieve the public mind, to a certain extent, if the Government can show that all the amount which has been charged to capital account during these years had a right to be charged to it. They should place us in possession of that before we discuss the railway accounts and before they are brought down. I hope the hon. the Minister of Railways will not delay, as he did here last year, in bringing down the return named in the scope of the motion, but will give us the full details as asked for correctly.

Mr. POPE. I do not know what was the wording of the hon. gentleman's motion last year. I notice this year that the wording of the motion is, that the return shall be brought down in detail.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And last year also.

Mr. POPE. I much prefer that should be the method adopted. I can say this to the hon. gentleman, in reference to the information which he says he has from somebody that seems to know so much about the railway, that not one engine has been sold for old iron or broken up, and a new engine bought and charged to capital account.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). And no cars?

Mr. POPE. And no cars either. If the hon. gentleman will look at the traffic accounts of that road he will see that they have more than doubled since 1876. He will also see that there must be a large amount of cars and a large amount of rolling stock added to the rolling stock, so as to be sufficient to meet this increase. The rolling stock required for this increase has been charged to capital account. A large amount of money has been expended on branches, and of course those branches have been charged to capital account, and that is why I would much rather bring the return down in detail, which will show the hon. gentleman and those who have given him this information that they are very much mistaken.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I promised the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) I would give him, at the next meeting of the committee, the reason for the increase of \$600 in the Finance Department at Winnipeg. I have made enquiry, and find that the increase is in consequence of changing the mode of payment of the officers there. They were allowed an additional sum for the increased cost of living, amounting to \$900. That has been reduced to \$600 by a readjustment of the salaries, so that there is really an actual saving of \$300.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under what head did that extra allowance appear before?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I suppose it was probably paid out of contingencies, but I will get the information.

Departmental Contingencies..... \$199,250

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is an increase of \$11,544.02. That arises from taking a vote for what is found to be the actual expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that it is very much better that he should ask for \$200,000, than that the vote should be habitually exceeded. But I would like to know from him, generally, how much of this vote really goes to extra clerks employed in the departments. Every now and then we hear that such-and-such a man has been employed and paid out of the contingencies, so that really there is a saving, but the

Mr. JONES (Halifax.)

contingencies appear to be increasing all the same. How much of this goes to pay extra clerks, and how many does the hon. gentleman suppose will be employed beyond the force of a thousand strong that I think we have already at headquarters?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will get that specific information and give it at the next meeting. The principal increase in this vote is in the Privy Council, to which the Department of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has been added.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I to understand that the same amount is practically taken from Legislation, for I do not think I find any corresponding decrease there?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That change has been made since last Session.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that the item of cab-hire and travelling expenses in connection with the Privy Council was pretty large last year. The First Minister had \$1,900 for travelling expenses. Of course, I suppose it is necessary, when he goes on a mission in the performance of his duty as First Minister, that his expenses should be paid; but at the same time I think it is well that the House should have some explanation of this large item. I notice also that for cab-hire, the hon. gentleman got for himself \$652, and that persons not named got \$696—some \$3,500 in all in connection with travelling expenses and cab-hire. This question of cab-hire has been before the House for several years, and I think it is time some understanding should be come to in regard to it. If the hon. First Minister finds that a salary of \$3,000 a year and \$1,000 for sessional allowance is not sufficient to enable him to pay his own cab-hire, let us increase his salary, and make it sufficient to enable him to do that. Then I would like to know how it is that such a large sum as \$690 should be voted for cab-hire to persons not named, without any explanation being given to the House. This expenditure is growing from year to year, and I think some explanation should be given of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I cannot at this moment give a full explanation as to the amount of my cab-hire. I suppose it is because I am getting older, and cannot walk so much as I formerly could. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman's suggestion that all this expenditure for cab-hire might be avoided by increasing the salary of the Minister. I will go with him that far. I think my hon. friend who was my predecessor will tell him that with the obligations thrown on the Prime Minister, he cannot, unless he has private resources, keep horses and carriages, as he, no doubt, found himself. We are obliged to draw considerably on our private resources, from whatever source they come, in addition to what we get from the public in the way of salary. However, if the hon. gentleman would like to ascertain the items of this expenditure, I will get them. These items, I take it, are laid before the Auditor, and he is satisfied with the audit or he would not pass them. However, I am satisfied that the papers are before the Committee of Public Accounts, and the hon. gentleman may, if he thinks more convenient, have the vouchers for every quarter of a dollar that may have been paid for persons, named or unnamed, for cab-hire.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am willing that the Premier should obtain as much as I got.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You are talking of the doctrine of averages. You should take the average of my hon. friend. There is in the Department of Agriculture an increase of \$5,000; what is that caused by?

Mr. CARLING. That is caused chiefly by the additional work relating to the Patent branch, the expenditure of which is more than paid for by the receipts from patents

and trade marks. The receipts exceed the expenses by \$13,000. This extra \$5,000 is caused by the employment of extra clerks in the Patent branch.

Amount required to provide for the contingent expenses of the High Commissioner in London..... \$2,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think really the House is entitled to a good deal of explanation of this item. Is the hon. the Minister of Finance going to elect to be the Finance Minister of Canada or the High Commissioner of Canada, and when will he make up his mind? I have no doubt he will render good service in either capacity, but it does appear to me the hon. gentleman cannot be conveniently in both places at once. I know, and I think by this time he knows, that the office of Finance Minister of Canada is quite enough to occupy all the time, attention, and talents of any ordinary mortal, and I do not think that, industrious and able as he may be, he can at one and the same time efficiently discharge the duties of High Commissioner and Minister of Finance. Moreover, he will recollect that when the High Commissionership was created we were told it was a most important office, and that it was absolutely necessary in the interests of Canada we should have some sort of resident permanent ambassador at the Court of St. James to look after our interests. If that be so, and it was on that ground this office was created by statute, how can the First Minister, let alone the Minister of Finance, reconcile it with his conscience to keep that most important office practically vacant during all the period of time the Minister of Finance is attending to his duties here. I think we must press for some decision on the part of the hon. the Minister of Finance. He is very useful here, and I am bound to say that, although I differ from him *in toto caelo* as to his policy, I think he is much the best Minister of Finance I have come across in my time, on that side of the House, for a long period of years. He is entirely wrong as to his ends, but he has a very clear perception of the way to attain them, perhaps too clear for the public good sometimes. However that may be, and notwithstanding his great talents, that does not enable him to be at two places at once; and as it is imperatively necessary that we should have a Finance Minister, and imperatively necessary—as we have declared by statute it is—that we should have a High Commissioner, the hon. the First Minister and the hon. gentleman are bound to explain to the House how it is they have left that office vacant for such a long period of time.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must tender my very sincere thanks to the hon. gentleman for the very great and undeserved compliment, for I feel it is quite undeserved, that he has been good enough to pay me across the floor of the House. I do not think I will have a great deal of difficulty in satisfying the House that no very great injury has been inflicted on the country by the saving of \$10,000 during the past twelve months, owing to my having been charged with the performance of the duties of Minister of Finance and at the same time with the supervision of the office of the High Commissioner in London. I think I could satisfy the House without much difficulty that greater service has never been performed in connection with this office than I have been able to perform in that capacity, or in relation to the duties of that office, since this House met last Session. I can only say, that I believe in no period has the office of High Commissioner, or the connection with Her Majesty's Government, been of greater value in every possible way to Canada than it has been during the last recess of Parliament, when I was charged, on the other side of the Atlantic, with looking after the duties of that office as well as those of the Finance Department. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that he cannot be half as anxious as I am that I should be relieved

of the double duties which have devolved upon me to a considerable extent for some time past. I feel my inadequacy, certainly, in every way to continue for any lengthened period duties so onerous as those which have been thrown upon me, but which, being thrown upon me, I have endeavored to discharge to the best of my ability in the interests of the country. The fact remains that although the duties of the office of High Commissioner have not been performed with the same satisfaction and advantage as they would have been, had there been a permanent officer all the time in London, yet, I think, from my intimate acquaintance with the public men of both the great parties in England, I have been enabled, although filling the office of Finance Minister at the same time, to perform very valuable and important services for the country in connection with the supervision of that office. I hope that my right hon. friend, the First Minister, may make such arrangements as will relieve me at a very early period from the double duties which have been placed upon my shoulders, but which, being called on to perform, I have performed to the best of my abilities.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has spoken in very flattering terms of himself with reference to the discharge of the duties of High Commissioner, since he has practically abandoned the office to come to this side of the Atlantic. What the hon. gentleman has said may be true, but, at all events, it would perhaps have been less embarrassing to him and more satisfactory to the House if he had entrusted the First Minister with those handsome compliments which he has paid himself during the past five minutes. Now, we all very well remember the observations which were addressed to the House at the time it was proposed to create the office of High Commissioner. The hon. gentleman told the House at that time that it was absolutely necessary to have a Minister residing in London, that it was impossible that anyone residing on this side of the Atlantic could discharge the duties required of the High Commissioner; and the hon. gentleman told us that it would altogether relieve the Government from the necessity of sending one of its members yearly to the other side of the Atlantic to call the attention of the English Government to those important matters on which it was necessary that they should receive information from some one occupying a high position as Minister of the Crown or High Commissioner in London. The hon. gentleman at that time, acting as a Minister of the Crown, as head of the Administration, marked out the policy of the country. The hon. gentleman introduced to the House an Act in which he provided for the appointment of the High Commissioner, and pointed out what the High Commissioner's duty should be, and fixed the salary of the High Commissioner. Well, after someone else had discharged those duties for some time, the present Finance Minister was appointed to that position. The hon. gentleman may have discharged the duties very well. We, at all events, know what the expenses of the office have been, although we have not had laid before us the cogent evidence, which would have been highly satisfactory if it had been presented, for the eminent or important services which the hon. gentleman has performed. It is true that the hon. gentleman has recently acted as one of Her Majesty's representatives or Commissioners at Washington to negotiate the treaty which is now under consideration, but the hon. gentleman did not so act as High Commissioner in England. He received that special appointment quite as much as a member of the Government of Canada as the representative of Canada in London. There may be differences of opinion as to the advantages which the country has derived from the negotiation of that treaty, but this is very clear: that either the First Minister was wrong when he introduced that Bill in the opinions he expressed then, or the hon.

gentleman ought not to be here now. If the First Minister has found it necessary to the existence of his Government that the Finance Minister should have lent to that Government his very powerful support, in that case he ought not to have insisted upon the Finance Minister continuing to hold the office of High Commissioner in London. The hon. gentleman is bound, as much as anyone else in this country, to obey the law. In fact, he ought to set an example to the rest of the country, and, therefore, he ought to insist upon his colleague discharging the duties which the law imposes upon him; but, contrary to the law, contrary to the provisions of the law, and contrary to his own declaration, he is setting a very bad example to the country instead of a good one. The hon. gentleman who undertook to answer the enquiry made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), sat down without doing so. He was asked whether he proposed to continue in the office of High Commissioner or to retain the office of Finance Minister; and the hon. gentleman told the House that his duties were very onerous, that he felt he was scarcely equal to the task of holding the two offices, and that he would have to abandon one of them by-and-bye, but whether it was the office of High Commissioner or the office of Finance Minister that he was to abandon he did not inform us. I think that, after the hon. gentleman has taken the committee into his confidence, so far as to state that he intends to abandon one office or the other, he ought to have gone a step further and to have stated which office he would abandon. I think the hon. gentleman is not entitled to hold both these offices. The hon. gentleman is required, by the Act which makes him the High Commissioner, to reside in London. The hon. gentleman does not reside in London. The hon. gentleman is entitled as High Commissioner to draw a particular salary, which, if he was to draw it, disqualifies him not only from being Minister of Finance but from being a member of this House. Now, whether the hon. gentleman has drawn the salary of High Commissioner or the salary of Minister of Finance, I do not know, and I do not know that he knows. Of course he will say that he has drawn the salary of the office which subjects him to the least inconvenience; but the hon. gentleman, when he was at Washington, whether he was acting there more in his capacity as High Commissioner, or more as a Minister of the Crown, should have known in what capacity he was acting. He was not here to discharge his duties as Minister of the Crown, and we find that he is not prepared to submit to the House his Budget speech. Why not? Because he has not been here to discharge the duties of Minister of Finance, and is therefore not prepared to meet Parliament in the ordinary way. I say the present position of things is one which is highly censurable, one that this House ought not to sanction, one that the First Minister ought not to have permitted to exist; but, nevertheless, we believe, or we have been informed, that the First Minister informed his colleague a little more than a year ago that, unless he came to this country, all was lost. He came back, and, without abandoning the position of High Commissioner, he entered upon an active canvass in Nova Scotia, which, as far as I know, did not contribute very much to the discharge of those duties which he had been appointed to perform as High Commissioner. By his extraordinary activity and great energy, and not less by his extraordinary promises, he succeeded in getting a majority from his Province, and the hon. gentleman, in accordance with the requirements of political exigencies, is still here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, hon. gentlemen may say "hear, hear," but the hon. gentleman is not in London, he is not where the First Minister said his duties could only be performed, in London, and that he would be constantly there, that he would be in daily contact, if necessary, with

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell)

the Colonial Secretary and other parties who might be connected with the commercial and other interests of this country. Well, Sir, is not the hon. gentleman well aware that it is impossible for him to discharge at the same time the duties of High Commissioner? I say we are entitled to know from the Government whether they have changed their views with regard to the importance of having a High Commissioner residing in London, for it is perfectly preposterous to talk about having a High Commissioner unless he resides where the law intended he should reside. If the hon. gentleman has discharged those duties in the highly efficient manner which he has spoken about to this House, he has done so while residing in this country, while engaged in the discharge of the duties of a Minister of the Crown, and if that be so, why does he continue to act as a Minister of the Crown while acting as High Commissioner? By his own confession, by his own observations addressed to the committee upon the efficient and important work which he has performed on behalf of the country during the past twelve months, he has shown conclusively that the First Minister was wrong in proposing to the House that there should be a High Commissioner appointed, and that he should reside in London.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MILLS. Why, does the First Minister not know that his colleague has been in this country for the past fifteen months? or has the hon. gentleman, like Rip Van Winkle, been sleeping during the whole of that time?

Mr. POPE. I did not say "no."

Mr. MILLS. Well, some hon. gentleman said "no" from the Treasury benches. Like Lord Castlereagh, he has been airing his vocabulary, and does not exactly know what he did say. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that the committee are entitled to know what are the views of the Government upon this question. Do they propose to continue the office of High Commissioner, who was intended to reside in London, and whom they intend shall reside here in Canada? Do they propose that the exigencies of the public service shall adapt themselves to the exigency of party, and when it is necessary, in order to save the Government from defeat, that the hon. gentleman should come back from London, he is brought back; and when, as we are told by the hon. gentleman himself, as I understand him, the Government could not find anybody else to fill his place. The First Minister boasts that he has a large following in this House, he boasts that he has the majority of the country at his back. Well, that may be so; but if it is, what an extraordinary commentary it is upon the majority of the people of this country, when there is only one man, the Finance Minister, according to his own statement, who is competent to discharge the work of High Commissioner in London. The hon. gentleman is better in this country as High Commissioner than any other man the First Minister can find amongst his supporters, would be in London itself. Inconvenient as it may be, contrary as it may be to the policy which the First Minister has laid down for the country, that the High Commissioner should reside in London, yet we are told by the hon. gentleman that he has performed a most important service to the Government as High Commissioner while he has been on this side of the Atlantic, and that he would be delighted if the First Minister would find some one who would relieve him of his duties. But the First Minister has looked over his vast following, and amongst them all he has been unable to find a man to fill the place the hon. gentleman occupies, 3,000 miles away from the only place in which the First Minister told us any party could efficiently discharge the duties of the office.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I fully agree in the tribute which has been paid to the ability of the Finance Minister by the

hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I also fully and frankly accept his statement that the work of the office of High Commissioner was never more efficiently performed than during the year that has passed. But we must bear in mind that the hon. gentleman has performed other important duties during the past year than those already alluded to. It is something like fifteen months, if my memory serves me rightly, since he vacated the office of High Commissioner; during that time he has had to engage in two onerous election contests, and he has also spent three months as British plenipotentiary at Washington. Now, Mr. Chairman, if one man can discharge the office of Finance Minister during that space of time, and at the same time discharge all the duties of High Commissioner efficiently, the question will naturally arise in simple minds whether it would not be possible and profitable to abolish the office of High Commissioner altogether. Seeing these duties can be so efficiently performed from this side with all these other duties superadded, the question will be raised, and it will have to be answered: Why cannot the High Commissionership be abolished, saving to the country all the enormous expense connected therewith? It may be that it is not easy to find a man with the abilities of the hon. gentleman who fills the office of Finance Minister, but I think we may make the experiment, and as that hon. gentleman must at some time or other leave the office, whether by resignation or in the course of nature, we will hope that Providence will allow his mantle to fall on some other gentleman who can discharge those duties quite as efficiently.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the House is certainly entitled to know what the policy of the Government is. There is no doubt that this office should be dispensed with, or it should be filled. One of those two things should be done. If it be correct that the Minister of Finance, after discharging the duties of that department, is able, in the trifling portion of time which can remain to him, to discharge the duties of High Commissioner as well, then a very strong case has been made out for abolishing the High Commissionership, as my hon. friend has suggested. Before this vote is passed the Government ought certainly to tell the House what their policy is with respect to the High Commissionership.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was rather amused at hearing the speech of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I am going to appeal to the leader of the Opposition to keep order in his camp, and not allow two hon. gentlemen to war against each other, as they generally do in a polite way, certainly. I think the hon. member for Bothwell commenced by an attack on my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, by saying that he has been praising himself. Well, as I understand it, the praise came from the hon. member who sits beside the hon. member for Bothwell, and knows more about these things than he does. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), stated that he believed that my hon. friend was the best Finance Minister he had seen, at all events, from this side of the House. He did not, of course, compare him with any Minister of Finance who might, perhaps, belong to the other side. That, of course, he was too modest to do. But there is one thing most extraordinary, and it is this: the utter reluctance of hon. gentlemen opposite, the party of Reform, to consent to any economy, or any saving of any kind. My hon. friend who sits near me enjoys the highly honorable and useful office of High Commissioner at a salary of \$10,000 a year, besides the allowances which some hon. gentlemen have cavilled at so much from time to time. But, because he undertook to perform efficiently the duties of High Commissioner, while at the same time he acted as Finance Minister, saving the whole of the \$10,000 to the country, and performing the duties of both offices for

\$7,000, the hon. gentleman says at once that this is an abuse. As Lord Palmerston used to say: "General professions of economy are the most popular things in the world, but the moment economy is exercised that moment it is the most unpopular step in the world." Hon. gentlemen opposite think it is unfortunate. Perhaps hon. gentlemen, looking at the early probability of their transfer to this side of the House, think it is a bad example to set that an hon. gentleman should consent to work for \$7,000 when he might have drawn the whole \$10,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He might not have drawn the whole \$10,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is the position taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite. But the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says there is a good case made out for doing away with the office of High Commissioner. I think we formerly had Agents Generals in England—I think hon. gentlemen opposite appointed Agents Generals or an Agent General.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We never appointed an Agent General; we appointed a Superintendent of Immigration.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, at all events, I think Mr. Jenkins styled himself Agent General. Everybody can remember that Mr. Jenkins signed himself that, and was so styled in his communications. My hon. friend beside me says it was on his door-plate.

"Exegi monumentum ære perennius."

My hon. friend near me says he was so economical that he actually charged the cost of the plate against the Government. If that had been done by my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) it would have been charged against him as an unwarrantable waste of public funds. An Agent General or an agent was thought by both Governments in 1867 to be required in England, thereby doing only what other colonies, especially the Australian colonies, had been doing for many years; and the Imperial Government thought it was so important that they themselves appointed agents to represent the Crown colonies, so that every description of dependency should be represented in England. In consequence of the rising importance—perhaps the hon. gentlemen opposite will cavil at that—of the prestige and position of the Dominion of Canada over, we are proud enough to believe, every other dependency of the Crown, it was thought well to mark our progress and our position by changing the name of our agent to the High Commissioner for Canada. I do not know that hurt anybody; I do not know that our interests were injured by the change of the title from Agent General to High Commissioner. Sir Alexander Galt performed those duties for some time; financially, Sir John Rose performed them for some time, and when my friend and colleague was appointed High Commissioner there was a general consensus of opinion that we were sending a valuable man who would be able to perform the duties of that office. The only question is this: Were the duties well performed or not? The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has paid a compliment to my hon. friend, a compliment which we all believe to be deserved, but which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) thinks it necessary to cavil at.

Mr. MILLS. No, I do not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Or to sneer at.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He insinuates—

Mr. MILLS. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—that which he, perhaps, does not care to assert openly, for it would look too much

like a division of opinion between the two hon. gentlemen. But the hon. member for South Oxford paid a compliment in the manner in which my hon. friend has administered the office of Minister of Finance. The hon. member for Bothwell says he did not sneer at that; but he said my hon. friend cannot be a good Minister of Finance, for he has not performed his duty, that on the tenth day of the Session he has not made his Budget speech. He differed from the statement by the hon. member for South Oxford; he said my hon. friend could not be a good Finance Minister because he had not his Budget ready, he was not ready to make his Budget speech.

Mr. MILLS. I said nothing of the sort.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman said my hon. friend was not able to perform his duty as Finance Minister because he was otherwise employed and could not get up his Budget speech. If that is not a censure I do not know what is. However, I will leave these little domestic quarrels or little domestic differences of opinion—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon for calling them quarrels—to be settled by themselves.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You are used to them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. I have had a little experience in that way I admit, and I think I have got over them as successfully as he has done on some occasions. My hon. friend became Finance Minister. He waived the difference between \$7,000 and \$10,000. He was elected, and he sat in Parliament during the dead season of the year, giving considerable strength, considerable support and considerable comfort to myself, to his colleagues, to the country and to our friends on the Ministerial benches, and giving equal discomfort and disheartenment to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. During the dead season of the year he came in and gave us his valuable services, and earned then, as he has continued to earn, the compliments of hon. gentlemen opposite. As soon as the Session was over, after the Budget was made and the principles on which the taxation of the country was to be regulated were determined, the mere administration of the Department of Finance is a matter which does not call for the abilities of the political head of the department. The hon. gentleman knows that in the mere administration of the votes of Parliament the deputy head, Mr. Courtney, is the man to attend to it; and the hon. gentleman knows that in all cases of difficulty, in addition to there being a general reference to Council, there was a special reference to the Minister of Customs, whose department administers one of the largest sources of revenue. Perhaps the hon. gentleman opposite will object to that, because the Minister of Customs performed his duties and did not ask the difference between \$7,000 and \$10,000, although he was two Ministers rolled into one, performing both duties.

Mr. MILLS. He could not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. During the whole of the summer my hon. friend has performed his duties in England, more especially in regard to important financial arrangements connected with the credit of Canada, besides important continental duties. After performing those duties as agent—not as High Commissioner, for such a phrase would give offence to the hon. gentlemen opposite—during the whole of the summer, he came back in December or January, and he went back to his constituents for re-election and vindicated his right to a seat in this House, and his right to the continuance of that office, the duties of which the hon. gentleman says he is performing so ably. We have saved the money of the country, and I have no doubt that either my hon. friend or some other person will perform the duties, at the opening of the season, of High Commissioner for Canada in England. Whether I

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

can spare my hon. friend from his present position of Minister of Finance and allow him to go back to England, depends a good deal on hon. gentlemen opposite. If they are very fierce in their attacks on us, if we become afraid of being overwhelmed by the superior ability of the hon. gentleman opposite, I may say to my hon. friend: I cannot spare you, I must keep you to fight those gentlemen. But if they are as mild as they have been at the commencement of the Session—with the exception of the hon. member for Bothwell, who is a party to himself—if things continue as pleasant as they have been hitherto, perhaps I may be able to spare my hon. friend. Do I understand the hon. gentlemen opposite desire, does the hon. member for Bothwell and does the hon. member for Middlesex desire it? He is not satisfied with this state of things and he cannot say: You must not have an agent at home, because his own party had agents at home. They never could do without agents at home. Therefore we must have an agent at home. The hon. gentleman has said that it is of more consequence to have a commissioner in England and a Finance Minister here, and to pay \$10,000 there and \$7,000 here, than to allow the hon. the Minister of Finance to do the duties as High Commissioner at a season when he is wanted, and at the same time remain here to be a terror to evil-doers and a praise to them that do well. The hon. gentleman who has spoken knows the good qualities of the Finance Minister best of any member sitting on that side of the House, and he knows his capacity and ability to fill the position.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. the Premier knows the force of the constitutional objection, and knows a good many other things too, but I do not know whether he has taken lessons in that kind of theatrical performance known as "gag," because I am bound to say that he has not given a proper explanation of this matter. Here is an important constitutional question raised by an hon. gentleman, and yet he treats it with the most absurd levity, and he talks about his economy in saving money by the union of both offices. Either we should have a High Commissioner according to the statute, or the office has become useless and unnecessary. Our contention is that the hon. the Minister of Finance constitutionally has no business and no right to hold those two offices together—no right whatever. To that point the hon. gentleman did not address himself at all, but he preferred to conjure up a difference which did not exist at all as between my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and myself. My hon. friend from Bothwell did not say one word in derogation of the way in which the Minister of Finance had discharged his duties. His remarks were directed to the fact, and the patent fact, that the Minister of Finance cannot discharge the duties of Finance Minister and High Commissioner at the same time. If the hon. the First Minister's statement to the House at a former time can be relied upon, questions of grave importance may arise in London during our Session, at which time it would be desirable to have a High Commissioner there. It is perfectly clear that he can by no possibility be there as the arrangement is at present. It is also contended that it is in violation of the clear purport of the Act which creates the High Commissioner, that the same man should hold both offices. Of course he cannot draw the salary of High Commissioner, because, as the hon. gentleman knows right well, that would disqualify him from sitting in Parliament, and subject him to a high penalty besides. Do not we recollect that the hon. the Minister of Finance had to have a special whitewashing indemnity Bill put through this House in order to save him from the penalties, and we remember when he could not vote in this House, although he spoke and sat in it, and on the occasion of every division that he had to retire to the gallery and look down on the hon. the Premier and his colleagues voting in support of himself. The hon. the First

Minister was good enough to endeavor, as he has done very often, though unsuccessfully heretofore, and he may rest assured unsuccessfully on this occasion, too, to create some little animosity between my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and myself. He will be totally unsuccessful in that or in any similar attempt. We know that it is part of the hon. Minister's stock-in-trade to try and set hon. gentlemen on this side of the House by the ears. I remember once when I heard the hon. gentleman in the afternoon rise and compliment my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) on the breadth and statesmanlike nature of his views, and point out the contrast between them and the narrow-minded and pedantic views of my lamented friend, the late member for Chateaugay. I recollect hearing the First Minister, after returning from dinner the same night, compliment the late lamented member for Chateaugay on the breadth and statesmanlike nature of his views, which he described as in utter contradiction to the narrow pedantry of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). I have known the hon. gentleman long and well, and I beg to assure him that no such little devices as these are likely to have the least effect on my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) or upon me. The hon. gentleman has not, as usual, told us one word as to his real intentions about this office of High Commissioner, nor has the Finance Minister told us whether he is going to elect to be Finance Minister or High Commissioner. I say it is unconstitutional in the highest degree for the hon. gentleman to hold both those offices. That is our point, and that point neither he nor the First Minister have ventured to meet in any way whatever.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can well remember that at the time the First Minister proposed we should have a High Commissioner at London, that he stated that the country would save such a very large amount of money in commissions, owing to the fact of having a High Commissioner in London, that the duties of our financial agents would be performed by him. I notice that last year we paid no less than \$7,600 to Sir John Rose for commissions on account of transactions performed on behalf of this country, while at the same time we had a High Commissioner in London. I notice also that we have paid this year a very large amount on commission and interest to Baring Bros. & Co., about \$17,811, and to Glen, Mills, Currie & Co. \$16,398, in addition to a further large amount to Mr. Rose on commissions. If the High Commissioner is supposed to perform all the duties in connection with the financial transactions in London, and if it is possible for him to save the country these very large sums, it would be very much better for the country to have him in London than to have him here. If we are to continue paying this \$34,000 in London on commissions only, because the Finance Minister of this country is not in London, it would be much better to have him there. It is rather singular that the hon. the First Minister has not been able to find a person whom he could place in the position of Finance Minister, and who would be able to discharge the duties properly. From my little experience of this House I can remember the very sickening exhibition made by his predecessor, with regard to the finances of the country, in the statement he delivered to this House. I do not wonder at all that the First Minister found it necessary to recall the hon. gentleman in order to discharge those duties. I can remember when we had the experience of his hon. colleague who sits behind him. I am sure his friends on that side of the House as well as on this, thought it desirable that some change should be made, and some man, better able to make a more intelligent explanation of the finances than he did on that occasion, selected. The First Minister only kept the hon. gentleman referred to one year in that position, when he removed him to a less important position and recalled the hon. gentleman who now fills the office. I also admit that the hon. the Finance Minister was recalled.

An hon. MEMBER. To carry the elections.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, for the twofold purpose.

Mr. BOWELL. And he did both well.

Mr. McMULLEN. I question very much if there is any man on that side of the House that could, with the same amount of force and sincerity, impose upon the country the enormous amount that he did impose in his last Budget speech by the increase of iron duties. I do not know that there is any other man who would have had daring enough to bring before this House a measure carrying with it such serious responsibilities to the consumers of iron in this country. Notwithstanding that fact he was equal to the occasion, and he laid this burden on the people of the country, who are now suffering from the results of the introduction of that policy of his last Session. There are one or two questions that have a right to be settled with regard to this matter. Either the High Commissionership is necessary or it is not necessary; and I say the country should not be called upon to pay the Minister of Finance his expenses across the Atlantic every now and then, all of which expenses connected with the positions which is filled by him are incurred. I find from the Public Accounts that the travelling expenses of the hon. gentleman have been paid in connection with the High Commissionership. If the hon. the First Minister intends to lead the House to understand that the hon. the Finance Minister is only drawing his salary as Finance Minister, he is mistaken. If he looks at the report he will find that the Minister of Finance has drawn money in connection with the High Commissionership at London. It is, therefore, unfair to attempt to give the impression to the House that he is only drawing money as Finance Minister and not as High Commissioner. As a matter of fact he is drawing money as both. The fact is that if the hon. gentleman were asked to explain the exact amount drawn as High Commissioner and as Minister of Finance, he would probably be unable to tell where one ceased and where the other began. But, occupying both offices, he has drawn a very large sum, and he has also drawn a great deal for travelling expenses. If the office of High Commissioner is at all necessary, and if we are going to save all the money that the hon. First Minister declared we would save by the establishment of that office, the sooner he fills it the better. Is it a fact, that, among the ranks of the hon. First Minister's followers, he cannot find a man of sufficient intelligence, ability, wisdom and sagacity to discharge the duties of High Commissioner in London? How is it that among all the bright geniuses he has in his ranks he cannot find one capable of performing the duties of Finance Minister? We admit that his last experiment in filling that office was a very deplorable and unfortunate one, but he should try again. Perhaps he has better material now than he had then. I hope the hon. First Minister will frankly state to the House what he intends to do. If the country is going to have the benefit of the hon. Finance Minister in the office of High Commissioner, we will promise him to cultivate that forbearance necessary to enable a new Finance Minister to get acquainted with the facts and figures connected with the finances of this country to enable him to discharge his duties, without pouncing on him too severely. But he should do one thing or the other. The hon. First Minister, when he asked us to assent to the appointment of the hon. Minister of Finance as High Commissioner, declared, with a great deal of gravity, that unless we did so the country would lose a great deal of money in paying commissions in London, and the expenses would be a great drain on our finances. But did that drain or those expenses stop? No; they went on the same as before. Sir John Rose drew a large amount of money last year, and I see his name in the list again this year.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is that possible ?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, it is ; and if you look at the Auditor General's Report you will find it so. We sympathise with the hon. First Minister. We admit the difficulty which he has in finding anyone to fill the office of High Commissioner ; we admit that the hon. Finance Minister filled it with great ability ; and we admit that it is very difficult for him to find anyone among his followers to fill the office of Finance Minister. We admit, in view of the extravagance and profligacy with which the finances of the country are administered by hon. gentlemen opposite, that it is difficult to get a man who has brass enough and boldness enough to take that office. The hon. gentleman has a great many followers with plenty of those qualities, but I do not know that he has one man in whom they are combined to such an extent as they are in the hon. gentleman who now holds the office.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not intend to say very much on this matter, but I want to appeal to the hon. High Commissioner, if he is High Commissioner, or to the hon. Finance Minister if he is Finance Minister, or I appeal to him in both capacities, to act squarely and honestly before this country and select one position or the other. When the hon. gentleman was appointed High Commissioner everybody was pleased. The country had confidence in his ability, and I think his career on the other side of the Atlantic showed that a High Commissioner who had some skill and some knowledge of the interests of this country was of great service. I recollect that on one occasion when Canada was threatened with being scheduled against the importation of cattle into Great Britain, the hon. gentleman took the matter up, went down to Liverpool, went into the cattle yards, took off his coat, and, with that scientific and practical knowledge which he possesses, convinced the British Commissioners that it was unnecessary to schedule the cattle of Canada. We acknowledge the great service he has rendered to the country in many other ways ; but I hold that it is a disgrace to this House to have a man occupying the office of High Commissioner in London, where his residence is and where his duties lie, at the same time sitting here as Finance Minister. There is no man on that side of the House in whom I have as much confidence as the Finance Minister of Canada. I know his ability, I know his courage, his determination and his cheek, and I commend him for it. But, Sir, I do protest as an independent man against the Premier of this country trifling with the Constitution by appointing a man High Commissioner to-day, and, when it is necessary to bulldoze Nova Scotia in the general election, sending for my hon. friend to come out and use his influence to carry that Province. Sir, there is no man in Canada who could have done it but the hon. gentleman ; and if the right hon. First Minister occupies the position of Premier of this country to-day, he owes it to the man sitting on his right, who occupies the dual position of High Commissioner and Finance Minister. I say it is time this farce was at an end, and I ask, for the reputation of the hon. gentleman himself, that it should be brought to an end, for I am afraid that otherwise he will fall in the high esteem in which I have ever held him. I say it is an outrage on the part of the Premier of this House to perpetrate on this House and this country the act of keeping a man in two positions at the same time, with the functions of the one to perform on the other side of the Atlantic, and the functions of the other on this side. I hope we shall have a vote on this question, and I could not allow the occasion to pass without expressing my views on the course the Government are taking.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. McMULLEN.

RETURN ORDERED.

Return showing the amount voted each Session since 1880 for subsidies to Railways ; also, the amount to each Province, and the amount that has been paid.—(Mr. Semple.)

ADJOURNMENT—L'ASSOMPTION ELECTION.

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

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask if the writ for the election in the county of L'Assomption has been issued ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It has, and we have fixed the nomination for as early a day as we could.

Mr. LAURIER. What date ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think the 3rd of next month will be the last day of voting. There has been no more than the legal delay.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 9th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Detroit River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Dominion Plate Glass Insurance Company.—(Mr. Holton.)

Bill (No. 33) to amend the Act incorporating the Hereford Branch Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Hereford Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 34) respecting the South Norfolk Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

DEATH OF THE EMPEROR OF GERMANY.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire whether the Government have received any positive information of the death of the Emperor of Germany ?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We have not received any positive information as a Government, but some of my colleagues and myself have received from the telegraph office a statement that the Emperor died this morning at half-past eight, and that the report was confirmed officially.

THE FISHERY TREATY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I promised the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that I would lay on the Table to-day the letter addressed to me by Mr. Bayard, and my answer.

QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the acting Premier to a rumor that is afloat, of an act which is somewhat at variance with the constitutional government of this country. It is that His Excellency the Governor General invited Messrs. Greenway and Martin, the repre-

representatives of the Government of Manitoba who are at present here, to an interview with him in relation to the difficulties existing between that Province and the Dominion. Now, as I understand constitutional government, the business of the country is carried on by the Ministers, who are responsible to this House and to the people for the acts which pass under the name of the Government, and hence under the name of Her Gracious Majesty the Queen; and if it is true, and I believe it is, that by the invitation of the Governor those gentlemen have had an interview with him on these matters, I would like to know whether it was at the instance of the Government or at the instance of the Governor himself? If it was the latter, I should regret that, at the close of a long career, which has been satisfactory alike to the people and the Government, His Excellency should attempt to interfere with matters that pertain solely to his advisers, and for which they are responsible. Therefore, I would like to know whether the Governor has acted on behalf of his Government, or whether he has assumed a responsibility which, in my opinion, he has no right to assume?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I hope the hon. gentleman will renew his question when the hon. First Minister is here. The charge that the hon. gentleman makes, or supposes can be made, against His Excellency the Governor General, is one that should be met by the First Minister. For my own part, all I can say to the hon. gentleman is that we, as the responsible advisers of the Crown, are ready at all times to take the responsibilities of any act of the Governor General in matters of State; and His Excellency, to my knowledge, and I have no doubt to the knowledge of the House, has never exposed himself to be called to account for any interference that would not be in a constitutional way.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not a question whether the Government assumed the responsibility of the acts of the Governor or not. The question I put is whether the Governor performed this act with the knowledge and at the request of the Government of the day, or whether he assumed it on his own mere motion. If the latter, I hold that he is interfering with matters with which he has no right to interfere under the Constitution. Now that the hon. First Minister has come in, I would repeat the question to him.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say that I was not aware, and I do not know that any of my colleagues were aware, that His Excellency had sent for these two gentlemen to talk over public matters. I had not heard of it until just this moment, but I take exception to the doctrine that the Governor General or Her Majesty cannot talk to such people as she or he may choose.

Mr. LAURIER. If my hon. friend for Northumberland will allow me, I would take exception to what he has said. Whether Mr. Greenway, or any other member or members of the Manitoba Government, were invited by the Governor General, or by this Government, to meet His Excellency, is of little moment, as the Government are the official advisers of His Excellency, and must be held responsible in either case.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not object to holding them responsible for it. That was not the point. What I wanted to know was, whether His Excellency, on his own mere motion, did this, because, if he did, I hold he was wrong?

Mr. LAURIER. The Government are the parties responsible.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is another matter of some importance with which I think the House should be made acquainted before the Orders of the Day are called. It is this; I find in the *Montreal Gazette* the following:—

“NEWFOUNDLAND ASKED TO ENTER THE CONFEDERATION.

“DELEGATES TO VISIT OTTAWA.

“*The Proposition Well Received and Likely to be Accepted by the Ancient Colony.*

“HALIFAX, N.S., March 8.—[Special.]—The *Halifax Herald* will publish to-morrow a special cablegram from St. John's, Nfld., showing that practical steps have been taken to embrace the ancient colony of Newfoundland in the Canadian Confederation. The following correspondence was laid before the Newfoundland Legislature to-day:—

“*The Governor General of Canada to the Governor of Newfoundland:*

“March 6, 1888.

“It is considered by my Government that, if your Government approves, the time would be convenient for the discussion of the question of the admission of Newfoundland into the Federal Union, and that no difficulty would be likely to arise in arranging the terms. Under these circumstances could you send a deputation to Ottawa, with power to negotiate? In our opinion the deputation should represent the Opposition as well as the Ministerial party. As the Canadian Session has begun, and may be short, I would suggest the expediency of the deputation sailing by the steamer leaving on the 19th inst.

“*The Governor of Newfoundland to the Governor General of Canada:*

“March 7, 1888.

“I have received your telegram and laid it before my Ministers.

“The question is now being discussed among the parties, and your correspondent has no doubt but that a deputation will be sent.”

This appears in one of the numerous organs of the Government and I presume it to be correct. I think that as Parliament is in Session, before a communication of that kind should be sent to another colony the Parliament of Canada ought to have been taken into consultation on the subject. In so important a question as that of admitting a remote Province like Newfoundland into the Union, the Government should not have assumed the responsibility of acting as they appear to have done, without having taken the Parliament of Canada into their confidence, while that Parliament is in Session. I would like the right hon. the First Minister to say whether there is any truth in the statement or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is true; those negotiations have taken place.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I think the House has been treated with scant courtesy, very scant courtesy, indeed—hon. gentlemen on that side as well as on this—by a matter of that importance being first made public through the medium of one of those paid hirelings of the hon. gentleman. I think it is utterly discourteous and unconstitutional, and it goes to show that true constitutional parliamentary government is becoming utterly unknown in Canada. We have a one-man power, we have an autocrat here to do as he pleases; and to all practical purposes, the people of Canada would be better off if they would send 130 or 140 proxies to the hon. gentleman, and thus save expense.

THE ONDERDONK ARBITRATION.

Mr. POPE. I was not in a position the other day to answer the question put by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), but I am happy to be able to do so now. The amount of the valuation of the rolling stock taken, under the terms of the contract, from the contractors of the western section of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia, is as follows:—

Eight locomotives and 185 platform cars	\$199,535 00
Account for the transportation of the above from British Columbia to Chaudiere.	22,028 19
Account for the repairs of the above	4,016 92
Total	<u>\$225,570 11</u>

Against that we have the following:—

Account against the C.P.R. for hire of the above.....	\$41,590 00
Account against the C.P.R. for three platform cars destroyed in their service.....	2,265 00
Account against the C.P.R. for nine platform cars undelivered.....	6,795 00
Total.....	\$50,650 00
Balance, being total cost.....	\$174,920 11

Mr. DAVIES. Does that include the moneys paid to the Grand Trunk Railway as well as to the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

THE FISHERIES CONFERENCE.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. the Finance Minister yesterday, in answer to an enquiry I made, informed us that the date of the proposal he made to the Commission at Washington, relating to trade matters, was the 3rd December. Among the papers he laid before the House there is a reply to that proposal by the American commissioners. I would ask the hon. gentleman to give us the date on which that reply was handed in.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will do that.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY ACCOUNT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. the Minister of Railways was to have brought down an answer to a part of my question touching the account of the Intercolonial Railway, which he was not able to answer the other day. He gave the receipts up to the 1st of March, and he said that in two or three days he hoped to be able to give the expenditure. Has he got that yet?

Mr. POPE. No, I have not. I do not remember that I said in two or three days, but I think I said as soon as I could.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does not the hon. gentleman get both earnings and expenses together?

Mr. POPE. Not necessarily, because the one takes longer to get than the other.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Payments to officers of the Post Office and Finance Departments for balancing and computing interest on depositors' accounts in Savings Banks. \$3,100

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the increase of \$200 for?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was found that the amount required was a little larger than the appropriation. That item, as the hon. gentleman knows, is to pay the officers who are engaged in calculating the interest in the Post Office and Finance Departments.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that very well. What I want to know particularly is, are these practically extra payments for over hours' work?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because I have called attention more than once, and so have other members of this House, to the vicious practice of allowing men in the service of the Government to considerably augment their salaries by doing extra work. I do not know how far that

Mr. POPE.

goes in regard to this particular work, but I take it that all this money goes to increase the salary of the employes.

Mr. McLELAN. This involves a lot of extra work, and it is thought better that the clerks who are familiar with this work should continue to do it than that strangers should be called in for that purpose.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is quite evident that the Savings Bank system is likely to be continued in this country for some time to come, and I, therefore, think that the Civil Service Act should be changed so that the clerks should perform this duty without any extra pay. I find, for instance, that there are no less than 382 clerks in the employment of the several departments, who have drawn no less than \$120,258 for extra services in connection with their respective duties. If it is considered that a clerk is not getting the amount of salary he should have, it would be better to amend the Act so as to include all these duties, because, when a clerk understands that, if he labors one or two hours after the regular hours, he is to be paid extra, the probability is that he would leave something over during his regular hours in order to get something to do by way of overtime. It is an inducement to clerks to put in extra time and not to perform their duties efficiently during the hours they are supposed to labor, and I think it is highly in the interest of the Civil Service that a change should be made. I find one case where a man who is getting \$1,400 of salary receives \$25 56 for calculating interest. Another man who is getting \$300 as a salary receives \$300 for calculating savings bank interest. Another man gets \$1,400 as a salary, Mr. J. R. Smith, and he receives \$33 for counting interest. I think, for a man who gets \$1,400 salary it is a pretty small matter on his part to extort out of the people of this Dominion \$33 for calculating interest in the department to which he belongs. The whole of this system is wrong, and the Government ought to amend the Civil Service Act and not leave this as a bribe which these men may extort for doing this because it is not within their regular hours.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It would be hardly right that I should allow the very strong language the hon. gentleman has used to go unanswered. There is no disposition to extort anything from the public Treasury, and to provide for the performance of this work in the ordinary way would add very largely to the public expenditure. It is found that a large number of these accounts have to be dealt with in a very short space of time, and the only persons who can deal with them efficiently are the officials who are upon a salary and upon whose time we have a claim for certain hours. By allowing these gentlemen who are familiar with the duties to perform these when this fresh press of work comes, and to be paid for the time they are occupied outside of the hours they are paid for in the ordinary discharge of their duties, the work is efficiently and quickly performed, and at a very great saving to the country. This has been explained again and again to the House, and I think the House has generally concurred in the wisdom of that expenditure. I quite admit that, under ordinary circumstances, the payment of clerks for time over and above their ordinary duties is an objectionable course, but it has been found that this is a case in which it is generally convenient, in the interests of the public service, and in point of time, and in regard to the discharge of the duties of the service, to make an exception, and I hope the House will not insist upon abandoning that course, because it would result in the necessity of appointing additional officers.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister of Finance is quite mistaken in supposing that the House has agreed to the system which is now in force at any time. There always has been objection to the system and there always will continue to

be objection to the system. The Minister is also mistaken in saying that the abandonment of this plan would result in requiring the employment of extra men. They would be the same men. These men are now doing the work, and they are simply paid for extra hours. There is no increase in the number; there is only an increase in the expense. The only question is whether the employes in this department should not be compelled to perform this duty, which occurs, I believe, once a year,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Twice a year.

Mr. CASEY. Well, twice a year, without extra pay. It is well to compare their position with that of clerks in banks and loan companies, where similar duties have to be performed at certain times of the year. It is true that, in banks and loan companies and other financial institutions, and in merchants' offices, there are periods of the year when clerks are required to do extra work. Are those clerks paid extra for that? I am not engaged in that sort of business, but I know a great many bankers, and I never heard of any such payment being made, and I do not think it is necessary that it should be made in the Civil Service. The hon. Minister speaks as if we only hired these men for a certain number of hours per day. The hon. gentleman is wrong. Their whole time is hired and paid for by the Government. There are certain hours fixed for them as a general rule, no doubt, but their whole time is at the disposal of the Government; and, if they object to that, they can resign. From a legal, as well as from a common sense point of view they are subject to perform extra duties in the same way as clerks in banks or other institutions, and my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is quite right in saying that the idea of paying them for over-hours is a vicious one, and there is a temptation in that for them to leave work undone in their ordinary hours. I do not say that every clerk would yield to that temptation, but there can be no doubt that it leaves temptation in the way of these clerks, and I have no doubt that the temptation in some cases has been effective and that work has been left undone during the hours for which the hon. Minister mistakenly says they are only paid for. But I cannot allow the item to pass without distinctly making the point that civil servants are not employed merely for so many hours, but their whole time belongs to the Government. I also object to the system of putting temptation in their way to leave their work undone, as is the practical effect under the present regulations.

Mr. McLELAN. I desire to say that there is not a staff in the Civil Service who work longer hours and more industriously than the staff connected with the Savings Bank branch of the Post Office Department.

Mr. CASEY. That can easily be.

Mr. McLELAN. There is not a week passes in which a large number of these men work over-hours, that is to say, longer hours than in any other branch of the service. That is especially the case about the 1st of January and the 1st of July, when there is an extra rush of work to get the accounts closed up and the balances struck in a very short time, work which cannot be done at any other period of the year than at those dates, and it is necessary that the clerks should work night and day in order to overtake the work. If we did not employ these both night and day, it would be necessary to bring in new men, and it would be very inconvenient for them to take up the books where these other men left off. Strangers who are not acquainted with the books cannot do as satisfactory work as those who are familiar with it. I think that on previous occasions the House has not taken exception to allowances to civil servants for doing over-work, and I do not see why an exception should be made in the present case.

Mr. CASEY. I think the hon. gentleman, like the most of us, was once in business for himself, and I would like to ask him when there was an occasional extra press of work, such as stock-taking, or balancing accounts, or anything of that sort, did he resort to either of these two alternatives—did he employ outsiders, or did he pay his clerks for working overtime?

Mr. McLELAN. I paid them extra.

Mr. CASEY. Then the hon. gentleman is much more generous than any of his colleagues whom I have come across. But if he paid his clerks extra for working overtime, in stock-taking, or in any of those pinches that occur in the course of business, he does more than any business man is in the habit of doing that I am acquainted with—at least very few do so. But the point is that neither one of the alternatives need be adopted—neither outsiders need be employed, nor need the clerks be paid extra for over-work, because their whole time belongs to the Government. If it is thought that the salaries are not sufficient, they can either resign—and I think the Government would have no difficulty in finding others at the same salary—or the Government might increase their salaries, and a slight increase would amount to less than these extra and irregular payments. Both of the hon. Ministers who have spoken have made a great point out of the awkwardness of bringing in outsiders. Now, if I am not misled by the item itself, this is merely a question of making up interest on deposits. I do not see why any able outside accountant, if it was necessary to employ one, should not be as well able to make up depositors' accounts as a clerk of the department. No special knowledge is required to calculate interest on deposits.

Amount required for salaries of Board of Examiners
and other expenses in connection with the Civil
Service Act..... \$7,500

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the reason of this increase of \$500?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is caused by the increase in the number of applicants for examination, which necessitates a larger amount of printing and other contingencies. There is no increase in the number of employes. I may mention that the greatest portion of the expenditure for that service is covered by moneys that come back to the Treasury in the way of fees.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the amount of fees received?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think it was, last year, over \$3,000. There were over 1,200 examinations.

Mr. CASEY. Could the hon. gentleman tell us to what extent the number of examinations have increased over the preceding year?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I cannot answer the question at the moment, but I know there has been a very large increase in the number of examinations, and it has been reported to me that this increase has necessitated a corresponding increase in the amount for printing and other contingencies.

Mr. DAVIES. Why does the hon. gentleman ask such a large sum when, of the sum voted last year, \$1,500 were not required? There does not seem to be any sense in asking for a couple of thousand more than the actual expenditure. Last year, of the amount voted, \$5,415, \$1,584 was not used.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have received from the examiners a demand for this grant; it is a very small increase over the ordinary expenditure. But if, as my hon. friend says, \$1,500 remain unexpended of last year's vote, certainly a smaller sum than here asked for would seem to suffice.

Consequently I ask that the item be suspended until I enquire into it.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the hon. Secretary of State what number of the 1,200 who were examined have received appointments? It would be well for the House to know just what number of offices are becoming vacant, and the number who are yearly coming into positions.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That report has been put before the House.

Mr. MILLS. If the number of those who are examined is greatly in excess of the number of vacancies, that might be a reason for increasing the difficulties of the examination.

Miscellaneous Justice, including North-West Territories..... \$20,000

Mr. LAURIER. What does the hon. Minister understand by Miscellaneous Justice? That seems to be a very vague term to apply to the administration of justice.

Mr. THOMPSON. It refers to the excellent system of justice we administer. The items refer principally to the administration of justice in the North-West, witnesses' fees and all expenditures of that character in connection with the court houses, and everything connected with the administration of justice in the North-West not paid by the municipalities or by the provincial authorities.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there is an item of expenditure which requires a little explanation. I observe an item in the Public Accounts in connection with the investigation of charges against Judge Travis. I think, as a very great number of statements have been made of a very varied and contradictory character about that officer, the Minister ought, on this occasion, to put the House in possession of the reasons for and results of that investigation. I understand Judge Travis is no longer in the service.

Mr. THOMPSON. He is no longer in the service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have seen some very remarkable letters over the signature of Mr. Travis, if I am not mistaken, reflecting greatly on the Minister of Justice himself. Those I do not propose, at this instance, to bring into controversy, but I should like to have from the Minister a succinct statement of the reasons of Mr. Travis's suspension or removal, or whatever it has been.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, does not remember that I laid on the Table of the House last Session the report of Judge Taylor, the Commissioner who made the investigation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think it has been printed.

Mr. THOMPSON. It was laid on the Table in response to a motion made by some hon. gentleman opposite. The report which was made by Judge Taylor, now Chief Justice of Manitoba, was that it was undesirable that Mr. Travis should continue to exercise the functions of stipendiary magistrate in the judicial district which had been assigned to him. The opinion of Judge Taylor, from the evidence taken before him,—and the evidence was very voluminous at the enquiry which he made,—and the opinion of myself and my colleagues as well, I think, was that the evidence not only justified the report which the commissioner made but precluded the Government from recommending the appointment of Mr. Travis to the Supreme Court of the North-West Territories. The hon. gentleman will remember, when I recall it to him, that shortly after the investigation was ordered the North-West Territories Judicial Act came into operation, the effect of which was that the various stipendiary

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

magistracies of the North-West were abolished, and a Supreme Court was organised in their place. Mr. Travis passed from office as a stipendiary magistrate by virtue of the operation of that Act, and the Act under which he was appointed provided that the retiring allowances in such cases should apply to all stipendiary magistrates of the Territories. Subsequently the report was made by Judge Taylor, and the only question that had to be dealt with in regard to Mr. Travis was, whether he should be appointed to the Bench of the Supreme Court of the North-West Territories or not; and he was not appointed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What pension is Mr. Travis receiving?

Mr. THOMPSON. \$720 or \$730, I think.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then we got off comparatively cheaply. He was appointed two or three years ago, if my memory serves me, and in a couple of years he was found to be unfit for the delicate and important position in which he was placed. He is, then, superannuated and becomes a permanent charge on the ratepayers of the Dominion. His unfitness has been reported on by a distinguished judge, who is now Chief Justice of Manitoba. It does look as if there was considerable carelessness exercised in the selection of Mr. Travis for an appointment of that description.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has not heard the explanation I made, which was that Mr. Travis passed out of office by the reason of the abolition of his office; and by the statute under which he was appointed he was entitled under those circumstances to superannuation, and the superannuation was calculated at the ordinary rate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I quite understand the *modus operandi* by which he had his head cut off. My point was that very great carelessness had been made in making the appointment, if within a couple of years after Mr. Travis' appointment it was necessary to call upon him to resign.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The House has not yet been informed on the point which the hon. member for South Oxford has brought under notice. The Minister of Justice says there was very voluminous evidence submitted before Judge Taylor; and I observe that \$500 or \$600 have been paid for transcribing that evidence. The evidence has not yet been laid before the House, and even if it was individual members would hardly be able to master it unless it was printed; but the House would like to know from the Minister what were the grounds of Mr. Travis' practical dismissal, for that is what it amounted to. Technically his position was abolished by the Judicature Act of the North-West Territories, but under ordinary circumstances he would have been appointed to another judicial position fixed by the same Act, and we understand he was not appointed because of some malfeasance or improper conduct in office. We would like to know from the Minister of Justice, who says he formed a strong opinion on the case which was shared by his colleagues, the grounds considered sufficient to justify the Government in not recommending Mr. Travis for promotion.

Mr. THOMPSON. To state with any degree of fullness, or in any such way that the hon. gentleman would be satisfied with the explanation, would be difficult, considering that the charges have been investigated by a judge receiving evidence which probably covers a thousand pages. But I will state briefly, that in the opinion of the commissioner who made the enquiry, and certainly in my own opinion, Mr. Travis exceeded his jurisdiction in administering his office in the District of

Calgary, that he exceeded that jurisdiction very greatly to the disadvantage of good order and of good government in the Territories. As regards the particular instances in which he exceeded that jurisdiction, one of them was in relation to the press of the particular district in which he exercised his office. Hon. gentlemen may remember that the judge's conduct was made the subject of comment and observation in this House shortly after it was announced, and I did the best I could, with the information at my command, to induce the House to suspend judgment, which was disposed to be exceedingly unfavorable to the magistrate. The investigation subsequently disclosed all the particulars of the transactions, and certainly led me to consider that the judge not only exceeded his jurisdiction, but that he had done so in a manner, and in instances, which caused it to be very undesirable to allow his conduct to pass without marked censure. The testimony taken at the investigation shows the judge to have exceeded his authority—that the judge's view as to his authority and as to his duty was so clearly erroneous and out of keeping with the modern view as to judicial rights, that it was unfit and intolerable that a person holding those views and exercising such authority should continue to hold his office. The particular instance in regard to the press was that Mr. Travis caused the imprisonment of a newspaper proprietor or editor who had chosen to question his actions and the accuracy of his decision. Another instance in which I think he entirely exceeded his authority was his suspension of a legal gentleman from practising at the bar of his court. The reason assigned for doing so was that this particular gentleman had attended a public meeting, called an indignation meeting, and at that meeting had expressed an opinion unfavorable to the judge and the proceedings he had taken in regard to the newspaper editor a few days before; and upon the gentleman taking his seat in court the magistrate ordered him to rise, and announced to him that he was suspended from practice, I think for two years, and banished "to the milder climate of Manitoba." There were instances also of the judge having otherwise exceeded his jurisdiction in a manner unfavorable to the administration of the law in his district. The most notable of those, other than the one I have mentioned, was the case in which he dealt with the municipal corporation of the town of Calgary. In that instance the affairs of the municipality were being conducted by a mayor and town council, and the magistrate formed the opinion that the mayor and town council were too favorable to the persons who were engaged in the liquor traffic in the town of Calgary. A petition was presented to him (it is alleged at his own instance, but that, however, has not been well established) indicating that those persons had, in relation to the election then about to be held, committed corrupt practices. The corrupt practices consisted merely of this: The mayor and town council were at the time revising the electoral list; the election was about to be held and they added, in the exercise of their judgment as to who were entitled to be on the list, a large number of persons to the electoral list. I think they added them irregularly and improperly, but the magistrate had no more to do with that question than I had. They were a committee to do this, authorised by law and subject to no control by him; but he not only undertook to review the decision as to the revision of their list, but he pronounced it to be a corrupt practice in relation to an election which had not come off, unseated the mayor and town council, disqualified them for a period of years, and imposed heavy fines upon them. At a subsequent period an election having been held to supply the vacancy he had thus caused by disqualifying the town council, in one or two instances, if not more (the hon. gentleman will understand I am speaking necessarily from memory, and have not referred to the papers for some

months past), the candidates whom he had unseated and disqualified were returned by overwhelming majorities, and he repeated his judgment of unseating and disqualification, sent for the return of the returning officer, and with his own hand declared the persons who had been overwhelmingly beaten to be duly returned in the election, and seated them as town councillors. The matter was carried on with such a degree of violence, as might be anticipated, that the mere idea of law and authority in his district was associated with ridicule, and it was conceived that the magistrate did not possess the idea of the duties of his office, of the powers of his office, or of the mode of conducting his office, which a person should possess in order to be appointed to the new court of the North-West Territories.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am only astonished that after the statement made by the Minister that this worthy gentleman, Judge Travis, has not been appointed returning officer in general for this Dominion.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not having had the advantage of reading the evidence or the report that the Minister of Justice refers to, I cannot attempt to challenge the correctness of the judgment he formed. I am very glad he made the statement he has made, however, for a number of reasons; firstly, because I think the removal of a man holding the judicial position he held, and the reasons for his removal, should always be communicated to Parliament in an authoritative statement; and, secondly, because I think they have important bearing upon the action which certain judges in other parts of the Dominion are now taking. I rejoice to see that it will become known generally throughout the Dominion that when judges attempt arbitrarily to punish those who practice before them, or those who make adverse comments upon judgments which they deliver, that those judges will find a power stronger than themselves, who will overrule them and may, perhaps, in a certain sense punish them. Mr. Travis, I am sorry, committed the offences, if we may term them such, or the errors which the Minister of Justice referred to. He was known when he practised at the bar of New Brunswick, as a painstaking and learned lawyer, and it was considered that he would distinguish himself in his judicial career. I shall call the attention of the Minister of Justice—now that he has spoken his views upon the exercise by judges of the power to punish for contempt, and characterised the exercise of that power in Mr. Travis' case as the exercise of a somewhat antiquated power—I would call his attention to the fact that in the eastern portion of the Dominion, the judges are about to exercise a power somewhat similar, in the case of a newspaper published in the town of Moncton. It will be remembered that some time ago an election took place in the county of Westmoreland, and that one of the judges of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, when applied to fix a day for the election petition, was asked specially to fix that day within the six months, for fear some question might be raised as to his jurisdiction, if he placed it beyond the six months. That judge, after considering, refused to fix the day within the six months; or rather, at first he did fix it, and changed his mind afterwards and fixed it beyond the six months. After the time for the trial had been fixed beyond the six months, when the day arrived the gentleman who had been elected to the seat, through his counsel, applied to set aside the whole proceedings on the ground that the court had no jurisdiction, and this same judge who had very deliberately refused to fix the time within the six months, and had placed it beyond the six months, turned round and joined in the judgment of the court declaring that his own action had been extra-judicial and beyond his power, and that no trial of it could take place. Well, such an extraordinary state of things, in the case of the same judge within a very short space of time, resulting in the prevention of the investigation into that election petition altogether and in depriving

the candidate and the electorate of Westmoreland of the power of testing whether that election had been carried correctly or not, naturally enough formed the subject of public comment. One of the newspapers published in that town called attention to it in pretty vigorous and strong language. I may say the circumstances justified the use of very strong language. Unexplained, the circumstances were such as, in my humble judgment, a newspaper would have failed to discharge its duty if it had not called public attention to them. We find now the extraordinary spectacle that, in this nineteenth century, the old antiquated notions which some judges possess, as the Minister of Justice has said prevail, and that they are furbishing up their old armour so that this unfortunate man, who had the temerity to call attention to the extraordinary change of views of that learned judge, is now dragged before the Supreme Court of New Brunswick and threatened with fine and imprisonment for daring to make any comment on the conduct of this august individual. After what has been said by the Minister of Justice I trust those judges will learn that they are not above the law, and that their attempt to burnish their antiquated weapons, which may be necessary under some extreme circumstances, is now unadvisable; and that at the present day, unless in extraordinary cases, those judges will learn that if they do so they will incur the displeasure of the Minister of Justice and this High Court of Parliament. I, myself, shall look with no small degree of interest upon the action of the Supreme Court in attempting to punish an editor who had the temerity to express his honest conviction upon the most extraordinary conduct and most extraordinary change of opinion on the part of a learned judge. I think that the remarks of the Minister of Justice with reference to the punishment by Mr. Travis of the men who offended against his dignity ought very well to be applied to a judge who attempts to punish this newspaper editor in the Town of Moncton for daring to comment on Mr. Justice Fraser's conduct. It is curious that analogies can be found in an eastern Province for some of the acts for which Mr. Justice Travis was punished. It seems that he was foolish enough to interfere with a matter which he had no right to interfere with, that is, with the lists for the election of municipal councillors in the town of Calgary. I remember that, a year ago, a learned judge, to whom was committed, by law, the duty of determining when and where there should be a recount in a certain county in New Brunswick, in the exercise of his proper and legitimate jurisdiction ordered a recount, when his hand was stayed by a judge of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, who issued a writ of prohibition, and thus prevented the law from taking its course. The result was an arbitrary, improper, illegal and unjustifiable return, made by a partisan returning officer, who I had hoped would be punished by the law, but who has, so far, escaped. That return was allowed to stand, and the member was returned to this House, and sat here nearly the whole Session, although he had no more right to sit here than one of the messengers. This shows that Mr. Justice Travis was not alone in usurping this extraordinary power of interfering in elections. In that case, too, some of the newspapers, shocked at the attempt made by a judge of the Supreme Court to interfere with the jurisdiction of a County Court judge, published some comments on the action of that learned judge, and those gentlemen were dragged before this tribunal and punished for what was alleged to be a contempt of court. The Minister of Justice tells us, in so many words, that this antiquated idea of punishing the press, because they express opinions on the judgments of the bench, will not be supported by the powers that be; and we are in hopes that he will not be satisfied with punishing Mr. Justice Travis only, but will also eke out even-handed justice and punish those judges in the Province of New Brunswick who acted in the same way as Mr. Justice Travis.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Mr. THOMPSON. I will not, of course, discuss the particular cases the hon. gentleman has called attention to, principally because I have not sufficient acquaintance with the details of them to be able, with any degree of confidence, to discuss them; but, unless I am very much misled by the information I have in regard to those cases in the eastern Provinces, they differ in the widest possible degree from the cases that have called for executive action in the North-West.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the hon. Minister of Justice ought to have enquired into the conduct of Judge Tuck, in the Province of New Brunswick. As a judge of the Supreme Court, he had no right whatever to interfere with the County Court judge in the discharge of his duties. The law authorised Judge Steadman to make a recount when proper application was made to him. He appointed a particular time for that recount, and was proceeding to discharge his duties when a writ of prohibition was issued by Judge Tuck which prevented him making that recount. Now, I say, that the result of that action was that a man was fraudulently returned to this House by a returning officer, and was permitted to retain a seat here during an entire Session. And Judge Tuck, who was guilty of this high-handed and illegal proceeding, ventured to commit the editors of two newspapers who had adversely criticised his conduct. Now, however violent those criticisms may have been, they were far less injurious to the public interest than the arbitrary and illegal conduct of the judge; and it seems to me to be of the utmost importance that the Minister of Justice should make enquiries into the matter, and that the result of those enquiries should be submitted to this House.

Mr. LANDRY. I do not think it right to let pass entirely unanswered what has been advanced by the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. I am not in a position at present to detail to the House exactly what did take place, but I may make it my business before many days to do so, because I feel that hon. gentlemen opposite have not accurately stated the position of affairs in New Brunswick in the comments they have made. When the hon. member who has just taken his seat says that the conduct of Mr. Justice Tuck was high-handed and illegal, I am not prepared to say positively that he is wrong, though I might express the opinion that he is wrong. But I would say this much, that it appears to me that the proper place to have that question tested was in the Court of Appeal of New Brunswick, on an appeal as to whether the issue of that writ of prohibition was wrong. If it was wrong, it could have been righted there; and if that court was not able to give a satisfactory decision, the question could have been appealed to a still higher court. The hon. gentleman should have remembered this, if he did not, that the application which was made for a recount was not an ordinary application for a recount. It was made on a return of a member by acclamation, and where the record showed no original count. As the matter stood, the returning officer had made a return, not that the votes had been counted, but that there was only one candidate put in nomination, and, therefore, that the candidate returned as elected, was elected, not by the ballots given, but by acclamation, there being nobody else in the field.

Mr. MACKENZIE. A vote was taken.

Mr. LANDRY. That may be; but I am merely speaking of the record as it appeared. The record was that the returning officer returned a man as elected as being the only one in nomination. Therefore, when the learned judge was asked to make a recount, when upon the record itself there had been no count, it appears to me there might be some justification for another judge, on application made on the record, to issue the writ of prohibition. I think it

would be somewhat presumptuous on my part to express as strong an opinion as the hon. gentleman who last spoke, that the action of Mr. Justice Tuck was entirely illegal or legal; but I make these remarks to show that the position of affairs was not properly explained by the hon. member for Bothwell, if he remembered it.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I think my hon. friend has not correctly stated the facts of this case. He has forgotten that a vote took place, and the deputy returning officers returned the ballots; and those ballots were what the judge of the county court was to recount. If my hon. friend will look at the Act, he will find that Judge Steadman had no alternative but to proceed in the manner in which he did proceed. In any case in which the County Court judge has a right to count the ballots he can only count them under the circumstances set forth in the law, and if a judge of the Supreme Court, or any other court, can interfere with him, that is practically doing away with the law. The courts in the Province of Ontario have expressly declared that neither a mandamus nor a writ of prohibition will lie in a case like this, and the three judges who gave that decision have occupied the position of Chief Justices of the High Court of Justice of Ontario. I do think that in an amendment to an election law, this should be clearly and distinctly defined, because it seems to me if a judge of the Supreme Court can issue a writ of prohibition against a County Court judge, there is nothing to prevent his issuing one against any returning officer or other person at any election.

Mr. LANDRY. I had not overlooked the fact that there had actually been a count, but what I said was that the gentleman returned was not returned as having been counted in by the returning officer, and, therefore, the judge had no jurisdiction in having a recount, when in the record itself there was no count, although, in point of fact, there may have been a count before that.

Mr. WELDON. When application is made to him, the judge is bound to have a recount. The returning officer attended with his ballot boxes, but received the information that he was not to deliver them to Judge Steadman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In this particular case the same returning officer had appointed deputies, and fixed the polling places. The polls were held, the ballots were marked, the ballot boxes were returned and the ballots were counted, and the hon. gentleman knows well the returning officer had no right to constitute himself an election court to try the validity of his own proceedings. The present Master of the Rolls, in a very recent and important case in England, decided that when a returning officer had decided to hold a poll it was not open to him to question the validity of his own proceedings. He acted ministerially, his duty was at an end, and all he had to do was to count the polls and declare the party who received the majority of votes the candidate elect. The hon. gentleman knows that the whole proceeding after the election was, in every way, a most violent interference with the right of election; and when the party who was wronged called upon the county judge to count the ballots, he was in the exercise of his rights, he was acting within the provision of the law, and the judge was violently and illegally interfered with by a judge of the Supreme Court, through the improper issue of a writ of prohibition. I think that that is a very proper subject of enquiry by the hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not at all rise for the purpose of prolonging this debate or entering into a legal discussion, which I do not consider myself qualified to do. But I do wish for myself, individually, to protest as strongly as I can against the doctrine which is being laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite—and I do not care by whom it is laid

down—that it would be for the advantage of the commonwealth of Canada that judges should be criticised freely in the discharge of their functions by the public press. I think anything more mischievous could scarcely be imagined. I think that it is absolutely essential that the judges should, in order to carry out the difficult and delicate duties which they have to perform, have the support of public opinion; and I am satisfied that nothing could be more detrimental to the administration of justice in this country than that the conduct of judges should be criticised frequently by the public press in this country. There is a remedy by which we can punish a judge if he discharges his duties in such a way as to make him unfit for holding the office to which he has been appointed, and so long as a judge is held to be fit to be a judge, he ought to be sustained by public opinion; and so soon as he is unfit to hold that position, he ought to be removed. But I am satisfied that if we lay down the principle that the judges in the discharge of their duties shall be subject to open criticism at the hands of the press of the country, we shall strike a fatal blow at the best and truest administration of justice in Canada. The hon. the member for Bothwell has referred to a recent decision of the Master of Rolls in England. I would ask him whether it is the practice in England to review in the public press the decisions of judges upon the bench. He knows as well as I that that is not the practice, and that where a judge in England is improperly criticised by the press, the same remedy is pursued there as has been pursued in the case referred to by the hon. member for Queen's.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A subject of very great interest and importance has arisen incidentally which is, perhaps, worthy of a little discussion. There is no doubt there is a medium in all these things; there is no doubt whatever that the press, if it should abuse its rights and privileges by making improper criticisms on the action of any judge, would do a great injury to society, as the hon. gentleman remarks; but, on the other hand, I do not think that we can afford to allow the idea to go abroad that the judiciary of Canada are to be entitled to be above criticism in the public press or elsewhere. On the contrary, my impression is that the judges require to be reminded, from time to time, that they are mere mortals. Being myself a layman, I am not, perhaps, imbued with the necessary amount of reverence for high judicial functionaries with which the legal profession would desire in some cases to inspire us. I must tell my hon. friend that I know, as a matter of course, that impeachment, no matter how thoroughly a judge may deserve to be dismissed, is an extremely difficult, an extremely expensive, and an extremely unusual proceeding; and although I have a high respect on the whole for the judiciary of my native Province, I know there have been several men on the bench who ought long ago to have been dismissed from it. There are more instances than one, two, three or four, and it has been found enormously difficult to obtain any justice or satisfaction against these men. Of course, it would be most invidious to go into particulars, and I am not going to do so, but I do not think we should lay down the doctrine that a judge, no matter how high and great, is to hold himself above criticism. I think that the old world and somewhat feudal idea that the judges are great beings whom no newspaper is to presume to criticise, is not a safe one—that it might tend, in a very great degree, to the abuse of justice; and I think if the hon. gentleman will look carefully over the English papers, he will see that a great latitude of criticism is indulged in not unfrequently by the press with respect to the English judges. But the main fact remains, as my hon. friend has stated, that the hon. the Minister of Justice has laid down a very important principle, and it is rather desirable,

as my hon. friend for Prince Edward Island stated, that that principle should be extended. The powers of the judges in dealing with responsible and fair criticism on their conduct should be sharply looked after by this House and the Minister of Justice, when they attempt to exercise those powers. There have been some curious cases in this country, and I dare say the hon. gentleman may remember one or two, in which the late lamented George Brown was concerned, in which the judges did not find it convenient to proceed, although opinions were tolerably freely expressed as to their conduct. I think there are not a few cases in which some considerable oppression has been exercised by some judges under this very old world rule of contempt of court, and it would be better to circumscribe the rule than allow the idea to go abroad that we are to sustain the judges in everything they do.

Mr. McNEILL. I did not intend to imply that the judges should be entirely free from criticism in the press, but I did intend to imply that the criticisms in the press should be guarded very closely indeed. And that it was not a fair thing to accuse the judges of having simply used some old rusty weapon because they had called to task those who had criticised them, not in the manner which the hon. gentleman has referred to, but in a very violent and a very improper manner. If there is criticism of the judges in England, and I have not said there is not such criticism, that is of a very different character from that which we have had under discussion here to-day.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I do not propose to continue the discussion, but I wish to say a word in regard to the statements which have been made by the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), in reference to the conduct of Judge Fraser, in reference to the Westmoreland election case. I think the remarks of that hon. gentleman were not justified by the conduct of the judge on that occasion, and I think, if he had known what actually transpired, he would not have made the remarks which he has made. I am not fully informed of the facts myself, and, as I do not belong to the legal profession, I am not as well able to discuss the question as the hon. gentleman, but, as I understand, what took place was as follows:—In fixing the day for the election trial, a day in the month of December was named. This was objected to by the counsel for Mr. Emerson, the petitioner in the trial, and a day in November—I do not remember the exact date—was afterwards suggested and agreed upon. This was done with the concurrence of the petitioner's counsel, as I understand. At all events, that is shown from the fact that there is a provision in the law that, if the day is not fixed within the six months' limit mentioned in the law, it is quite competent for the petitioner's counsel to apply to the judge and have an extension of the time. The fact that he did not make this application, that he concurred in having the date fixed without making the application, shows that he did not consider it necessary, but that he considered the day fixed was a proper day or was within the limit of time fixed by the statute, and that, therefore, there was no need to apply for an extension. As to Judge Fraser, I will say that, as he freely admitted, and as I heard him myself admit in the court house in Dorchester afterwards, he was under the impression that the day fixed was within the limit of time fixed by the statute, but, when the question was raised afterwards before the full court, the full court decided, and he on further consideration was obliged to coincide with the opinion of all the other judges on the bench, that the day fixed was beyond the time allowed by the statute, and that, therefore, the trial could not take place. Under these circumstances, I think, when the reasons for Judge Fraser's conduct are understood by this House, hon. members will see that he was not censurable for the action he took. As to the action

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

which is now pending against the editor of the *Moncton Transcript*, I can only say that the language used by that paper was very extreme and very disrespectful to the judge who tried that case, and was not only unjustifiable in view of the course of action which the judge had pursued, but was of a very extreme and abusive character; and I think, if my hon. friend will turn up some of the recent editions of that paper, he will find that the editor now admits this and says he used this language when he was much excited and that he has really apologised for the use of it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not want to prolong the discussion, but I may say that the point I raised was not whether Mr. Justice Fraser was right in the first instance, or was right in the considered opinion he afterwards gave reversing his first judgment. All I was expressing an opinion about was that the facts were of such a character as to warrant and call upon the public press to make the comments it did on his conduct. It may be open to explanation, but I repudiate the idea that judges are above the law, that they are above public opinion, or that they are above criticism by the newspapers which give expression to public opinion. If a newspaper uses language which is calculated to frustrate the administration of justice, then I understand that it can be punished for so doing, but in this particular instance to which my hon. friend refers, the judge first fixed the date within the six months, afterwards changed it and tried to fix one beyond the six months; the petitioner's counsel said that would annul the whole thing, but the judge overruled the objection and said there was nothing in it and did so fix it, and when it came before the full court, he admitted that he had been wrong and that his action had destroyed the effect of the whole petition. It would not be in human nature if those who had so properly conducted the election without any corrupt practices, while the most corrupt practices possible had been used against them, should be defeated by the action of the judge and should hold their tongues. I raise my protest against the judges of this land raising themselves above public opinion and above the law, and against the idea that, in all cases where language is used which in their opinion affects their dignity, they can turn round and punish the press and send an editor to gaol. I do not think that any member of the House should defend such arbitrary action on the part of any judge unless he can show that his action was in order to prevent the proper administration of justice being carried out. In this case, the very opposite was the case. The judge, who had acted a most extraordinary and inexplicable part, as far as an outsider can see, found his action commented upon in a very severe manner by a newspaper, and he took that occasion to punish the editor for contempt.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think the inutility of discussing any particular case not directly connected with the vote is illustrated by this debate, inasmuch as my hon. friends from New Brunswick, who no doubt have had as much opportunity as my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), of making themselves acquainted with the facts of the case, are utterly at variance with him as to the particulars.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not say all the members from New Brunswick, but I mean those with whom I have had an opportunity of conferring with since the discussion began. They are not only at variance as to the steps which were taken in that election trial, but as to the nature of the comments which were made the subject of the contempt. Coming back to the general question, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says, there are various kinds of criticism, and I am not aware of any

judge under the British system of jurisprudence who objects to criticism by the press if it be fair and honest criticism, and the test applied must be whether the criticism pronounced is fair and honest criticism, or whether it transcends the bounds of fair and honest criticism, and is of such a character as to bring the administration of justice into contempt. In the particular instance which is under discussion, I think there is no doubt that the criticism of the action of the magistrate at Calgary was a criticism which might have been published with perfect impunity in the United Kingdom in regard to any judge in that country. But my hon. friends opposite, in calling my attention to transactions which occurred in another end of the country, and in asking me, as the hon. member for South Oxford has done, to extend there the supervision over the administration of justice which he supposes I have exercised with regard to the North-West Territories, forget for the moment that I have no control whatever over the conduct of judges in the various Provinces of Canada. Those judges are quite at liberty to pronounce decisions which I may think totally unwarranted, and even if they exceed their jurisdiction to as great an extent as I think the stipendiary magistrate at Calgary did, I have no power to deal with them, and I am not justified even in expressing an opinion as to their conduct. In this particular instance, the office of the judge had ceased, and it was simply a question whether I could recommend him to the Executive as suitable not only to be replaced in an office of the same kind, but in a higher office in which he would have more important functions, and from which he could only be removed by Parliament.

Clerk, Stenographer, Exchequer Court \$800

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A new office, I see.

Mr. THOMPSON. Under the Act of last Session there was simply a registrar appointed. It will no doubt be necessary to give him assistance, especially as the judges' duties call him to different parts of the country to exercise his functions. It is uncertain whether a clerk will be required and a stenographer, or a stenographer alone.

Contingencies and disbursements..... \$5,000

Mr. DAVIES. What is meant by this \$150 for books for judges.

Mr. LAURIER. I see another item at the bottom of the page for the purchase of law reports and text books, \$1,500; whereas, in this item only \$150 are asked for books for judges. What is the reason of the difference?

Mr. THOMPSON. The present item is for books for the immediate use of the judges in their chambers; the others are for the general library.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before we pass these items I desire to enquire from the Minister of Justice whether he is able to give the House any information as to an important question which has lately attracted the attention of the public, as it has of the hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, and that is: Whether it is the intention of the Government to recommend such increases to the salaries of the judges, especially in the Province of Ontario, as will enable them to obtain the services of the best men of the profession? Now, I believe I am speaking of a matter which is well known to both sides of the House, when I say that at the present moment, from various causes, there is a very general opinion, more particularly among the lawyers of Ontario, that at present you cannot get a first-class lawyer in that Province to go upon the bench. I do not want to make any reflection at all on the gentlemen who have accepted appointments under the Government, but I am stating what is a well-known fact. I believe that over and over again the present Government and the last Government endeavored to obtain the services of men who stood at the top of their

profession, and they were unable to do so because the salaries we were able to offer them were not adequate to obtain first-class legal talent. I believe, also, that there have been cases, more than one, of gentlemen retiring from the bench and coming down into practice of the profession again, a thing which certainly has very grave inconvenience. Now, this is a question of great public importance, and I think that this is the best time for us to interrogate the Government and to obtain from them, if they have any scheme upon the subject, some idea of what they propose to do in order to grapple with a difficulty which is becoming a very grave one in my own Province, and possibly in other Provinces too. Perhaps I ought to apologise to my legal friends for venturing on their own province, but I don't believe they will take any very great umbrage to my suggestion.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I took occasion last year to call the attention of the House to this matter, and I am very glad the hon. member for South Oxford has done so now. I think it is not a question for the legal profession alone, by any means; it is much more a question for the general public whether the men who occupy the highest legal position should not be procured for the bench. It is the public at large who are interested in law-suits much more than the lawyers are, and it is they who are most concerned in having the administration of justice placed upon the highest footing. I would also say that the difficulty complained of arises with regard to County Court judges, and while it is important, as regards the greater interest of a smaller number, that the Supreme Court judges and the higher court judges should be men of eminence and ability, it is of equal importance to a greater number of persons, though, perhaps, in a smaller degree in each case, that the County Court judges and the junior County Court judges should also be men fully qualified and competent for the positions they hold. Now, the same difficulty arises with regard to them as arises with regard to those in the Superior Court, and I hope that when the Minister and the Government take this matter into their consideration, as I have no doubt they will feel bound to do, that they will consider the position of the County Court and junior judges as well as those of the higher courts.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Whatever complaint there may be among the profession in Ontario, I think that in the Lower Provinces, at all events, they have a very strong case to present to this House. I have always taken the ground, ever since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, that it is a very unjust thing to place the judges of the Supreme Courts of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island in the invidious position of paying them only \$1,000, when the judges in the larger Provinces, Quebec and Ontario, receive a very much larger amount. I know there is a very strong feeling on this point in the profession in my own Province, and I have been given to understand that the hon. Minister of Justice, during the time that he adorned the bench of Nova Scotia, prepared a very strong memorial to the Administration of that day, setting forth the position which he and his brother judges occupied in that respect. Now that the hon. gentleman is in a position to exercise his great influence and great ability, to give effect to his own recommendations, I hope that the Province from which he comes, and the other Provinces as well, will be relieved from the position in which they are now so unfavorably placed, not only with regard to the judges of the Supreme Court, but also with regard to the judges of the County Courts. We have County Court judges in Nova Scotia who only receive \$2,400 a year. The county judge of Halifax has a very large business to attend to, the largest, I believe, of any in the Dominion; at all events, I believe more cases—I speak without professional knowledge, but from representations made to me—come

before the county judge of Halifax than before any other county judge in the Dominion.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). It has been represented to me that such is the case, and I believe it to be the fact, unless my hon. friend is aware of the number of cases heard by the different county judges, and in that event I would yield to his opinion. It has been represented to me that the business of Halifax is of that character which gives the County Court judge there more professional work than any judge in any part of the Dominion. Be that as it may, the work there is very extensive and very important, and while, for some reason or other, since the present Administration came into power the County Court judges of St. John has received an increase of salary, the salary of the County Court judge of Halifax has remained the same. There are some districts in the Province where the amount of business is naturally very small, and very different from those important and onerous duties that are thrown on the County Court judge in the city of Halifax. Now that the Minister of Justice is in a position, I repeat, to carry out the recommendations which he no doubt made, and which I am given to understand he made to the Government before he became a member of it, I hope, with the expression of opinion that has been given to-day from both sides of the House, the whole subject may be considered and the smaller Provinces relieved from the invidious position in which their judges stand under the present position of affairs.

Mr. WELSH. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has very properly expressed his opinion in regard to the remuneration and treatment of the judges in the Province of Nova Scotia. It brought to my mind the fact that the small Province to which I belong has been invariably treated worse than all. Talk about Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia has been treated like a prince, compared with the way Prince Edward Island has been treated. I find, in every department of the public service, Prince Edward Island is treated—in what manner shall I say?—by coercion. I have taken up some papers and have looked over them, and I find the pay of captains of mud-boats is greater than that of a captain of a Government steamer. I also see that an engineer on such a boat receives more pay than the captain. However, when the papers come down in answer to the motion I made, we can discuss the matter more fully. Let me say a word with respect to the judges of Prince Edward Island. We have as good legal talent there as in any Province, and we have a very fair example of it on the floor of this House, an example of which we are not ashamed, and that hon. gentleman would treat with contempt any offer made of the best office in the Island within the gift of the Dominion Government. I want to call the attention of the Government to the fact that they ought to pay men according to their ability and capacity, and not according to the size of the Province. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has put the matter very fairly for Nova Scotia. I know men who have devoted their lives to law, and they are not treated as they should be. I, therefore, hope the Government will take the matter in hand, and see that fair average pay is given to the judges, according to their ability. As to lawyers, I consider time would be wasted in sympathising with them. It is well understood they are able to take care of themselves, and I will not say one word in their behalf.

Mr. DAVIN. I entirely concur in the opinion expressed on both sides of the House as to the inadequacy of the salaries of judges all over the Dominion of Canada. In regard to the salaries of the judges in the North-West Territories, I think that there the salaries are also inadequate. The sum of \$4,000 a year for a judge in the North-West Territories is, I may say, just as deficient from the point of

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

view of meeting all the claims on him and enabling him to live as a judge should live, as the same amount is in Prince Edward Island or in New Brunswick. There is also an invidious arrangement in regard to the judges in the North-West Territories, which I would press upon the attention of the Minister of Justice. The senior judge there is only paid the same amount as the other judges. The Chief Justice of Manitoba receives \$5,000 a year, an utterly inadequate sum, I do not hesitate to say, for the chief justice of that Province. A chief justice in Winnipeg has more expenses to meet than a chief justice in Toronto, and the senior judge in the North-West Territories, who resides in the capital, and who is to all intents and purposes a chief, has to meet expenses connected with the dignity of his office that, in my opinion, should entitle him to a larger salary than the other judges. In regard to the general question, I did not intend to speak to it, nor do I intend now to deal with it, beyond expressing in a single sentence my own opinion. In regard to the important general question raised by the hon. member, and discussed so ably by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) and by the Minister of Justice, I may say this, as a man connected a little with law and a good deal with newspapers, that I have never known any instance, with the one exception which was dealt with here by the Minister of Justice, of a judge misusing the power of imprisonment for contempt. There are cases where newspapers have to comment on judgment of judges, and have to comment severely also on their judgments, and it is only right they should do so. It is in fact a protection to the public, and if the judges exercised their powers properly, it ought to be an assistance to them because their judgments will be expounded and enforced by the press and brought home to the popular conscience. If the press is allowed to pronounce upon a judgment that is correct and right, how can the press be prevented from questioning a judgment on the other hand if that judgment be wrong. I have seen cases in which the judges have been condemned and condemned, strongly too, by the press, but in language that was perfectly respectful. For my part I will undertake to say the very strongest possible things in regard to a judgment or in regard to judges; but I do not think there will be one gross expression or one expression that any man can object to in my language. I think that in the interest of justice, in the interests of the public it is most important that men exercising the functions of judges should be protected from that ribaldry which is sent broadcast over the press of this country and which makes a politician sometimes wish that he had the power of imprisoning for contempt. I only hope that the Minister of Justice will take into consideration the proposal to enhance the salaries of the judges, and I think, from what has happened here this afternoon, it must be perfectly clear to him that he will have the support of both sides of the House.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I desire to say a few words in reference to the salaries of the New Brunswick judges, speaking in the same line taken by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). I am perhaps the only barrister representing a New Brunswick constituency who is not in active practice, and I may be said to speak on this question in a perfectly disinterested way. On behalf of the New Brunswick bar I desire strongly to express the hope that the Minister will consider the proposition and listen to the suggestion made by so many eminent laymen in this House, to increase the salaries of the Supreme Court judges of New Brunswick to \$5,000. I may be pardoned for reminding this House that the little Province has taken a very prominent part in the legal history of this country, and that it has given to the Supreme Court of Canada its Chief Justice. Anyone who is familiar with the New Brunswick Law Reports and who reads their judgments carefully, has no reason to be ashamed of the reputation of

the bench of that Province. I know it is said that in New Brunswick the incomes of barristers are not so great as in some great cities in the upper Provinces, and therefore that it is more difficult in those upper Provinces to get a man of eminence sufficient to fill the position of judge without giving him a higher salary than in the lower Provinces. I do not believe in this argument. I think it is a matter of common justice between Province and Province to give to the choice and picked men of the Province of New Brunswick \$5,000 a year, the same as to judges in the upper Provinces.

Mr. HAGGART. I trust I will be pardoned if I take an entirely different view to some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this subject. I am of opinion that the salaries of judges are sufficient. There is not in the rural constituencies a lawyer who would not be glad to accept the office of a County Court judge, and who does not think that the salaries and emoluments are large enough. The reason why, in my opinion, men of first-class legal talent cannot be got to fill the office of judge in the Superior Courts is, because of the centralisation of the different law courts in certain cities in the large Provinces, which offers facilities to lawyers for obtaining far larger sums and larger salaries than men of equal ability in almost every other walk of life. Another thing I have to complain about is this: Those lawyers do not wish to leave their large fees and large emoluments for the purpose of taking a position which, although perhaps more dignified, has not so much pay attached to it. I wish to offer a suggestion to the Minister of Justice on the difficulty of obtaining justice in this country on account of the number of courts. We have too many judges and too many administrators of justice in this country. One thing which ought, above all others, to be scientific in the law is the interpretation of a clause of an Act of Parliament or a statute. Perhaps a judge may differ from another in passing an opinion as to the evidence taken before him, and one may be mistaken in the character of a man. In the interpretation of a clause of an Act of Parliament it is different. A lawyer's education on this point ought to be scientific and mathematical. What do we see throughout this country? You may appeal to a judge in Ontario to get an interpretation upon a clause of an Act of Parliament. He gives one opinion. You appeal to the full court, and, as is the case to my own knowledge, they give an entirely different one. If you go from there to the Court of Appeal (there are three different tribunals in the Province), they will, perhaps, coincide with the court below them. You apply to the Supreme Court and they, perhaps, reverse their decision; and then you go to the Privy Council in England, and they reverse the decision of the Supreme Court in Canada. I would suggest to the Minister of Justice the reduction of those courts, and I think some arrangement should be made with the Provincial Legislatures for the reduction of those courts. Unless a man has a large fortune, or a large amount of money, it is almost impossible to get justice in this country, as the case is taken from one court to another in appeal. As I stated before, that which should be most scientific to the lawyers and judges is the interpretation of an Act. It is now impossible to get a consensus of opinion on any point of law in the different courts of the Province. I think the feeling throughout this country is that the number of courts is too numerous. If there were less facilities for a certain class in the community earning larger pay and getting larger fees, than equally clever and equally able men in other walks of life, there would be no difficulty to get first class men to fill the position of judges for the large salaries which we pay now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish my hon. friend would speak a little offener and bring this grave matter more to the attention of this law-ridden community, than

he does. As to the matter on which he directed some considerable attention, the extraordinary difficulty of the courts interpreting an Act of Parliament, I would say that my friend is a pretty old member of the House, and has assisted in passing a great many of those Acts of Parliament; he knows how they are made, and he need not wonder if all the courts, not merely in British North America or the British Empire, but the world at large, should sometimes have extreme difficulty in finding out what those enactments mean. The way in which our legislation is conducted is as much productive of uncertainty, ambiguity, obscurity, and all manner of litigation as anything well could be. I think it will continue to be so until our mode of legislating and drawing Acts of Parliament is materially altered from the mode that now prevails. He has made a very interesting suggestion for a great moral reform in the administration of justice. I have not heard the First Minister or Minister of Justice say if they are prepared to make any statement as to the important practical question which I raised some time ago, on what they mean to do, on what I might almost call the strike that is initiated among lawyers in my own Province, as to the filling important judicial offices. I believe that every one here, not excepting my hon. friend who spoke last, will agree that it is of the vastest importance that we should have the very best legal talent in the community represented on the bench. As I said I do not wish to make any invidious remarks on the gentlemen that have been appointed,—very far from it, but I do know that there is a very strong opinion among the public in the Province of Ontario, and for aught I know in other places, that we are not able to get anything like the best class of lawyers to go on the bench. The administration of justice will suffer very much if you find that the bar are very decidedly stronger than the bench in any Province.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have no doubt the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) reflects the views of a large number of people of this country, and it is quite evident from the cheers he received at the conclusion of his speech that he reflects the views of no small number in this House. I think, however, that some of his objections are without foundation. He will find, on reference to the proceedings in the mother land, that appeals are just as frequent there from the judges of the court in the first instance as they are in this country. The complications of society are such that those appeals necessarily must arise. In many cases, owing to want of time or pressure of business, the view of a judge in the first instance may have been given in rather a hurried manner, without that consideration and reflection that is possible when the case is more fully argued and explained before the Court of Appeal. I do not think the public has very much to complain of in this country on that score, nor do I venture to express any opinion on the general subject as to whether the salaries of the judges in the larger Provinces are so low that they should be raised. But I do venture to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the anomalous position in which the judges of Prince Edward Island have been placed for some years back, with regard to the great disparity that exists between their salaries and those of the judges of the other Provinces; and I am sure that if any change is to be made in the salaries of the judges, the hon. gentleman will see that that anomaly is removed. In the Province of British Columbia, the Chief Justice gets \$5,820; the next judge, \$4,850, and three puisné judges \$4,000 each. In the Province of Manitoba the Chief Justice gets \$5,000, and the other three judges \$4,000 each. In the Province of Nova Scotia the Chief Justice gets \$5,000, and the other judges \$4,000 each. In the Province of New Brunswick the same rule prevails as in the Province of Nova Scotia. It is very curious that the salaries of the Prince Edward Island judges were placed a long way below

those of the judges in the other Provinces. The Chief Justice there gets but \$4,000, although he has to discharge the duties of a judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court besides his regular duties, and the puisné judges receive \$3,000 each, whereas in every other part of the Dominion \$4,000 is the minimum. Whether or not the salaries of the judges of Manitoba or British Columbia are too low, I do not know. I do not know anything of the social or other circumstances of those places; but there can be no justification in keeping the salaries of the judges in Prince Edward Island at the low rate at which they have been for such a long time. My hon. colleague says he has no interest in this matter, and as far as I am concerned I have no personal interest either; but I know that it is impossible for the judges to discharge their duties and live on the salaries they receive; and if they had not private incomes, they would not be where they are. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) referred to the case of the County Court judges. I am not going to express an opinion whether their salaries should be increased or not; but there are exceptional cases. I think the judges of metropolitan counties have a much larger quantity of work than those of outlying counties. The hon. member for Halifax said the judges in that city had the largest business in the Dominion of Canada. He may be right; I will not say positively that he is not; but if he looks into the matter, he will find that some of the judges come very close to them, and one of them is the judge for Queen's county. He determines an enormous mass of cases, increased by the fact of the cost of litigation in his court, and the fees having been made very low by the Local Legislature; and if any man deserves an increase, that man does. Now, representations have been made to the Government setting forth the facts in regard to the judges of Prince Edward Island, and I hope the Government will do fair and even-handed justice to them. I think it is sufficient merely to state the facts without enlarging upon them.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). I am rather in sympathy with the principle for which my learned friend who has taken his seat, contends. I do not appreciate the reason for the invidious distinction which has been made in regard to the same office in the different Provinces in the Dominion. If the labors of the judiciary in one Province are lighter than in another, that is a reason for a smaller number of judges in the one case than in the other, but I think that the judges of the same relative rank who perform the same kind of duties in the same kind of courts, should be put more on a level, without regard to the Provinces in which they perform those duties. As some reason for this, I might mention that when the County Court jurisdiction was instituted, the salaries of the County Court judges in the different Provinces were made very nearly alike. Then, to take an illustration of the principle which this House will appreciate, there is no such distinction among the hon. gentlemen who compose the Cabinet. Hon. gentlemen coming from the Maritime Provinces are not given a smaller salary than those who come from the larger Provinces; and if the principle which is acted upon in regard to the Supreme Court judges is a sound one, I do not see why a similar distinction does not obtain in regard to the other officers who are paid out of the Consolidated Fund. I hope, therefore, that the Minister of Justice, in preparing the measure that has been alluded to to-day, will consider not merely the increase of salaries in particular Provinces, but a leveling up of the salaries of the judges in all the Provinces.

Mr. THOMPSON. I hope to introduce a Bill in connection with this subject in a few days, and until then I am not prepared to enter into a discussion of the various principles by which we may be guided.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I was going to say that what has been said in regard to the salaries of the judges of the different Provinces applies with equal force to the salaries of the

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Lieutenant Governors. I remember that, in 1867, when the scale of Lieutenant Governors' salaries was first fixed, I took exception to the difference made between the larger and smaller Provinces. For instance, compare the position in Halifax with the position in Toronto. Halifax is the headquarters of the Army and Navy, and heavy duties and responsibilities in the way of public entertainment are expected from the Lieutenant Governor in Halifax which do not always fall upon the Lieutenant Governors of some of the other Provinces; and while many Governors have been appointed in the past with ample private means, such candidates cannot always be secured; and I am sure of one thing, that no one who has filled the position of Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia since Confederation has been able to save anything out of his salary, if he has been able to live on it at all. I know from one who occupied that position a long time, that he had to draw on his private means for the expenses of that position; and I think that, at the time the Government are considering this question of the salaries of judges, they ought also to seriously consider whether the Lieutenant Governors of the various Provinces should not be placed in the same position as regards salary.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). Has anything been done with regard to extending the jurisdiction of the Vice-Admiralty Court? Some years ago there was a correspondence between the Imperial and Dominion Governments on the subject, and I think it is important some steps should be taken to assimilate the jurisdiction of our Vice-Admiralty Court with that of the High Admiralty Court in England.

Mr. THOMPSON. We have had the promise of Her Majesty's Government, from year to year, that that subject should be legislated upon, and we must wait their action in the matter.

Kingston Penitentiary..... \$118,629 85

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman had better state, generally, the reasons why he is asking for an increase of \$7,000. Has the number of prisoners increased, or is it expected to increase?

Mr. THOMPSON. On page 26 the hon. gentleman will observe that the first increase is one of \$50 in the salary of the accountant, which is a statutory increase. It is proposed to add \$130 to the salary of the steward under these circumstances. At the earnest solicitation of the warden, and in consequence of the long and very valuable services of the steward, I consented to recommend an increase of \$100, and the \$30 is the increase provided under the Penitentiary Act of last Session. By reference to that Act, it will be seen that the steward is entitled to a maximum salary of \$900, and from the \$800, which I recommend to-day, his salary will be increased to \$900, at the rate of \$30 a year. The chief keeper receives an increase of \$30, likewise a statutory increase; so with the \$30 allowed for the schoolmaster. I may explain, in that connection, that there has not been a schoolmaster appointed. A vote has been taken from year to year, which, last year, was reduced to \$500. The prison authorities have ascertained, from experience, that the most efficient mode of giving instruction is to allow four or five of the keepers, best qualified, to give instruction at a stated hour, and, inasmuch as this entails extra work, the \$500 will be divided among them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does appear to me that that is rather a doubtful practice. I should say that if there was one post in the penitentiary more than another to which it is desirable to appoint a man with special qualifications, it would be the somewhat difficult post of schoolmaster to the prisoners, and the practice of appointing half-a-dozen men in turn to act as school-master, is very dubious theoretically. I have not made any enquiry into the subject as to how this system would work, but it seems to me it is

contrary to all our practical experience in ordinary educational matters. It would be well to consider it.

Mr. THOMPSON. I was inclined to take that view myself last year, and in reducing the vote to \$500, it was my intention to recommend the appointment of a school-master, but I ascertained from the prison authorities that for reasons connected with the discipline of the institution, it is practically impossible to assemble the convicts, at the one time and have them taught by the one school-master. Each of these keepers has in charge a certain gang of men, and by taking the men under his control, at a certain hour, which happens to be the dinner hour of the keepers, he can give his gang the necessary school instruction. On the recommendation of the warden who has given the subject much consideration, I refrained from appointing a school-master, and the statutory increase necessary to provide instruction is divided among the keepers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You do not propose to divide \$500 among five instructors?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, if the present system is continued.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a point on which I can see there may be convenience and a good deal of difference of opinion. I do not like to press my view unnecessarily, but if any good is to be done to these unfortunates in the way of reforming them, I think it would be really worth considering whether you would not do better by having a school-master and an assistant, instead of making this a kind of prize for some half-a-dozen guards. As the right hon. the First Minister has been Minister of Justice and knows the Kingston Penitentiary very well, as well as I do myself, I suppose the Minister of Justice has consulted with him on the subject. Has the First Minister any opinion on the point formed from his long experience?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can quite agree with the statement of the hon. the Minister of Justice. I can quite understand that one school-master cannot perform his duties for the whole of the convicts who are likely to receive instruction, which will consist principally in reading, writing and arithmetic. The keepers are pretty well educated men. They are superior men, and it seems to me that a keeper, having a certain number of men under his control, would be more fitted to give them the necessary instruction than one whom they only see occasionally, and for whose authority, therefore, they have not the same respect. It is quite clear that in a penitentiary like Kingston, if there is any large number seeking means of learning how to write and read, one school-master could not do the work.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The reason I put the question is this: Of course, I speak from memory and under correction, but my impression is that the great proportion of our convicts know how to read and write, which is not the case elsewhere, and that the intention, when this vote was taken, was that a school-master should be specially detailed to instruct the small minority who require special education. A man may be extremely well educated and very unqualified to act as school-master. His qualifications as a keeper has nothing at all to do with the special faculty of imparting instruction, and it was chiefly for that reason that I called attention to this matter. Of course, this is a matter which the Minister of Justice is extremely competent to look after, but I wish to impress upon him the necessity of considering it a little more. My reason is this: Here you are offering some five or six officers a considerable increase of pay, nearly equal to 20 per cent. on their present salaries. Now, we know well that all these gentlemen will all vote themselves perfectly qualified instructors for a smaller sum probably than \$100 a year, and I doubt if on the whole the process will be found to work well,

unless there are a larger number of uneducated men than I think there are in that prison.

Mr. THOMPSON. One hundred dollars has been added to the salary of the miller. He has been a good while in that prison and has a good deal of work to do, and he notified me that it would be impossible for him to continue in that employment unless he got an increase; and I believe he had a promise from my predecessor in office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has that mill been a quite satisfactory operation? I never regarded the old mill as a very useful institution. I rather regarded it as a whim of poor Mr. Creighton's, and thought it was rather useless and a sort of fifth wheel to the economy of the penitentiary.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it has been fairly successful, as far as I am in a position to speak of it. In regard to the increases of \$60 to the various trade instructors, I propose that they shall stand in a somewhat better position than the ordinary keepers. At present the maximum for ordinary keepers is \$600, but by the Act of last year it is provided that the maximum salary of trade instructors shall be \$700. This is the increase of \$30 for last year, and \$30 for this, because no vote for that purpose was taken last year. The \$30 for the shoemaker is also a statutory increase, but it is only \$30 instead of \$60 because he is a new appointee. The quarry trade instructor is in the same position. Then there are two statutory increases of \$30 each. There is a provision for the appointment of two new guards at a smaller salary than the two who preceded them, though there appears to be a clerical error in the estimates as printed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How does the heavy charge for officers' uniforms come to be made?

Mr. THOMPSON. They are to have a summer uniform every year instead of once every two years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are these uniforms made in the prison?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think so, but I am not positive.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a very heavy additional item for working expenses, \$1,600; what does that represent?

Mr. THOMPSON. There is an additional sum for heating on account of the anticipated advance in the price of coal. There is an addition for gas. It is not anticipated that that will have to be used, as we are increasing to some extent the facility for supplying gas.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman, and the attention of the First Minister, to a fact which I can state of my own personal knowledge, that the manufacture of gas in the penitentiary in Kingston has become a nuisance of the very first quality to certain persons occupying residences adjacent to the institution. The First Minister knows what I refer to, the residence particularly of Mr. J. A. Allen. I am prepared to state of my own knowledge that many days last summer, and the summer before, it was impossible for anyone with any comfort to walk about Mr. Allen's grounds when the wind was in a certain quarter blowing from the penitentiary. It would be very undesirable to have a matter of that kind brought before the courts. I believe it has been brought to the attention of the Minister and of the First Minister, and I would ask whether they intend to abate the nuisance, or whether it will be tried before a court of law?

Mr. THOMPSON. I should be sorry if anything of that kind had to come before the courts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the value of the property as a residential

property will be wholly destroyed if no means are found of putting an end to the nuisance which is caused by the offensive smell of this gas if the wind sets, as it usually does there, from the south-west. I could bring fifty witnesses to prove that.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have been informed by the officers that there is no more inconvenience caused by the gas-making operations in Kingston than is caused in any city by the manufacture of gas, and there cannot possibly be any inconvenience except perhaps once a week when the retorts are being cleaned out. However, as Mr. Allen disputes that, I have directed an examination to be made of the matter, and I will deal with it as soon as I have a report on the subject.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would it not be better in every way to introduce the electric light system? I think it would be more wholesome for the prisoners.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have directed the officers to see if that is possible or not. The reports previously indicated that it was a matter of very doubtful expediency, but I am having more full enquiries made, and I have been largely led to that course by this very complaint of Mr. Allen to which the hon. gentleman refers.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister has laid on the Table the very important letters to which I alluded, which passed between himself and Secretary Bayard. I suppose he will see that these are printed and placed in the hands of every member, and they should be printed in good large type.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, that is being printed.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 12th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a notification of a vacancy having occurred in the representation of the Electoral District of Missisquoi by the decease of George Claves, Esq., and that he had issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

DEATH OF THE HON. MR. PLUMB.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt every hon. member of this House will have been greatly shocked at the announcement of the unexpected decease of the hon. Speaker of the Senate. To those gentlemen who knew Mr. Plumb, it will be a sorrow without any alleviation. To those like myself and the gentlemen immediately surrounding me, who have known him intimately, his loss, I may say, is irretrievable. He sat in this House for some time, and took a very marked and distinguished position in the House; and those who knew him personally without reference to political divisions, must have admired his

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

wonderful ability, his encyclopædic knowledge on every subject, and the readiness with which he communicated that knowledge. To those who sought him as a sure and certain source of information the feeling must be deep, aggravated under the circumstances by the fact that he had been presiding, not only last Session, but this Session, with great success and acceptance over the Chamber of which he was a member, and full, apparently, of life and hope. To me, I may say, the loss is irreparable, and I can say no more. Out of respect for the position he held, as the presiding officer of the co-ordinate branch of the Legislature, I move, Sir, that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. LAURIER. It becomes my duty under such circumstances to second the motion of the right hon. leader of the Government, made not only out of respect to the other branch of the Legislature, but also out of respect to the memory of the late lamented Mr. Plumb. I agree in everything that has been said by the right hon. gentleman as to the deceased gentleman. We who had the pleasure of sitting with him for many years, know that his loss must be a very great loss indeed to the right hon. gentleman and to his party generally. We knew him to be a hard fighter; at the same time, we knew him to be a fair opponent, who was ready to receive as much as he gave. But those, Sir, who knew Mr. Plumb only in public life did not know the whole man. Those who had the advantage of knowing him in private life will be ready to bear cheerful testimony that he was a most courteous gentleman, with most varied accomplishments and most charming conversational powers, and at all times a most agreeable companion.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 13th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 35) to enable the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to run a ferry between Beecher Bay, in British Columbia, and a point on the Straits of Fuca, within the United States of America.—(Mr. Baker.)

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 40) to extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.—(Mr. Charlton.)

PATENTS OF INVENTION.

Mr. CARLING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 38) respecting Patents of Invention. He said: I propose to amend the Act by giving power to appoint a Deputy Commissioner of Patents. Under the present law the Deputy Minister of Agriculture is Deputy Minister of Patents, but the Patent branch has grown so large of late years that the Government deem it advisable some one should be at the head of that branch to take sole charge of it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FERRIES.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 39) to amend the Act respecting Ferries, chapter 97 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman explain the provisions of this Bill?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The object of the amendment is to make some alteration in the manner of dealing with ferries as it exists at present. Now, all ferries are licensed after competition, but in the Bill it is proposed that we should change that in regard to international ferries, so that they may be leased by Order in Council, and also that in regard to existing licenses when they expire, if the service has been satisfactorily performed and it is thought it should continue, the Governor General in Council may extend the time for a term not exceeding ten years. As to inter-provincial ferries, the limit will be made five years, and it is proposed that, in the case of all ferries which would run out their term under the old Act, if the work has been satisfactorily performed, the Governor in Council may extend the term for a period not exceeding five years, subject to the provisions of this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

Mr. CARLING moved that on Friday next the House go into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That the Governor in Council may appoint a Deputy Commissioner of Patents of Invention, whose salary shall be _____ dollars per annum.

Mr. EDGAR. I suppose the hon. Minister does not intend to go on with that resolution until the Bill referring to the same subject is printed and distributed?

Mr. CARLING. No, I will not go on with the resolution until the Bill is distributed.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before the Government Orders are called, I would suggest that it would be well, in order to give some work to the Committees, to call the Private Bills which are ready, read them a second time, and send them to the Committees.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to ask if the letters between Mr. Bayard and Sir Charles Tupper are printed yet? I think the Minister of Finance promised to have them printed and distributed on Monday, but they have not reached me yet.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think they are printed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be a convenience if they could be printed, and perhaps the Minister will take a note of it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I very much regret to see that the Minister of Finance is not in his place, and to hear that he is rather seriously indisposed. In order to prevent confusion, I should like to know whether that will interfere with the arrangement which was made to proceed with the debate to-morrow.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I may say, first, that we are very sorry that the Minister of Finance has been so unwell for a few days. We hope he may recover very soon, but it is not likely that he can be here to-morrow. Nevertheless, as that day was fixed, if the hon. gentleman wishes to proceed to-morrow, the Government will not object.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then we will proceed to-morrow, if you do not object.

MERCHANTS MARINE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. CURRAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 11) to empower the Merchants Marine Insurance Company of Canada to relinquish its charter and to provide for the winding up of its affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like the mover to give some explanation about this Bill. There is another hon. gentleman who, as well as myself, happens to be a director of this company. We have put a good deal of money into it, and he has informed me that he received no notice of this, and I have no recollection of receiving any notice of an intention to come to Parliament to ask powers to wind up the affairs of this company. I would like the mover of the Bill to make some explanations, or if he is not prepared to give them, he should let the Bill stand until we know what it is. Perhaps my co-directors want to say something about this.

Mr. SCARTH. I find, since speaking to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that this Bill is the substance of a resolution passed in 1881. I had forgotten the particulars on which this Bill is founded, and would like very much to have some explanation from the hon. member who is introducing it.

Mr. CURRAN. The Bill was placed in my hands in the usual way by the solicitors of the company, with the request that I should put it through, and the statement was made to me—and, in glancing over the Bill, I think my hon. friends will find the statement is correct—that every precaution has been taken to protect all the rights of all the parties concerned. There are special provisions made that all those rights should be taken care of, and a sum of money retained to cover such rights as may not be settled at the present time. I believe the Bill has been framed upon similar legislation introduced into the British House of Commons, and that in so far as the form of the Bill is concerned, and the protection that is given to all interested parties, it may be safely allowed to take its second reading.

Mr. MITCHELL. I can only say that the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth) and myself are directors of that company, and we have lost a good deal of money in it. This resolution which has been spoken of was passed to close up the company some seven years ago, not to come to Parliament. What the solicitor of the company has been doing with the moneys, that have been collected since then, I should like to know, and I think the Bill ought to stand until the solicitor is brought here, and we have an opportunity of knowing what the particular object is, what has been done with the money, and what position the company is in. For my part I have no recollection of receiving any notice of an intention of presenting a Bill to Parliament for winding up the company—I do not know whether the hon. member for Winnipeg has. I think, under these circumstances, two of the directors being present, that the solicitor of the company ought not to be allowed to bring in a Bill here without consulting the directors.

Mr. CURRAN. I am under the impression that my hon. friend is mistaken with regard to the directors not having been consulted. The hon. member for Winnipeg says that this is an old resolution, passed in 1881, which is being carried out now. At all events, all the objections of my hon. friend can be dealt with in committee. The Bill may be read the second time, and unless the hon. gentleman, and all other members of the committee, are perfectly satisfied that everything is straight and regular, the Bill will not be allowed to go through committee. I think my hon. friend should allow the second reading of the Bill, reserving to himself the right of exercising all his privileges in committee.

Mr. SCARTH. I have to corroborate what the hon. gentleman has just said, that the directors have never been consulted with regard to this Bill. I never knew anything about it until I heard the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Curran) bring it in. I think the Bill ought to be allowed to stand, at all events, until the directors are called together and consulted in the matter.

Mr. WELSH. I am very glad this matter has been ventilated a little. I think we cannot be too cautious in a matter of this kind. We do not know whether the Bill is wanted by the shareholders themselves, or whether it is promoted solely by the solicitor and the directors. Now, I have invariably remarked, when a petition is presented to Parliament for powers to wind up a company, that the interests of the shareholders are generally sacrificed. I suppose this matter is going before the Private Bills Committee; I will be there, and I shall insist upon a fuller statement of the affairs of this company before I sanction this Act.

Mr. EDGAR. I think this is a matter of large interest, and ought to be considered by this House before the Bill gets a second reading. I do not know whether the directors or the shareholders have concurred in it, but I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he has concurred in it? I would like to ask the mover of the Bill why this company does not come under the general Winding-up Companies' Act? because that Act provides fully for the winding-up of just such companies as this. That Act is respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Companies, &c., and the term "Insurance Companies" covers all insurance, whether life, fire, marine, ocean or inland. Now, I do not think the Minister of Justice can have had this matter brought before his attention, or he would scarcely sanction private legislation for winding up a company unless some very special circumstances called for it. I do not think that this should be, as a matter of course, referred to the Committee of the House; I think we should settle the principle at this stage and hear the views of the Government as to whether this legislation ought to be allowed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If this Bill had passed through the Committee on Banking and Commerce and returned to the House, I could well understand what the hon. gentleman says. But the object of the reference to the committee is exactly for the purpose of investigating the Bill, to see whether injustice is done to any one, or whether this matter should not come under the general Act, or whether there are reasons for passing a special Act. We are not in a position, as a House, to go into that investigation, and that is the reason why we have appointed Standing Committees. I would suggest that, instead of discussing this matter now, we send the Bill to the Committee of Banking and Commerce, where it will be investigated, and where the members can consider this matter a great deal more carefully than we can do here. After going to that committee, in the course, I suppose, of seven or eight days, the Bill will come back here, and if there are still objections to it, we can consider them, and either amend the Bill or throw it out. But now I do not think we are in a position to deal with it, and I would certainly ask my hon. friend who objected to it in the first instance, to allow it to go to the committee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) By reading the Bill a second time now, the House would practically assent to, and endorse its principle. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but there can be nothing passed upon or approved at the second reading, but the principle of the Bill. Then its details, the preamble, and everything of that kind, are referred to the Committee; but so far as the principle is concerned, we dispose of it here. The Committee on Banking and Commerce do not discuss the principle of the Bill after it is once

Mr. CURRAN.

passed upon by the House. Now, a very important point has been raised by my hon. friend behind me, and that is whether, in the face of the Act which covers cases of this kind, the Government should permit individual companies to come in and pass special Acts to wind these companies up, unless those companies are able to show good and sufficient reasons for so doing. If we pass this Bill, as a matter of course we assent to the principle that every company that comes here can get a special Act of incorporation for itself, and there are many reasons why that should not be so. The Winding up Companies' Act has carefully prepared provisions for the protection of the shareholders, but it does not at all follow that these private Acts, when brought in, have these provisions. Parliament has made general provisions in this Act for the benefit of shareholders. I happen to be a shareholder of this company, and I never heard of this Bill before, and never had an intimation that it was being introduced. I am in the same position as my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House; we have no knowledge of it, and do not know what it means. But on the larger question raised by the hon. gentleman behind me I think the Government should consider whether they are not endorsing fully the principle of the Bill by carrying the second reading.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I think the hon. gentleman has failed to draw the distinction between a private Bill and a public Bill. It is when a public Bill receives a second reading that it is considered that the principle has been adopted, but it is otherwise with respect to a private Bill. A private Bill receives its second reading *pro forma* and goes to a select committee, and there the first question before it is: "Shall the preamble be taken as proved?" and evidence is taken on that point. This very discussion shows the impossibility of considering the principle of the Bill on the second reading here. We cannot well hear witnesses to prove the preamble or the merits of the Bill, but they must be heard before the Select Standing Committee. It is for that reason that the second reading of a private Bill differs from the second reading of a public Bill; in the former case the principle of the Bill is not considered as adopted by the House when it passes the second reading until the committee has adopted the preamble, and if the preamble is not proved the Select Standing Committee reports back to the House that the preamble is not proven, and the Bill is not proceeded with. I think, therefore, it would be proper to allow the Bill to pass *pro forma* the second reading, and refer it to a Select Standing Committee where evidence would be given to show whether it is a proper Bill or not.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to ask a question with regard to a Bill, such, for example, as one to incorporate a railway company coming before the House. If the opinion of this House was that the railway was unnecessary, or objections of a financial or legal character were taken against the proposed enactment, or that they would interfere with other existing companies, or similar grounds, would not the principle of the Bill, it having passed the second reading, be sustained before the committee?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has not been as much before the committee as I have. In reply to the Minister of Public Works I may say that although objections have been taken to the principle of a Bill, the Bill has been sustained, because it had passed its second reading and that the House had adopted the principle, not only for public Bills, but on Bills affecting corporations. I take exception to this Bill on grounds entirely different from those taken by the two hon. gentlemen who have spoken on that side of the House.

What I contend is this: Where parties occupying the position of directors, as the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Scarth) and myself do, have received no notice of the intention to wind up the company, and a Bill for that purpose comes before this House, and this is the first intimation we have received in an official form, some further information should be given by the hon. member in charge of the Bill before the House is asked to pass the second reading. I suggest that the Bill should stand over, and the mover should inform the parties who have put the matter in his hands as to the objections that have been taken, and let them explain to at least two of the directors, who have lost a good deal of money by the company, what their objects are, and why our counsel was not asked before this important step in regard to the company's affairs was adopted. It is early in the Session yet, and we can get the solicitor of the company to explain to those two of the directors why the matter was not laid before them before such an important step was taken.

Mr. THOMPSON. No doubt the objections suggested by the other side of the House are very important, and I concur in the suggestion that when permission is asked to wind up the affairs of the company, not under the general winding-up Act, but under special provisions to be granted by Bill, this should only be allowed, as suggested by the hon. member for Queens, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), when special grounds are shown for making the exception, and I would expect them to be very well sustained before I would concur in the proposal. I am prepared to vote for the second reading of the Bill, so that the parties may show the special grounds; and it is only by reading the Bill the second time and sending it before the committee, that they can have an opportunity of doing so. They have otherwise no opportunity of presenting the explanations which the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), says should be presented to the House before the Bill is assented to. He will see that the course he has suggested, that the Bill should stand over until the solicitor of the company come to Ottawa and satisfies two members of this House in regard to the matter, would be an entirely unsatisfactory practice. The solicitor might entirely satisfy them and not satisfy any other two members of the House, and still the House would be blocking the passage of the Bill, not on any ground of principle at all, but in order that individual members should be convinced by parties outside. I take it that in allowing the Bill to be read the second time we are doing nothing more than recognising the fact that the Bill complies with the Rules of the House, and has reached a stage when the parties who desire it to be passed may be heard in its favor. Until they urge very sufficient reasons indeed why they should obtain special legislation in reference to winding up, I for one will not agree to the Bill being passed; but when I vote for the second reading, I simply vote to allow the parties an opportunity to present such sufficient reasons which, I admit, it will be very difficult for them to sustain. All that the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has said is, no doubt, strongly against the Bill, that is, that the assent of the present directors has not yet been obtained, that they have not been consulted, and that this Bill is being promoted upon a resolution passed six or eight years ago. As one of the members of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, these statements, if not satisfactorily explained, would induce me to vote against the Bill; but we simply send it to the committee in order that those difficulties may be removed if they can be removed, or, at all events, we give the promoters of the Bill an opportunity to remove them. It would be unreasonable to expect the hon. member in charge of a Bill in the House to carry a brief in support of it and make statements that the directors were consulted or were not, and on being met by counter-statements on the

other side, make a further reply. It is only by giving the parties an opportunity to appear before the committee and give the explanations, that the House can arrive at a satisfactory conclusion in regard to the Bill. Hon. gentlemen will remember that the frequent practice is for private Bills to be rejected after they have gone to the committee, so that the principle of this Bill is not affirmed in any way that would bind the House by allowing it to pass the second reading.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is one feature in regard to which the Minister of Justice has drawn an unfair distinction. He says it would scarcely be proper to allow this Bill to be postponed to allow two members of the House to be consulted. It is not as a member of this House that I claim the right to be consulted, but as an investor in the company and one of its directors. No harm can be done by deferring the second reading of the Bill. It is not a matter for the general public so much as a domestic matter of the company itself, one interesting those who have put their money into the company, none of whom, with the exception of the solicitor of the company and another officer, have made money out of it. I want to know the authority of these parties to incur the expenditure connected with this Bill for the winding up of the company. I take exception to the course recommended by the Minister of Justice. Of course, hon. gentlemen opposite are strong enough to do what they like; but we as a minority, and I as a minority, have rights, and they are personal rights, not as a member of this House I claim them, but as a private individual interested in the affairs of the company.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that a false construction has been put on the remarks of my hon. friend. There is no question of principle involved in the matter; it is a question of opportunity. Two members of the House, shareholders in the company and directors, state that they are now aware for the first time of this application, and they never were consulted in regard to the Bill. They ask, not that the Bill be thrown out, but that the second reading be postponed in order to allow them to ascertain how far they can support the application or oppose it. It seems to me, under the circumstances, to be only fair and an act of justice to those two gentlemen who are shareholders and directors, to postpone the second reading until they have had an opportunity to examine into the matter, and see whether they are prepared to support or oppose the Bill. It is a question of courtesy, and, perhaps, also a question of justice, which the majority of the House should extend to the very fair application made by the member for Northumberland.

Mr. THOMPSON. As far as I am concerned I do not want to be understood, from what the hon. gentleman has just stated, as having misinterpreted the hon. member for Northumberland. His was not a request that the Bill should be stayed—

An hon. MEMBER. Yes, yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is what I requested.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has contradicted something I have not said. What I was about to say was that it was not a request by the hon. member for Northumberland that the Bill should stand over until he should enquire into the matter, but a request that it should stand over until the persons promoting the Bill should come to Ottawa and explain it to him. All I said in relation to that was, that the committee room was the most convenient place to have it not only explained, but proved to the satisfaction of the House that the Bill ought to pass. Of course I fully agree with the hon. member who has just spoken, that when any member of the House desires delay in regard to a private Bill, to enquire into its merits, there is no reason in the world why the Bill should be forced.

Mr. CURRAN. I have no objection that the Bill should stand.

Bill allowed to stand.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 8) to incorporate the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Bill (No. 9) respecting the Canada Southern and the Erie and Niagara Railway Companies.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Ontario Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Ward.)

Bill (No. 18) to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western and Lake Ontario Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson (Welland).)

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 21) respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 23) to reduce the capital stock of "La Banque Nationale."—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 33) to amend the Act incorporating the Hereford Branch Railway Company, and to change the name of the company to the Hereford Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 34) respecting the South Norfolk Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. SCARTH (in the absence of Mr. DALY) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 25) to confirm the charter of incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.

Mr. EDGAR. This is not an ordinary Bill at all, and I think the House is entitled to some explanation about it. It seems to be an Act to confirm an Order in Council which was passed about two years ago, incorporating this railway. Now, I think the House certainly ought to know, before they vote a second reading of this Bill, what is wrong with the Order in Council that it should require confirmation; how is it that an Order in Council passed under the special powers of an Act is not right; and in what particular does the House require to confirm that?

Mr. SCARTH. I moved the second reading of the Bill in consequence of the absence of my friend the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly), who is detained in Ontario. I am unable to give any explanation of it, but I suppose there is no objection that the Bill should stand.

Bill allowed to stand.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY AGREEMENTS.

Mr. SMALL moved second reading of (Bill No. 26) "to confirm a certain Agreement made between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Canada Southern Railway Company and the London and Port Stanley Railway Company, and a certain Agreement made between the London and South-Eastern Railway Company and the Canada Southern Railway Company." He said: The object of the Bill is simply to confirm certain agreements entered into between those different lines of railway in relation to the running powers over the different roads.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. THOMPSON.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—DEBATES TRANS-LATORS.

Mr. LAURIER. I desire to bring up now the question of privilege of which I have given notice.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon gentleman will allow me, I would state that I mentioned to him before we met that the papers which had been ordered to be printed had not yet been distributed. I understand that a number of members have received them, but I only received a copy about a quarter of an hour ago, and I know that my colleagues are in the same position. The hon. First Minister had no copy and had no opportunity of reading the papers. Under these circumstances I would ask the hon. gentleman to postpone his motion.

Mr. LAURIER. There must have been something wrong in the distribution, because the hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have been treated differently from us on this side of the House. We had the papers on Friday last.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I heard three or four of my colleagues say that they have not yet had a copy.

Mr. LAURIER. That is something for you to enquire into, Mr. Speaker, as there must be something wrong with your officers. But, of course, if the hon. gentleman is not ready now, I will not press the question. Would he say on what day he would be ready to discuss it?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Say on Monday next, because another subject is set for to-morrow, and is to go on from day to day.

Mr. LAURIER. I am willing to take Monday if the other matter is then disposed of.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Salaries of Board of Examiners and other expenses in connection with the Civil Service Act..... \$7,500

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I move that this item be reduced to \$6,000. The mistake is due to the oversight of an officer who put another item for this one.

Mr. MULOCK. I believe the Act requires that these examinations shall be held at certain fixed periods, but I understand that a certain degree of irregularity or laxity is growing up in connection with them, and that examinations are occasionally held at other than the regular sessions. If that is the case, and I am aware that it is, it is a practice to be deprecated; and if the hon. the Secretary of State allows it to continue, he will soon have that branch of his department in hopeless confusion. I believe there are two examinations a year fixed by the Act, and I cannot see what cause can be made out to justify the holding of special examinations. Of course, it may happen that a candidate may stand well in the estimation of the Government, and may, perhaps, be an applicant for an office, and it may be desirable, in order to qualify him, to hold a special examination, such as took place in the month of March, 1837, immediately after the general elections. I believe it happens, in other branches of the service, that special examinations are held at times to serve special purposes. Such a case happened at the Royal Military College of Kingston. The effect of this sort of thing is to destroy the confidence of the public in the *bond fides* of these examinations. I would also call the attention of the hon. the Secretary of State to the fact, that there appears to be no regular period for making known the results of the examinations to the public, and there have been delays for many months. If the exami-

ations are conducted on the merits, then I submit that the returns should be promptly made known to the public.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am sure my hon. friend has not intentionally tried to mislead the House in regard to the work of the Board of Civil Service Examiners; but I can assure him that his information is wrong. There are two kinds of examinations. There are the preliminary and qualifying examinations for candidates who desire to enter the civil service. These are held by statute and Orders in Council at fixed periods twice a year, namely, in November and May; and they have been held at no other periods, and only after full advertisement—in fact, perhaps too much advertisement—in the public newspapers. The other examinations, for promotion, are those which have led my hon. friend into error. If he will look at the statute, he will see that the times for holding those examinations are regulated by Orders in Council, and are held at different times, according to the wants of the service. In two or three instances, owing to urgent wants of some of the departments, examinations have been held at other periods, but only on very urgent occasions. My hon. friend has spoken of examinations of the military school. I have not much to do with the military, and am, therefore, not competent to say anything with respect to those examinations. But I know that the civil service examiners have nothing at all to do with those of the military college. As regards the date of publication of the returns, that depends entirely on the number of examinations. I know that the board of examiners have always done their best to have the results published at as early a day as possible. In the case of examinations for promotion, it has been thought better to have these returns sent to the heads of each department. There is no need to publish them in the newspapers, as they only concern the administration of the departments. They are sent to the Council and kept secretly before the Council, and when promotions are made, they are made according to these reports.

Mr. MULLOCK. That is a very extraordinary course. I believe the hon. the Secretary of State has declared, what seems to me, to be a very improper system. Men present themselves for promotion; they may or may not have passed, but the Secretary of State keeps the results of their examination secret, until it may suit the Government to make them known.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The candidates are informed of the results of the examinations; they are informed as to whether they have passed or not, but their papers are not returned to them or published.

Mr. MULLOCK. I know a case in point where a candidate for promotion underwent an examination, and the result was withheld from him for nearly a year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think my hon. friend has been wrongly informed.

Mr. MULLOCK. No, I have not.

Mr. BOWELL. I know that the results are sometimes withheld for a long time, but not by the Government. There was one case in my department for promotion, in which the examination took place in Halifax, and it was some months before I could get the results myself from the examiners.

Mr. MULLOCK. Why was the delay?

Mr. BOWELL. The examiners said they had so many papers to investigate that they were unable to award the different marks within reasonable time. The delay was not due to any action on the part of the Government, and I simply give this as an individual case that came under my notice, and of which the hon. the Secretary of State had no information.

Mr. MULLOCK. Is each candidate for promotion entitled to be informed of the result of his examination as soon as the examiners have reported to the Government?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, he is told whether he has passed or not, but he is not entitled to receive the different examination papers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman, I think, agreed to inform us, when this item was under discussion a day or two ago, of the proportion of the 1,200 persons who passed the examination last year, who had received appointments.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said the results of all the examinations made during the past year were contained in a statement I put before the House some days ago. I have not the figures now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can you not state it from memory?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is one observation I feel disposed to make on this subject, and that is, that experience goes to show the time has come in Canada when we ought to introduce, in regard to appointments to the civil service, the English competitive system, as to the early stages; and the hon. gentleman has it in his power to earn the gratitude of future generations, if he cares for that, and of future civil servants, by introducing the competitive system for the early stages. I have great doubts myself as to how far you can apply the competitive system, after men have been once admitted to the service, but with due restrictions as to age, I think there is no doubt whatever that the experience of England shows conclusively that a very great improvement in every possible shape and form would be made by introducing the competitive system; and the immense number of persons, who, according to the hon. gentleman are applying for civil service positions, ranging up to 1,200, show that the Government have most admirable material, if only they will make use of it, for greatly improving and raising the standard of the whole service by that expedient.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I must say there is certainly something in the remarks of the hon. gentleman. The necessity of considering that question has forced itself upon the Government, and a measure dealing with it would certainly be expedient, considering the present number of persons holding certificates of examination, a number which has reached over 2,000. There is no doubt that it will be necessary either to suspend for some time the Government statute or devise some other system, so as to check an increase in the number of people holding certificates, and who, unfortunately, consider they are necessarily entitled to be appointed to the service. I think that is a great evil for them, and certainly not a comfort for the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to hear the hon. the Secretary of State say that. It does him credit; and I think I am justified in hinting to him that if he requires any support in introducing a measure to establish a competitive system in the early stages, hon. gentlemen on this side will only be too happy, for once, to assist him.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would be glad if hon. gentlemen opposite would do so, so that we could say for once they kept their promise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think we ever promised support to the hon. gentleman before.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman says 2,000 persons are qualified to be employed in the public service. Do I understand him to say that when a vacancy occurs in the service it will be filled out of this 2,000? Supposing a vac-

any should occur in the custom house or post office at Ottawa or Montreal, would the person who would get that appointment be selected out of that 2,000?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. All those who by the Act are included in the civil service must submit to an examination before appointment. The outside service, as it is called, is not subject to the rules of the civil service, and to a large extent may not be subject to examination. In some of the departments—for instance, the Inland Revenue Department—there are special technical examinations.

Mr. MITCHELL. Take the case of a postmaster. Do postmasters in the outside service—for instance, at Ottawa, or Montreal, or Halifax—undergo the civil service examination before they are appointed?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If my hon. friend will look at the Act, he will find that postmasters are not subject to examination. Inspectors, collectors and others, he will find, on examining the Act, are not subject to examination. Those who must undergo it are mentioned in the schedule annexed to the Act.

Mr. MITCHELL. Of course I can look at the Act, but as we are not so conversant with it as hon. gentlemen who are paid to hold the positions they occupy, I ask the hon. gentleman in order to get the information in a brief way. I do not want to be referred to the Act. I understand the hon. gentleman now to state that a postmaster in the outside service does not require to undergo civil service examination before his appointment.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Some of them do and some of them do not. Sometimes, in regard to some unimportant position, if an examination is coming on in a few days or a few weeks, an appointment might be made subject to the examination which is coming on very shortly.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman says some do and some do not. I will put a distinct, definite question to him. If a vacancy occurred in the post office in the city of Ottawa, would the candidate be required to go up for his examination before he was appointed?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He is not obliged.

Mr. MITCHELL. Or in the post office in Montreal?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, he is not.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I should like the Minister to inform us what percentage of those who receive certificates obtain appointments each year. I understand that there are some two thousand who have received certificates; how many of these are appointed yearly? If it is only a small percentage, it seems to be a great waste of public money to go on paying \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year, examining young men for the civil service, when there are such a large number on the list at present who have not received appointments.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The examinations last year cost \$5,184, and the receipts were about \$2,500, so that the expense was not so very large. I do not know what the appointments were in each department.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I did not ask what appointments were made in each department, but what was the percentage of appointments altogether. Was it 10 per cent., or 20 per cent., or 50 per cent.?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I cannot say. I suppose there are a number of appointments in a year, but the number must vary in different years. I know that in my own department I had the sorrow, last year, of losing from the fever four or five employés in three months.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Would there be more than 100 appointed in a year?

Mr. MITCHELL.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I should think more than that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But, if there are only 100, or even if you double that and say 200, and you have 2,000 qualified, what is the sense of continuing this expense for the examination of other candidates?

Mr. BAKER. What harm does it do?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The harm is the useless expense of \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Those examinations, as the hon. gentleman may know, have become very severe examinations. They are found to be too severe, and I think, taking those who receive appointments during the year, and taking the money expended as between \$2,500 and \$3,000, in order to have good, well qualified officers when we want them, and having in this way a class of young men throughout the country possessed of a good commercial education, there is not much expenditure to object to.

Mr. CASEY. I think it is absurd for the hon. gentleman to say that the examination is too severe.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say that.

Mr. CASEY. That is what the hon. gentleman said, whether he meant it or not.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said that some said it was too severe.

Mr. CASEY. At any rate, we know that the examination is not severe. We find that there are 2,000 certified men who have passed the examination, and that is altogether in excess of the necessities of the Government, so that of itself shows that the examination is not at all too severe. I am glad the hon. Minister has recognised this difficulty at last. He will probably remember that, before he was a Minister in this House at all, this matter was discussed, and it was pointed out that this difficulty was likely to arise from an Act of this kind. Before he became a Minister here a Commission appointed by his colleagues had gone thoroughly into the question of the organisation of the civil service, had taken evidence in all parts of Canada, had come to ripe conclusions, and had laid a report before the House pointing out the weaknesses of the existing system, the necessity of adopting the principle of competition, and this difficulty which is now being spoken of must arise from all examinations which are merely of a qualifying nature. While the hon. gentleman's Bill was before the House, I, amongst others—and I was not by any means alone—pointed out that this very thing would arise which has arisen, that if the examinations were only of a qualifying nature, everyone who succeeded in passing them would consider himself entitled to a place in the service, and wait for a vacancy to occur, and that consequently a large number of young people all over the country would be waiting for dead men's shoes, would be waiting to get the place to which they thought they were entitled. I am glad to find that the Minister recognises the difficulty at last, and that he hints at the possibility of the Government adopting a real reform in the civil service. There is no doubt, as my hon. friend from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says, that these results show that there are many young men and women who are qualified to take the places, who are eager to take the salaries, who are eager to take positions in the civil service, and that a great many of them possess a reasonable amount of education, as the Minister himself states. It seems clear that, with such a large class to draw upon, if the examinations were made really competitive, and if those who came out at the top of the list would be entitled to the positions, you might count on even a larger class of applicants, that you might count upon the class of school-teachers as well as a number of young men who are now studying for professions, and who

might be tempted to try to obtain positions in the service. In speaking of this matter, I wish to do so without any political leanings. I brought the matter before the House long before the Minister came here, and while my own friends were in power, and I say that no Government, under the present system of patronage, can have the knowledge necessary to appoint the best men available to the service. The only method by which to get the best men obtainable for the service is a method which excludes the system of patronage altogether. It is well known that, under the present law, a man does not generally go up for examination unless he is previously recommended by a member, unless he has applied to a member for a position and has been told to go up for his examination. In the next place, he cannot get his position, after he has passed his examination, without patronage. Unless he is recommended by some member supporting the Government his certificate goes for nothing, so that patronage enters into the whole of the present system of admitting members to the civil service. Let us compare this with the British system, and we may admit, without derogation to our own dignity, that the people of Great Britain and Ireland have shown themselves to be as good business people as we are. There they manage this on business principles. All those who produce certificates of health and character are allowed to go up for a preliminary examination as they are here, and if they pass that preliminary examination, they are allowed to go on to the competitive examination; and from those who succeed in passing the competitive examination, the vacancies that occur during the year are filled, giving the man who comes out at the head of the list his first choice, and the others their choice in succession of the places vacant. The Premier of England has no power to appoint even messengers, and a great many places in the English service that are not considered here to belong to the civil service, are filled by this competitive system. It was put into operation primarily and tentatively, I think, in 1853, and there has never since that time been the slightest serious attempt to change the system. I think it is time that we, in Canada, took advantage of the experience gained by the people of the mother country. Now, within the last few years, what do we see? Even in the United States, the hot-bed of the patronage system, the country in which originated the system that to the victors belong the spoils—even in the United States they have a system of competitive examination for the civil service, not quite so thorough-going as that in England, but still a system which requires a man to pass a competitive examination and take a good stand before he has any reasonable chance of getting an appointment. Now, in the English system, the evil of having a lot of young people waiting, as I said, for dead men's shoes, is obviated in this way: Before each competitive examination is held, the Government, making a calculation of the number of places that are likely to become vacant during the year, publish that number broadcast; on the basis of that calculation the examination is held, and the parties who have succeeded in passing the competitive examination and who do not succeed in getting an appointment during that year, have no claim whatever upon the Government, and cannot obtain a position without going up afresh for another competitive examination. Under that system you have only one year at a time to deal with, and nobody is kept waiting after the termination of that year for a situation. Suppose the number of vacancies at first was 100, any man who finds himself lower than 100 on the list may as well make up his mind that he has no chance of getting a position, and he may look out for some other career. Men are ranked in the order of merit up to the average number of vacancies that occur during a year, and a great deal of trouble and annoyance is saved to those parties who know that they are precluded from all chance of getting a vacancy. I think that

my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, in speaking of the expense of the scheme, did not merely consider the expense of holding the examination, but the expense to which the competitors are put, and among other things the loss of time on their part. I think the Minister ought to consider this point very seriously. He has had now seven years, at least, to digest the report presented to this House before he entered it, one of the most thorough and satisfactory reports, I think, ever presented in relation to the civil service of any country. With the assistance of that report, he should be able now to introduce a thorough Civil Service Reform Act, providing, among other things, for a competitive examination. Perhaps he will do so by next year, as he seems to have learned a great many things. I think he has found out this, among other things, that the possession of patronage is not, after all, an unmixed benefit to a Government or to its supporters. I know that those of us who, on this side of the House, were supporting a Government during five years, found out that patronage was by no means an unmixed benefit to the Government. For every friend you make in the disposition of patronage, you probably make half a-dozen enemies; and the Government or the members who cling tenaciously to the exercise of patronage are really injuring themselves as well as injuring the civil service, and doing an injustice to a great many young men well qualified to transact public business, and who want to have a chance to assist in the civil service. I claim that the country has a right to the services of men of all classes in conducting its affairs. It is the right of men of all parties to have a chance of obtaining a position in the civil service of a country. On these two principles, I shall contend strongly in the future, as I have done in the past, that whatever Government may be in power, whether Conservative or Reform, a change is greatly needed in our civil service system, approximating it more nearly to that of England.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not quite have a good opportunity to follow my hon. friend from South Oxford in the statement he made that the gentlemen on this side of the House—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did not speak for this side of the House. I said the gentlemen with whom I was more especially connected.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understood you to speak for the gentlemen whom you represent, whom you more immediately control—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; I did not say I controlled anybody.

Mr. MITCHELL. What did you say?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I said who usually act with me.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then, the gentlemen who usually act with the hon. gentleman for South Oxford. He said it would be difficult to support a civil service measure based upon civil service examination such as this. Now, Sir, if there is any merit in a civil service examination at all, it is in the first stages alone. Looking at the results of the civil service examination since that law has been in existence, I must say that I have arrived at the conclusion that it is a useless piece of expense; it creates a class of officials and perpetuates sons of officials in the civil service, as a special class who look forward to no other future. We know that a large proportion of the sons of officials in the civil service are led to look forward, as their highest object in life, to a position in the civil service, and it ruins hundreds of them. There are many of them bright young fellows, who, if they would devote their energy to mechanical, mercantile, engineering and other pursuits, would succeed far better in life

than by wasting so many years waiting for employment in the civil service. Perhaps in the course of next year there will be 15 or 20 vacancies where there will be hundreds of applicants. It has been a characteristic of the right hon. gentleman—I am sorry he is not here, perhaps some of his colleagues may convey to him my ideas; if they do not, the papers will—that ever since he came into office, in 1878, he has been pervaded with the desire to copy certain of what I call English fads, political fads, and one of them is this civil service institution. I believe it is calculated to injure the country, to cause a great deal of expense, to induce hundreds and thousands of our young men to look forward to employment in the civil service, destroying their prospects for other professions. In this way we are doing an injury to the country, and so far from agreeing with the idea that the Civil Service Act is going to do any good in the future, I think it is doing harm, and the sooner we wipe it off the statute-book the better for the country.

Mr. CASEY. I am sorry my hon. friend has got the idea in his head that the present Civil Service Bill bears the remotest relation to the English Civil Service Bill. If he had listened to what I have been saying, he would have seen that I pointed out a great many glaring differences.

Mr. MITCHELL. I object to the principle.

Mr. CASEY. The principle of this Bill is totally different from the principle of the English Civil Service Act, and it is exactly because it is so different that it is expensive and useless. The principle of the English Civil Service Act is competitive, the principle of this Civil Service Act is simply a qualifying examination which everybody has to pass, and afterwards he has to have the old-fashioned political influence before he gets an appointment. I fully agree with the hon. gentleman in his strictures upon the present Act, that it is a perfect farce in the working, as I contended it would be when it was presented to the House. There has been no check at all upon patronage; men have been appointed from year to year in spite of the report of the examiners that the appointees had not passed the examinations. It is a perfect farce from beginning to end.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I, perhaps, did not quite understand the reply of the Secretary of State with reference to the observations made by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). My hon. friend drew attention to the fact that the Secretary of State had stated that some 2,000 persons had passed the civil service examination, of whom only a very small portion had received appointments. And he naturally asked the question, whether, until those persons who had passed the examination were absorbed into the civil service, the hon. gentleman thought it worth while to go on and incur the expenditure by an annual or semi-annual examination. I confess that I did not gather from the observations of the Secretary of State whether he was inclined to that view, or whether he intimated that it was the intention of the Government to go on with the examination of candidates, although so many as already qualified for vacancies that might occur. Again, I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the Government has endorsed the view which has been very generally expressed in this House, which was the view of the Government when they established the military college at Kingston, to give cadets of the military college the preference in all civil appointments. There you have a class of educated young gentlemen who have gone through a course of scientific study and who are eminently qualified for the various branches of the public service, for our railways, telegraphs and public works, as well as the civil service immediately connected with the departments here; and I know it was the object of the Government when that institution was established to endeavor to keep in the country as many of those young gentlemen as possible, young gentle-

Mr. MITCHELL.

men who have been educated largely at the expense of the country. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the Government have arrived at any policy on that subject, or whether they propose to follow what I consider has been the erroneous policy since they came into power, of allowing the cadets of that very excellent institution to be distributed into other employments and to leave the country, and not have them immediately available in case of need? I think it is a point which should seriously engage the attention of the hon. Minister and of the Government. I feel very strongly upon this point, because I am satisfied that until we utilise the services of those young gentlemen, who have been educated largely at the expense of the Government, we will fail to realise the object for which that excellent institution was originated.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why not wipe it out?

Mr. BAKER. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) seemed to wax very warm and appeared to be highly indignant that I should put in an interrogatory as to what harm there could be in having 2,000 candidates who had already passed the civil service examination. I repeat to that hon. gentleman that I see no possible harm in it, and if there were 20,000 or 200,000 it would be all the better for the Dominion of Canada to day, because, as he knows, as I know, and as every hon. member knows, the best time for passing an examination under the Civil Service Act is when young fellows are young fellows and not when they have reached mature years, when it is exceedingly difficult to pass any examination whatever. If the hon. gentleman could show that the examination of a larger number of candidates increases in any degree the expenditure, then I think his remarks would be very fitting at this particular juncture, but if there are 20, 200 or 2,000 candidates for examination under the Civil Service Act, under the provision made in the Estimates for the examination, it would make no financial difference whatever. If, as the hon. gentleman knows, there are 2,000 persons who have passed the civil service examination, he, I dare say, of all members, would be the first to cry out if I sent a man from British Columbia to occupy a position in Charlottetown, P.E.I. He would say: This has nothing to do with you, this is not your territory or your patronage, and the holder of this particular position must be an Islander. And in that I think he is right. The harm of having a large number of candidates for civil service appointments I fail to see. If there is a question on which I feel a little warm it is on this matter of the civil service examinations, because a good deal of the future of the civil service of Canada depends upon the material we introduce into it at the earlier stages. I will now leave the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to his own reflections, and direct my remarks for a few moments to the observations which fell from the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I have listened with pleasure, as I always do, to the remarks which fell from the leader of the outside party, more particularly when he spoke in regard to the civil service; and I understood him to put to the Secretary of State the question as to whether persons entering the post offices of Montreal or Ottawa were required to pass the civil service examination. If I heard correctly the reply of the Secretary of State, it was that it would not be necessary. The hon. member for Northumberland might carry away the impression that, in order to obtain positions in those particular post offices, it was not necessary to pass the examinations. I have read the Civil Service Act, with its amendments and the rules and regulations made thereunder, very carefully; and if it is any information to the hon. member for Northumberland, I would state that so far as the city postmasters, or any postmaster, are concerned the provisions of the Civil Service Act of Canada do not apply. But if appointments are to be made to any position below that of city postmaster, the hon.

gentleman will find that every candidate who aspires to occupy a position of that nature will find it obligatory to pass the civil service qualifying examination.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very much obliged for the information the hon. gentleman has given me. I can return the compliment and say that I always listen to the hon. gentleman with a great deal of pleasure, and particularly when he assumes the role of semi-Minister or Minister *in futuro*, because it is evident he is qualifying himself for that position. I may say with all sincerity that he would make a capital one, and although my recommendations would not carry much weight in that direction with the hon. gentlemen opposite, I think the sentiment of the House would support me, especially in regard to matters to which he had given attention and which he understood. I am glad the hon. gentleman has told us just what the law is, as the Secretary of State did not make it quite so clear as I desired. We have had it stated by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Baker) that for the higher positions, such as post-master of Montreal, who controls many thousands of dollars, no civil service examination is required. That, indeed, is not the particular kind of qualification needed; but if any clerk who may receive \$300, \$400, \$500, \$600 or \$1,000 a year, desires to obtain a position in the post office, he must undergo civil service examination. In other words, the practical result is this: Take the case of Hamilton or Montreal, take the case of some of the British Columbia ports, take the case of the ports of the Maritime Provinces, it is not the civil service requirements that govern the qualifications of an appointee, it is that a man must be a present or past member of Parliament, and have supported the Administration of the day. That is the civil service qualification required in that case. I believe the same thing applies, as I understand the Minister of Customs to say, to the Customs Department. The collectors and the chief officers are exempt, while all subordinate officers are expected to pass this civil service examination. I ask any reasonable man what kind of a civil service system is that? I say it is a system that is promoted for the purpose of controlling political patronage and that it is not conducted in the public interest or with a view to secure efficiency, but that it is for the purpose of rewarding the rag-tag and bob-tail who support the Ministry in the House; that is what it is. It is a system that should be wiped away altogether. I am against this civil service examination business. We had just as good officers, and better officers I believe, when there was no civil service examination at all, than we have to-day. I think the selection of officers, because of their efficiency for positions in the civil service of this country, was much better before this fad of the English system, or this attempted imitation of the English system, which the hon. the Premier affects, was brought into force. As I said before, the sooner it is wiped off the Statute-book the better.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Baker) rose to express his opinion on the civil service, I was prepared to listen with great respect to any opinion he might choose to offer upon the subject, because I knew he had given the matter a great deal of attention. I regret that the hon. gentleman resumed his seat without expressing any opinion whatever as to whether our extraordinary civil service system was a good one or not. The hon. gentleman ventured to say that he could not perceive any possible harm in the retention of the system.

Mr. BAKER. Pardon me, I did not say "in the retention of the system." I said "in having a large number of qualified candidates for positions in the civil service from whom to select."

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman questioned a few remarks I had made, for the purpose of showing that the

retention of the system was not desirable. He was questioning that, and if he was doing anything he was arguing in favor of the retention of the system. He was either doing that or nothing at all. The hon. gentleman stated that he could not see any possible harm in the fact that there were two or three thousand candidates throughout this Dominion who had passed qualifying examinations and who were there waiting for their positions.

Mr. BAKER. No.

Mr. DAVIES. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that.

Mr. BAKER. I did not say so.

Mr. DAVIES. I understood him to say he could not conceive any objection to that.

Mr. BAKER. I did not say anything about it.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman asked, what harm was there in it. To my mind there is a great deal of harm in the fact that we have in the different Provinces in this Dominion a large number of young gentlemen who have passed the qualifying examination for the civil service, and who have reason to suppose, or who do suppose, that they may have a reasonable prospect of getting into the service, when, as a matter of fact, no prospect exists for them unless they have political influence. That, to my mind, is a system on which I cannot look with favor. I think it does a great deal of harm to the young men.

Mr. BAKER. I do not think it.

Mr. DAVIES. I do. I think it keeps a lot of young men who would otherwise devote their energy and talents to some other business, hanging on to the fringe of a Government "jackall," or Government supporter, in the hope that by so hanging on they would some day get an appointment. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) referred to our system as somewhat analogous to the English system. Our system is as different from the English system as chalk is from cheese. Our system is essentially a political one, and a young man, after passing his examination, has no hope of any appointment in the civil service unless he gets his application endorsed by a political supporter of the Government. It is a pure farce and nothing else. The entire system is different from the English.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not say it paralleled the English system at all. All I contended was that it was an imitation of the English system to a certain extent, and that it failed in all the essential and proper conditions of the English system.

Mr. DAVIES. They have omitted to incorporate those portions of the English system which are good in themselves into our system. As I have said a half-dozen times, there are some things to be said in favor of the competitive system, especially with reference to the initiatory step in entering the civil service. Our system depends entirely upon politics and upon political patronage, and endeavors to hide that damping fact under the cloak of an examination. I say it is the worst system I know of. If it openly announced to the people that this examination is only a farce, intended only to deceive, and that they appoint men simply on political grounds, there might be something to be said for it. "To the victors belong the spoils" is an old American cry, and there is something to be said in its favor. But you attempt to lead the people to believe that the examination has something to do with appointments in the civil service, when, as a matter of fact, it has nothing to do with it whatever; for if a man does pass the examination he cannot get appointed except through political patronage. I

endorse a great many of the remarks which fell from this side of the House. It is time our system was changed, but I do not expect the hon. the Secretary of State to do so until perhaps he may see that his friends are going out of power.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend seems to understand very little about our system of civil service examinations, and I think it will take more time than can be occupied by this debate to teach him what are the good effects of the Civil Service Act, so far as examinations are concerned. When the hon. gentleman has looked into the matter a little more, and does not try to make political capital out of this non-political matter, he will see that the civil service examination system has done a good deal of good. There is, no doubt, an inconvenience in the large number of candidates who have passed the examination, but this is the case in every profession, and in all parts of the world. The same thing has been said of the profession to which my hon. friend belongs, in the different Provinces, that there were too many candidates, too many students, too many lawyers. It is not reasonable nor fair to single out this inconvenience in the civil service system only. There is no doubt that there is a very large number of candidates offering themselves, and this, of course, should be cured one way or the other; but it is not correct to say that those two thousand young men are all waiting for positions in the civil service. I know a great number of young men who occupy other positions, and who think it is a pride for them to be holders of a certificate from the civil service examiners. I can also inform the hon. gentleman opposite that a number of people who have needed clerks, in banks, and other institutions, have asked me to recommend men who have passed the civil service examination, and I have always said that if a young man passes successfully the examination for the civil service, that he was an efficient young man, and one worthy of being employed in any commercial position. This is one particular in which the examination system has had a good effect. It is not because there are some inconveniences which have to be remedied, that it should be concluded immediately that the system is nothing but a political engine, and that there is nothing in it but bribery of members to secure positions for political protégés, as some of the hon. gentlemen have intimated.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman must not put words in my mouth. I said nothing about bribery at all. I said the system was purely political.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I alluded, in my last words, to the remark of one of the hon. gentleman's friends.

Mr. MITCHELL. Did the hon. gentleman, when he pointed this way, mean me? If so, I want to correct him.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I beg pardon of the leader of the outside party—

Mr. MITCHELL. If I understood you to mean me, I did not say that there was bribery of members. I said the selections were made from hangers-on to past members of Parliament, as a rule.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I heard what the hon. gentleman said; I do not care repeating his expressions, but I knew what it meant, and it meant what I have said.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell.) The observations of the Secretary of State, as addressed to the committee with reference to the professions being overcrowded, does not at all apply to the condition of things that result from this examination system. Each one who serves an apprenticeship in an office, whether it be in a law office or some physician's office, expects to follow his profession as such. But what profession does any can-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

didate fill who has passed a civil service examination? Is he admitted as a matter of course into the civil service? The hon. gentleman knows well that he has ten times as many candidates as he has places, and that therefore he is simply inviting a number of young men and women to come forward and offer themselves for examination without any prospect of their ever being employed in the public service. They are kept from engaging in legitimate pursuits, and are encouraged to live in a state of expectancy on account of this system which the hon. gentleman has introduced. The hon. gentleman has told us that he has been enabled to furnish to banks and other institutions of that sort a certain number of candidates who have been examined for the civil service. Well, Sir, I would very seriously object to the hon. gentleman extending his patronage not only to the whole of the civil service, but to the banking institutions of the country. If he wants to do justice to the candidates, let him publish the results of these examinations so that the public may see what is the exact standing of the candidates in every subject. Then the public will know whether the hon. gentleman and his colleagues are selecting the persons who are best qualified, or simply those who are able to pass, and he would also enable any institution requiring the services of such candidates, to select those of the best standing. In that way the success of the candidates in obtaining positions would depend on their capacities and attainments. But the position of things at the present time is very different. The civil service examinations, moreover, are not at all equal to the literary examinations of school teachers in almost every Province in the Dominion. If young men or young women wish to ascertain what their exact standing is, or to compare it with that of others seeking positions on the ground of their literary attainments, they will have a better opportunity of doing so by means of the examinations held in connection with the school boards than by means of the civil service examinations. The hon. gentleman's plan has not promoted the efficiency of the civil service. I believe the statement made by the hon. member for Northumberland is borne out by the facts, that the examinations have simply enabled the Government occasionally to put off some member of their party to whom they did not wish to give a position in the civil service, by saying to him: "You must take the examination." But if he has influence and friends ready to back him, his inability to pass the examination in no case stands in his way. The hon. gentleman admits to the public service at present many incompetent persons who have not passed the examinations. Thus expectations are excited which only lead to disappointment, and the Government have used the civil service examinations in the interest of their party, without the slightest regard to the benefits that might be derived from them by the public service.

Mr. CASEY. Before the item is carried, I feel tempted to make some further remarks in the line of the discussion which has gone before, but I will not do so just now. I want to bring up a new point which has not been discussed this year, although we discussed it two or three years ago—I mean the method of conducting the civil service examinations. The hon. member for North York and some others of us urged very strongly that instead of having a permanent staff of examiners, all highly paid, as at present, we should have only one or two civil service commissioners to superintend the work of examining applicants, and the examination papers made up from year to year by the ablest professors and teachers who could be obtained for the purpose, paying them a stated sum for making up the papers and examining the answers. Now, this discussion which we have had to-day will go abroad to the country, and those who aspire to places in the service will learn that there are two thousand ahead of them, and I

hope the knowledge will be good for the country, by discouraging numbers of young people from coming up to these examinations. Suppose we have only three or four hundred candidates to be examined during the next year; what will be the result? Any reduction in the salaries of the civil service examiners? Not a dollar. Whether they have much or little to do, they will be paid their full salaries just the same. Now, I say that is not right. Two commissioners at most, to provide for the accident of one or the other being taken ill, could attend to all the business of the civil service commission as a commission, and the examination of the candidates should be carried on as it is done in every university and school in Canada, by outside parties for the time being. In the universities the professors do not examine their own students for degrees; but outside parties are engaged, and the highest amount paid to any examiner in the University of Toronto for making out papers and examining the answers, and rating the students according to their standing, is \$400; and it is an infinitely more laborious piece of work than that of the civil service examiners, who are paid high salaries—I forget what their salaries are.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think \$600, and the Secretary \$700 besides—I am not exactly sure.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister does not even remember how much is paid to the commissioners under his own care. Perhaps it would be well for him, as he said to my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, before he discusses the question of expenditure to ascertain the exact amount. By appointing one or two commissioners and making them independent of the Government, as they should be, and allowing them to engage outside men to make up the papers of candidates in the order of merit, we would save a lot of money and have a real and genuine examination. The examination held at present is very expensive, and, as my hon. friend from Bothwell said truly, it is not as severe as the examinations for school teachers—hardly more severe than the examination for admission to the grammar schools of Ontario. It does not show any considerable degree of education on the part of those who pass. It shows that they can read and write at dictation, and a few other little things, but why should we not get the very best men who are willing to come up for examination? Under a better system we should have many college graduates coming up for examination, and many well qualified young men, instead of those who do not feel themselves qualified for other positions. Why not adopt the competitive system, and get the very best men who are willing to go into the service? That is the substance of the English system, and I wish to differentiate that, as far as possible, from the miserable substitute for it called the civil service system of Canada. My hon. friend has laid before me the Auditor General's accounts, and I find that the Minister's memory, although he was not sure of it, was good. The secretary is paid \$700, and the three examiners are paid \$600 each. But the hon. gentleman is wrong in one respect, for I find that the same person is secretary and examiner. Mr. LeSueur draws \$700 as secretary and \$600 as examiner, and also draws I do not know how much out of the superannuation fund. Mr. DeCelles, another examiner, gets \$700, although as joint-librarian his whole time and services, which, I admit, are valuable, are supposed to be given to the library. Mr. Thorburn is paid \$600, Mr. Clark \$575, and then there are sub-examiners in different places. I merely wish to object to the system of engaging a number of men as permanent examiners when one or two commissioners, with examiners chosen from professors and other qualified men, would do the whole business more efficiently and cheaper.

Mr. BURDETT. I think the Government are perfectly justified in appointing their own supporters to all vacant

offices. I have no faith in any civil service examination, nor do I believe the leader of the Government ever makes the mistake of appointing his opponents to office. It was left to this side to make those mistakes; and if when they get into power again, they are going again to fill the vacant offices with Conservatives, they might as well remain out of power. For my part, if any vacancy should occur, and it should come within my control, I will take care to help those who helped me. That is the plain straight system, We made the mistake, when in power, of acting differently.

Mr. HAGGART. You made a good many mistakes.

Mr. BURDETT. Had we appointed to office our own friends when in power and let our enemies go by the board, we might be in power yet. What I maintain, in regard to the subject under discussion, is that there is no use in having competitive examinations. If the hon. the First Minister wished to fill vacancies with Liberals he would find them all qualified.

Mr. BOWELL. In their own estimation.

Mr. BURDETT. Well, that is worth something. But the point I wish to make is this, that there are too many civil servants, and I believe those who do the least work get the most pay. I believe in a party when in power appointing its friends to office and giving honest pay for honest work; but as the case stands, more men are employed than are necessary to do the work, and a great number are employed who do nothing but sign the pay roll.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And sometimes sign it twice.

Mr. BURDETT. I would also suggest the abolition of this system of superannuation and pensions. Let men understand, when they enter the civil service, how much money they are going to get, and let them provide out of their means for their old age as do other people in the country, and that system will be found the most healthy in the long run. I see no use for examinations. The party in power in any case appoint their own friends to office, and they will be very foolish if they do not. When the party on this side gets into power, they will appoint their friends, no matter what they say now, and if they do not they will have very few friends. I do not think it is at all dishonorable for men to engage in politics, or for a man to help a friend to obtain a political position; and I am of opinion that the young men who assist their friends to get into Parliament have a right to look to them in return for appointments when there are any going. Of course the basis of all appointments should be capability. The first question should be, is the applicant fit for the position? and then, if it be not possible to find a gentleman with sufficient requirements from our own ranks, appoint somebody from the other side. But, to spend two or three hours here discussing a principle which all parties carry out when in power, is, in my estimation, a useless expenditure of public time and money.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that Mr. LeSueur is on the superannuation list. He was superannuated because he was supposed to be incapable of performing the duties that devolved upon him as a civil servant, yet now we see him performing the double service of secretary and examiner. As secretary, he draws \$700, as examiner \$600, and as a superannuated officer \$1,024, making in all \$2,324. According to the superannuation system in Ontario, under our school system, should a teacher who has been superannuated engage in any other business, his allowance is cut off, because it is evident that if he can earn his living there is no reason for giving him a superannuation allowance. The same system should rule here. Here is a man who has been superannuated on the ground of sickness and receives \$1,024 out of the superannuation fund, yet we find

him capable of filling two positions on an important board. It is evident from this alone, that the whole superannuation system is a farce.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary \$95,654 79

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was not aware that the Kingston item had been entirely disposed of, and I will take the liberty of asking the hon. the Minister of Justice what course he proposes to adopt as to the employment of the prisoners in the Kingston penitentiary, particularly with respect to public works in the vicinity of the prison?

Mr. THOMPSON. No great difficulty was found last year in finding employment for the convicts. The hon. gentleman is aware that the work of lock-making carried on in the penitentiary had ceased, and employment had to be found for 60 or 80 prisoners who had followed that occupation. Some of them have been taken into the trade shops, others have been employed on the farms, and work was found for the whole of them pretty satisfactorily last year. With regard to the policy that might be adopted concerning public works in Kingston, my own opinion, which I would be disposed to present to my colleagues, is that the labor of the convicts should be made available, as far as possible, on public works in the vicinity of the prison.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to enquire something in regard to an escape which took place from the Kingston penitentiary. I understand that, during the last year, there were two convicts who escaped in rather a peculiar way. I believe there was, or is, a steam yacht owned in connection with the penitentiary. I would like to know whether that yacht is the property of this Dominion or the property of the warden of the penitentiary? I would like to know whether those convicts who were employed on that steam yacht were so employed with the consent of the Minister of Justice, or whether the warden of the penitentiary has the right to take outside of the premises any convict he chooses for the purpose of his own convenience, or the convenience of his family, and to run the risk of their escaping in the way those two convicts escaped? We should have some explanation from the Minister of Justice in regard to that matter. I would like to know how these persons were engaged when they made their escape, for what purpose they were engaged, under whose direction they were so employed, and whether it was with the consent of the Minister of Justice or not?

Mr. THOMPSON. The steam yacht is the property of the Dominion. It is not for the convenience of the warden, but for the convenience of the prison, and it is found to be a very great convenience for the penitentiary. As to my having sanctioned the employment of these convicts, I had no particular knowledge of their being so employed, but I would not have hesitated to sanction the employment of any convicts whom the warden thought fit, in the exercise of his reasonable discretion, to be employed outside of the prison walls. All convicts who have short terms to serve, or who have proved themselves to be of good character, are trusted to a greater extent than those of a more questionable character. As to the escape referred to, I understand the facts to be that the convicts employed upon the yacht were thought to be perfectly reliable persons. The practice was to keep steam up in the yacht during the hours of the day when it was likely that she would be required to make a trip—a sufficient amount of steam to allow her to be got under way when necessary. These two convicts were employed at the time in making temporary repairs on the yacht. It happened that no guards were on board at the time, though they were in the vicinity, and these convicts quite unexpectedly, and very adroitly, got up steam and made their escape, although

Mr. McMULLEN.

they were immediately fired upon, and one was probably hit, and they made their escape in that way.

Mr. MULLOCK. Is not this yacht used as a pleasure yacht by the warden and his family?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is not. I am not prepared to say that my officer does not take pleasure in the performance of his duties, but this yacht is there for the use of the prison and is used in that way.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will the hon. gentleman say that this yacht had not been used for a pleasure tour on that day by the warden and his family, and that it was not only after they stepped ashore that these convicts made their escape?

Mr. THOMPSON. My information is to the contrary.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have information to the contrary, and I believe it is correct.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the information the Minister has is quite correct. I think the Minister will find on further enquiry that this was used as a pleasure yacht, and there is objection to prisoners being used in managing a steam yacht for the convenience of these gentlemen. No doubt, the yacht may be more used for legitimate purposes in the other way, but I do not think the information which the Minister has is quite correct. I remember that the matter was fully discussed in the Kingston papers at the time, and the statements made then were not the same as those which the Minister has been advised to make.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am speaking from very full reports made to me in consequence of my enquiries into this matter, and I hope no member of the House will be misled by statements which may appear in the newspapers as to what goes on within the prison walls. I do not think that this yacht was used for the pleasure of the warden, or that the convicts were employed for the pleasure of the warden.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary \$95,654 79

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). The Minister ought to give us some information, as there is a large increase here over the amount voted last year, and over the expenditure of 1886-7.

Mr. THOMPSON. The increase in the salaries is the statutory increase authorised by the Act of last Session. The increase in the allowance for uniforms arises from the fact that, under the Penitentiary Act of last Session, we provided, for good reasons, that the officers should be given a winter and a summer suit every year, when previously they had only one every second year. There is an increase in the cost of maintenance largely because the coal contracted for is at an increased price over last year. The working expenses are increased by more than \$600 by the enlargement of the prison and the rearrangement of the heating apparatus which necessitates the use of more fuel. There is an amount of \$225 extra under working expenses for sleighs which it is found are required, and the miscellaneous expenses are increased by \$100 for such matters as postage, telegrams and contingent expenses, such as expressage and so on.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I see that the number of convicts estimated for in 1886-7 was more than the number estimated for in 1888-9, and you are asking a much larger amount for a smaller number of convicts. I am not able to say what was expended last year, but I think it is the duty of the Minister to come as near as possible to the probable expenditure. It is a vicious system that the Government should set apart a much larger amount than may be required for the expenditure of the year, as it may cause an extravagant outlay. When we see the enormous amount of money being expended in these various institutions, we are led to think that some extravagance is committed in

the letting of contracts, or in other ways. Now, I see a large amount is taken for heating these buildings. Does the hon. member think the expenditure this year is going to be greater than in past years? I would like to know where he obtains the coal used there? Is it the anthracite, or does he use Nova Scotia coal?

Mr. THOMPSON. I am not able, at this moment, to answer the hon. gentleman. I will tell him to-morrow, if he will be kind enough to wait.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I see here an item of \$224 for duty upon coal, which would seem to indicate that it was anthracite coal. This is a matter that concerns the Postmaster General. He has plenty of coal in his Province, and according to his policy we ought to foster all home industries, and I would advise him to pay some attention to that. I see also a small item to pay for two gallons of brandy for plum-pudding on Christmas day. I know that the Minister of Justice is a strictly temperate man, and I would like to know what he thinks of this item. Does he not think that a large amount for flavoring plum-pudding for 325 convicts?

Mr. THOMPSON. I find it very difficult to answer that, because I never made a plum-pudding. An hon. gentleman beside me remarks that it depends a great deal on the size of the pudding. I think there was no doubt whatever that the brandy was used.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Nobody doubts that.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice in the Auditor General's report an item of \$3,390.31 for gratuities. I would like to know from the Minister what is meant by these gratuities?

Mr. THOMPSON. There is a system regarding retiring penitentiary officers that those who are appointed by Order in Council and give their whole time to the work of the prison, are put on the superannuation list, and, when they retire from the public service, receive their ordinary superannuation under the Superannuation Act. With regard to all other officers, such as those appointed by the Minister himself, or by the warden, they simply receive a gratuity on retiring, calculated on the number of years' service; and, occasionally, under the regulations of the Treasury Board, when an officer dies, a gratuity equal to two months' salary is paid to his family.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I notice that in 1886-7 there were \$182.58 expended for drugs and medicines. Could the Minister give us the details? That really seems a very large sum.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have not by me the details of that item, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that before a single dollar is allowed to be expended for drugs and medicines, a requisition for every article proposed to be purchased is sent to the department by the warden, and it is passed by the Minister. The requisition of the warden must also be accompanied by the requisition of the surgeon. We know that generally these drugs and medicines include almost everything that is required for the use of the hospital, including also hospital appliances of various kinds. Occasional articles which are required in the surgery have to be furnished, although they do not come strictly under the head of drugs and medicines, but they are only furnished on a requisition, and there is a voucher for every cent expended.

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask the Minister if he can give us any information as to the present management of the penitentiary at St. Vincent de Paul. The hon. gentleman is aware that for many years the administration of that institution was a disgrace to the country.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am glad to be able to state to the hon. gentleman that, under the new control, the prison has

been entirely without reproach, so far as I have been able to ascertain. The hon. gentleman is well aware that the institution is subjected to such constant criticisms that any irregularities would certainly come under my observation, if any had occurred. Under the present management there has not been a single complaint on the part of the prisoners, the officers, or the outside public. During recess I took occasion to visit the prison, and so far as I was able to judge, it appeared to be conducted very satisfactorily indeed. During the late administration the principal cause of complaint was insubordination, and I know that that has been entirely removed.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very glad to hear it. There is no doubt at all that, according to the report of that institution made from time to time, a good deal of the evil which undoubtedly prevailed formerly arose from the insubordination of the inferior officers, and I am glad to learn that better discipline now prevails. May I ask who the deputy warden is now?

Mr. THOMPSON. Thomas McCarthy.

Mr. LAURIER. The former chief keeper?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice on page 65 of the Auditor General's report another item in connection with the penitentiaries, landau carriage, \$675. I should like some information in regard to the item.

Mr. THOMPSON. As there was no carriage at the prison fit for use I authorised the warden to purchase one, a carriage sufficient to hold three or four persons.

Mr. MULLOCK. Where was it manufactured?

Mr. THOMPSON. It was bought second-hand.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is it not a rather expensive carriage to have around a place of this kind? A carriage for four or five persons, costing \$675, is a rather expensive ornament to have around a penitentiary. The committee is entitled to know where it was manufactured, the contract price, or whether the work was given out at a fictitious price. It is an absurd price to pay for an article of that kind.

Mr. THOMPSON. It was not manufactured to order as I have said. The hon. gentleman is, perhaps, not aware that the penitentiary is a considerable distance from the railway station, and occasionally business requires that some of the officers should go to Montreal. The carriage has, therefore, to be strongly built, and must be substantial, and the one in question is not different from those in use at other penitentiaries.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many horses are kept around this place?

Mr. THOMPSON. I think six.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice they have used 1,800 bushels of oats, one bushel a day for each horse. I really think these items deserve some explanation. It is our duty to ask these questions, for this item has grown enormously. The expenditure connected with the penitentiaries is rolling up every year. It is the duty of the Opposition to criticise every item, and to obtain information, not for themselves, but for the people of the country. Explanations should be given to the committee.

Mr. THOMPSON. I should be very sorry if the hon. gentleman supposed I was unwilling to give explanations. I stated from memory the number of horses, and I think the statement is correct; but the oats are not used entirely for the horses. In some instances, they are seed oats, bought for the use of the farm.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understood the Minister to say that there was one vehicle around there.

Mr. THOMPSON. No, I explained that we were taking a small sum, \$215, for the purchase of a sleigh.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is also an item of \$56 for repairs for buggy.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES. In answer to the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), I understood the Minister to say that before any expenditures were incurred in connection with the penitentiary every care was taken that the articles ordered were required, and nothing more was obtained but what was required.

Mr. THOMPSON. Perhaps that is going further than I stated. I stated that I required the requisition both of the surgeon and the warden in connection with the supplies for the hospital.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) As I listened to the hon. gentleman's statement I remembered that last year a very interesting discussion took place in the House on the main item to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and I think hon. members were pretty well satisfied that, while the department at Ottawa was not to blame, under cover of drugs money had been expended for other purposes. I amused myself while the Minister was speaking in going over this year's report of the Auditor General, taking the cost of supplying the necessary medicines for convicts in the different penitentiaries. In Kingston, with 572 convicts, only \$373 were spent for drugs, or 65 cts. a head. In St. Vincent de Paul, with 282 convicts, \$498 were expended, or nearly \$2 a head. In Dorchester, with 143 convicts, \$271 were spent; but in Manitoba, where the trouble arose last year, and where it was satisfactorily proved to the minds of the majority of the House that there had been very gross irregularities, to put it very mildly, in the accounts of the officer of that penitentiary—in that penitentiary, with 85 convicts, \$639 were spent for drugs. In British Columbia penitentiary, with 95 convicts, \$263 were spent. The thing is so utterly ridiculous on its face that the statement made last year that the word "drugs" was used to cover up improper expenditures is true beyond a doubt. It seems ridiculous that while in Kingston the expenditure was 65 cts. a head, the expenditure in Manitoba penitentiary should be \$8 per head. I assume, of course, that the Minister of Justice was correct in what he said respecting the requisitions of the medical man and the warden, but the facts are such as to warrant an investigation into that department, and if this is made it looks as if the hon. gentleman will find that the statement made last year, that there was gross and indefensible irregularities in the department, will be proved to be true.

Mr. THOMPSON. Statements like those made by the hon. gentleman were made two years ago and an investigation was held, and I know perfectly well that there were no such irregularities in connection with this item, either in the Manitoba penitentiary or anywhere else; and under the head of drugs there was nothing covered and concealed, and not one dollar of the public money was expended for anything outside of what was required for the use of the surgery and the hospital. It is quite a mistake for the hon. gentleman to take up the Auditor General's report and endeavor to make comparisons in this way, and say that the figures in Manitoba show \$6 per head while the figures at Dorchester show \$2. The fact is that those supplies are not laid in so as to cover the consumption for a single year, for as regards some of them a supply of medicines is kept on hand, many of which may not be used in the course of the year. I may remind the hon. gentleman that it was the year before

Mr. THOMPSON.

last that these particular charges respecting irregularities in the purchase of medical supplies for Manitoba penitentiary were made, and the very unusually large charge for medical supplies there was brought forward, and I have discovered that nearly \$500 of the amount included in the sum stated in the Auditor General's report as being for the year was for the settlement of an old account, some of the items of which had been in dispute, in consequence of which the whole account was kept in suspense. I have no hesitation in saying this: That a very much larger quantity of drugs and medicines has to be used and kept on hand in Manitoba penitentiary, comparing the number of prisoners there with the number in any other penitentiary, than is necessary elsewhere. Almost constantly we have Indians and persons in infirm health, and for whom prison life is exceedingly hard, confined in Manitoba penitentiary. We get there a class of prisoners we do not get in any other penitentiary in the Dominion, a number of whom require daily hospital treatment.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I think the Minister's explanation as to the amount taken almost every year will be shown not to be correct, if we take the Auditor General's report for a number of years past, and the amount taken year in and year out. A similar amount has been taken each and every year during a number of years past. That being the case, and the same amount going each year for the purchase of drugs and medicines, it would appear to me that drugs and medicines are used for the purpose of covering up certain things that would not bear the light of day. I certainly hold the belief that the drugs and medicines required in Manitoba, to the extent which the Minister conveys the impression, have not been used for the purpose of reviving broken down Indians and convicts.

Mr. THOMPSON. Could the hon. gentleman reserve his remarks on Manitoba until to-morrow, and allow us to take the vote on St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, if he has no objection to that vote?

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I am perfectly willing to do so.

Mr. MITCHELL. I cannot allow that resolution to pass without making a few complimentary remarks to the Minister, in relation to one feature in the management of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary: that was, the great consideration which he gave to the representation which I made to him about one of the convicts. The convict was an unfortunate negro boy who was in for twenty years. He was the man who at the time of the insurrection in the prison prevented the rebels from getting into the main building. I took it upon myself to represent to the Minister this fact, and I am pleased to say that he dealt with it with that consideration which I thought the case deserved, and on the recommendation of the hon. the Minister of Justice the Government took ten years from the convict's sentence of twenty years penal servitude.

Committee rose and reported progress.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Marine for the year 1887.—(Mr. Foster.)

Report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery for the year 1887.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

GOVERNMENT MEASURES.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We have been in Session now for nearly a month, and the hon. the Prime Minister has not introduced any one of the Bills referred to in the Speech from the Throne. There are several important Bills promised; those in relation to the parliamentary elections,

the Franchise Bill, and the Contested Elections Bill, which the hon. gentleman has informed us would be the subject of legislation this Session. I think it is only fair to us and only fair to the country that the Government should bring down the measures at once and that we should have an opportunity of carefully considering them and inviting the opinions of our constituents with reference to them. We are already dealing with the Estimates and those measures which the Government—the parties who enjoy the confidence of the country—measures by which the Government propose to deal with the grievances of the people of this country, are not yet presented to the House. It would be adhering to the constitutional principle that those measures should be in the hands of the members of this House now. I am sure if the Government desires to facilitate the work of the Session, they will see that we are put in possession of those measures at an early date. I have already called the attention of Parliament to the fact that, for the past fifty years, all important measures of the English Ministry have been submitted to Parliament during the first three weeks of the Session. That period already has passed in our case, and not one of those measures which the hon. the First Minister has promised in the speech of His Excellency are yet in the hands of the members.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are not three weeks in Session yet.

Mr. LAURIER. Three weeks to-morrow.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Three weeks to-day. The hon. gentleman will see that we don't count Thursday twice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite sure that the Government is very anxious to bring down the measures, and I may point out that some of the measures have been already introduced. Those measures which have been spoken of in connection with the elections have not yet been brought down but they will be in a few days, and the country will have an opportunity of considering them. A very important measure which has been brought down is the Railway Bill. I think it is very likely that the Bill connected with the fisheries will be brought down as soon as Sir Charles Tupper is in his place. He is confined to his bed just now, but I hope he will be well in a day or two. The Minister of Justice will try to bring the Electoral Franchise Bill down in a few days.

THE LOBSTER INDUSTRY.

Mr. DAVIES. I wish to repeat my question to the Minister of Marine about the reports on the lobster fishery on which subject a great many enquiries are being made. When will they be brought down? It was stated a few days ago that they would be down in a few days.

Mr. FOSTER. They will be brought down on Thursday.

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 14th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MANITOBA LAW.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 41) respecting the application of certain laws, therein mentioned, to the Province of Manitoba. He said: A ques-

tion has arisen as to the applicability of a large portion of the modern law of England to the Province of Manitoba. Under a constitutional principle which is well established and widely known, the provisions of the statute law of the mother country extend to a colony as far as they are applicable down to the period when a Legislative Assembly is organised in the colony. The case of the Province of Manitoba has been somewhat peculiar. It existed as a mere territory under the control of the Hudson's Bay Company down to the date of the Order in Council which transferred it to the Dominion of Canada on the 15th July, 1870; and when the Legislature was organised, it was provided by a statute of that Legislature that the law of England, as far as it was capable of being applied to the colony as it existed on the 15th July, 1870, should be the law of the Province of Manitoba in regard to such matters as were within the control of the Provincial Legislature; but in other matters, such, for example, as the law of interest and the law relating to promissory notes, the statute of the Province would be ineffectual, and the question has arisen as to what portion of the English law is in force in regard to matters which have not been expressly legislated upon by the Dominion, and are outside of the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature. Doubts have arisen as to what portion of the English law is in force subsequent to 1870, the date of the charter of the Hudson's Bay Company. In that charter, the language is in substance that the company is authorised to establish courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction in its territory, and that these courts shall administer the laws of England, those being presumably and probably the laws which were then in force, so that the laws of England in regard to subsequent matters, such as promissory notes and interest, have been left without any application to the Province of Manitoba, or, at any rate, in the opinion of the jurists who have had to pronounce on the subject, that is the case. This Bill proposes to make applicable to the Province of Manitoba the English law which existed on the 15th July, 1870, and to make special provisions in relation to interest. The 3rd clause of the Bill provides that the 1st clause shall not apply to existing litigation, but, as to matters of interest, the law will apply to existing proceedings as well as to those which have not yet been commenced.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think this is a very necessary measure. There is no doubt of the correctness of the admissions made by the Minister of Justice that so far as the legislation of the Province of Manitoba is concerned, it could not affect any other rights than those that are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Province. This territory, I have no doubt, was, historically, a portion of the territory ceded by France to Great Britain in 1764. The old maps that the commissioners at that time had before them, show that the whole country, as far west as the Rocky Mountains, was in the possession of France; in fact the later governors who were sent out by France to govern this country extended their jurisdiction over that territory, and at the time Canada was surrendered to Great Britain, there were French troops as well as French trading posts established in that country. The French Governor of Canada issued licenses for that country; and as soon as Canada was ceded to Great Britain, the whole country as far westward as the Mississippi River, and the whole country north of the Mississippi River, indefinitely westward as far as it was the property of the King of France, became a portion of the territories of the King of England; so that whether the common law of England would extend to that country at all, previous to 1764, is a matter of great doubt. Then the Minister of Justice knows that, according to the recognised rules of public law, whether the English law would be extended to that country, or the law of France, which was in force over the entire country at the time of the surrender,

would depend upon the determination of the king himself. If he expressed no opinion upon the subject then, of course, the law which was in force prior to the conquest would continue to be in force after the conquest was consummated. I may say, however, that I believe that territory at the time of the surrender was a part of the territory of the King of France, and that subsequent to the Quebec Act, when Upper Canada was established in 1791, it was intended to be embraced, and was embraced as a part of the Province of Upper Canada. No doubt the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in dealing with the question as to the limits of the Province of Ontario, did not pretend to say that that territory now known as the Province of Ontario and the North-West Territory, was not included in the Province of Upper Canada when it was established; but the subsequent establishment there of a government by the Hudson's Bay Company, as a matter of fact, which was not contested, or actively opposed, by the Government of the Province of Ontario, led to the loss of the territories by the principle of acquiescence. So when they undertook to ascertain what were the western boundaries of Ontario, as they now exist, they declared that as the Province of Assiniboia did not extend eastward of the Winnipeg River, the Province of Ontario continues to hold the territory as far westward as it had been embraced in the old Province of Quebec under the Act of 1774. So that what particular law is in force in that country, apart from our legislative declaration, would be a matter of extreme doubt, whether it would be the old law of France, or the common law of England; and whether it was the law of England in 1774 or 1791, is also a matter of doubt. Therefore, it seems to me that the proposed legislation by the Minister of Justice is highly necessary to remove all doubt, and determine what law does govern the people in that country within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BAR AT PINETTE HARBOR.

Mr. WELSH asked, Is it the intention of the Government to have the bar at Pinette Harbor, Prince Edward Island, dredged during the coming summer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am informed that there are about 10 feet of water over that bar at Pinette Harbor, in high water; and it is found that the bar is of rock. My chief engineer says that, before we undertake this, we must have a survey in order to ascertain all the facts.

WOOD ISLAND HARBOR.

Mr. WELSH asked, Is it the intention of the Government to have the dredging at Wood Island Harbor performed this year, so as to make that harbor available for shipping purposes?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows that some years ago an attempt was made to dredge Wood Island Harbor, and the work was given up. I understand that it was likely to cost too much money. Since that time there have been many petitions to the same effect, but their request was refused for the same reason. It is not likely we could undertake this work unless stronger reasons are given for it than have yet been presented to us.

OVERLOADING OF VESSELS.

Mr. GUILLET asked, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a measure to prevent the overloading of vessels trading on our inland waters?

Mr. FOSTER. In reply to that question, I would say that the matter is engaging the attention of the Government at the present time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

COMPENSATION TO GENERAL STRANGE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government have compensated, or intend to compensate General Strange, for the loss of his pension derived from the British Government during the period while General Strange was engaged in assisting to suppress the rebellion in the North-West?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman I beg to state that Major General Strange, from the 28th of March to the 17th September, 1885, 174 days, received \$2,117. It is not the intention of the Government to compensate Major General Strange for the loss of his pension.

HADLOW COVE PIER.

Mr. GUAY asked Whether the Government have taken into consideration, since last Session, the petitions of the inhabitants of St. David, L'Auberivière and of St. Telesphore, asking for an extension of the Government pier at Hadlow Cove to deep water? If so, is it their intention to have the work commenced at an early date?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have had this question examined by my officers in order to ascertain if we had any public works of the kind at L'Auberivière. The wharf which is there is the property of a private individual, and the petitions which have been presented here have for object the lengthening of this wharf so as to make it the terminus of a ferry communication between the two shores. I regret to have to inform the hon. gentleman that this is a purely local matter, outside the jurisdiction of this Government.

CHARLES LEDUC.

Mr. DESSAINT asked, Whether Charles Leduc, Esquire, of Hull, is employed in the Civil Service? If he is, since when has he been employed, in what office, what is the nature of his duties, and what is his salary?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That gentleman is not employed in the Civil Service.

PREPARATION OF VACCINE.

Mr. Fiset asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make a money grant to Dr. Edmond Gauvreau, of Quebec, in order to assist his establishment for the preparation of vaccine?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have to inform the hon. gentleman that it is not the intention of the Government.

TERMS OF UNION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. DAVIES asked, Is it the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to submit any proposition to Parliament with the view of meeting the complaints of the Government of Prince Edward Island respecting the alleged non-compliance by the Dominion Government with the Terms of Union respecting steam communication with that Province, or with reference to the suggestions for a settlement of the claims made upon the Dominion by Prince Edward Island, contained in Earl Granville's despatch to His Excellency the Governor General, dated 31st March, 1886?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention of the Government.

THE NORTHERN LIGHT.

Mr. DAVIES asked, Is it the intention of the Government to have another steamer built this season to assist the *Northern Light* in keeping up communication between

Prince Edward Island and the mainland in the winter season? If not, how is it proposed that such communication shall be maintained during next winter, so as to comply with that article of the Terms of Union between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion, stipulating that an efficient steam service for the conveyance of mails and passengers is to be established and maintained between the Island and the Dominion, winter and summer, thus placing the Island in continuous communication with the Intercolonial Railway and the Railway system of the Dominion?

Mr. FOSTER. The subject-matter of the hon. gentleman's question is under consideration.

THE LAW OF LIBEL.

Mr. INNES asked, Is it the intention of the Government during the present Session to introduce a Bill to amend the Law of Libel?

Mr. THOMPSON. I cannot answer the question more definitely to-day than to say that the subject is now being considered.

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Were the applicants for the charter of the Great North-West Central Railway Company required by the Government to make a deposit prior to the granting thereof? If such deposit was required, what amount was demanded, and was the deposit made? If made, was it in money, in bank deposit receipts or cheques on a charter bank? If in cheques, whose cheques were given, on what bank, and were they duly marked as good or accepted by the bank?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The applicants for this charter were required to make a deposit prior to the granting thereof; \$50,000 were required, and the deposit was made. It was made in bank deposit receipts and cheques; the cheques were given on the Union Bank of Lower Canada and were marked good.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Is the Government aware whether the Great North-West Central Railway Company have, since their incorporation on 22nd July, 1836, effected their permanent organisation by subscribing for \$500,000 of stock and paying up 10 per cent. thereof?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Have the incorporators named in the charter of the Great North-West Central Railway Company been changed by resignation or otherwise? And if changes have been made, who have taken the places of those who have gone out?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The incorporators named in the charter of this company have been changed; the name of R. J. Devlin has been submitted for that of C. T. Bate, who resigned.

COST OF CANADIAN RAILWAYS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the nominal cost, as given to 1st January, 1888, of all railways in the Dominion of Canada?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must ask the hon. gentleman to repeat that question on another day.

THE FISHERIES TREATY—PAPERS.

Mr. DAVIES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to direct the attention of the Government to an omission in the papers furnished to the House in connection with the fisheries conference that took place in Washington a short time ago between the two Governments. It will be

remembered that a number of questions were asked from this side of the House as to the propositions made by the respective plenipotentiaries of each Government to the other, and after consultation had taken place several times in the House, it was understood that, in addition to the papers first submitted, there would be other papers containing—as we understood at least—a full account of all the several negotiations and propositions made on either side. Now, in the papers which were circulated and laid on the table of each member the other day, I find the only additional memorandum is a letter which Mr. Bayard wrote on 31st May to Sir Charles Tupper, and the answer of Sir Charles Tupper to Mr. Bayard; but in the propositions which appear to have been made by Sir Charles Tupper on the 3rd December, 1887, and the reply of the United States plenipotentiaries on the 7th December, it appears in the reply of the United States plenipotentiaries that, previous to Sir Charles submitting his proposal, they had submitted a proposal to him, and his proposition was a reply to that which emanated from them in the first instance. The House will see, by looking at the papers, that the United States plenipotentiaries commenced their reply as follows:—

“While continuing their proposal heretofore submitted—on the 30th ultimo,—and fully sharing the desire of Her Britannic Majesty's plenipotentiaries to remove all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, the American plenipotentiaries are constrained, after careful consideration.”

Now, the proposal which was submitted by the United States plenipotentiaries, and on which Sir Charles Tupper made his proposition of December 3rd, has never yet been communicated to the House. The House will see how very important it is on the eve of the present discussion, and also in view of the discussion on the fisheries question, that hon. members should be placed in full possession of the proposals which emanated from the American plenipotentiaries as well as those which emanated from the Canadian commissioner. I call the attention of the First Minister to this point in the hope that we may have the proposal laid before the House at an early day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I regret that the absence of the Minister of Finance through illness prevents his giving a full answer to the hon. gentleman. I may say now that it was understood at the meeting of the conference that the results only should be embodied in the protocols. The same arrangement was made, I may say, at the time of the Washington Treaty; it was found absolutely necessary, from the political circumstances of the day, that this should be the case. No statement of what occurred during the negotiations can be submitted either to the Congress of the United States or the Parliament of Canada that has not been mutually agreed upon. Sir Charles obtained the consent of Mr. Bayard to the submission of the correspondence to which the hon. gentleman has referred. If any further papers are wanted, including the papers to which he now refers, Sir Charles, when he is able to resume his place in the House, which will be in a few days, will communicate with the British ambassador at Washington, and if Mr. Bayard consents, there will be no objection to the papers being brought down.

Mr. LAURIER. I submit that this statement is very disappointing and very unsatisfactory. This is contrary to all the precedents on which we have proceeded. I cannot do better than to refer the hon. gentleman to the Treaty of Washington itself, in which case the whole of the proceedings were brought down to the House and full information was communicated, not only to the members of this Legislature, but to all parties concerned and interested. Naturally in this legislation all parties concerned are interested, and it seems to me that the plenipotentiaries have pursued a different course from what has ever been pursued before. We have nothing but a summary of the protocols. It ap-

pears, however—and I take the statements of the hon. gentlemen themselves—that it was agreed upon by those plenipotentiaries that nothing but summaries of the protocols should be distributed to accompany the treaty. The hon. gentleman and his Government were kind enough some time ago to ask the assent of Mr. Bayard to have certain proposals which they made—which, rather, the plenipotentiaries had made—submitted to Parliament. It seems to me they might have asked the assent of Mr. Bayard to submit also the other proposals which were made on the part of the American plenipotentiaries. It certainly seems to me that it is not treating the House with that proper respect to which the House is entitled, to submit one part of those proposals and not the other. I think the House is entitled to everything that occurred, not only the proposals made by the British plenipotentiaries, but the proposals made by the American plenipotentiaries as well, all the more so because the proposals made by our plenipotentiaries are in answer to the proposals made by the American plenipotentiaries. Under such circumstances I hope that the hon. gentleman will follow the precedent which took place not more than three weeks ago, during the illness of Sir Charles Tupper. He, himself, communicated with Mr. Bayard to have his assent to this proposal being submitted to the House, and during the present unfortunate illness of the Minister of Finance I hope he will again ask the assent of Mr. Bayard to have the proposals of the American plenipotentiaries laid before us.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only say that if the doctrine of the hon. gentleman is maintained, it will be impossible ever to make a treaty with any country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The First Minister will see, if he looks at the papers brought down, that when we were discussing the Treaty of Washington the various propositions made by the plenipotentiaries or joint high commissioners on each side were given to Parliament. It is true the arguments by which they were supported were not given, but the proposals themselves were given. Now, what objection does the hon. gentleman see to saying what the propositions were which the British commissioners submitted and what were the counter-propositions submitted by the commissioners of the United States. To submit the arguments that were presented in support of those propositions is one thing, to submit the propositions themselves is a totally different thing. It does seem to me that the hon. gentleman recognises the principle of responsible government; he admits that he and his Government are responsible to Parliament. Surely in vindication of this it is right that Parliament should know what was done by those acting on its behalf, and supposed to enjoy its confidence. It does seem to me that the proposition which the hon. gentleman now makes is one wholly different from that made in 1872, when we were put in possession of all the propositions and counter-propositions submitted before the joint high commission, and when we had also the Order in Council protesting against the course of the Imperial Government brought down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No doubt, as full information was given in 1871 as could properly be given. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there was due discrimination observed at that time as to what was sent to Parliament and what was withheld.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is all very well in the interests of the Government for the gentleman who leads this House to make a statement of that kind, and to take upon himself to say that all has been given that can be given in the interests of the Government of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say so.
Mr. LAURIER.

Mr. MITCHELL. But if the treaty is complete and this House is asked, as Congress has been asked, to assent to it, this House as well as Congress has a right to the fullest information as to how those gentlemen arrived at the conclusions at which they have arrived. I find, on looking at the papers distributed to the members of this House the other day, that this proposition in relation to more extended commercial relations did not arise—as the organs of this Government have taken the credit of saying it did—with the representative of the Canadian Government, the present Minister of Finance (Sir Charles Tupper), but that it arose, first, so far as I can find them on the records of the papers, in a letter addressed by Mr. Bayard on the 31st of May to Sir Charles Tupper. This is the first evidence of any correspondence on the point which is laid before the House. One paragraph of this letter reads as follows:—

“It is evident that the commercial intercourse between the inhabitants of Canada and those of the United States has grown into too vast proportions to be exposed much longer to this wordy triangular duel, and more direct and responsible methods should be resorted to.”

In a previous part of this letter he goes on to point out the difficulties in which our colonial position places us in dealing with the neighboring country. He tells us the whole correspondence has to be made to England, and through England to the Governor General of this country and his Council; that all this matter has to be answered, first to England and then to the United States again before an answer can be got, and that unnecessary time and delay is taken up in that way. Mr. Bayard has evidently made a distinct proposition in relation to the manner in which this difficulty about the fishery troubles could be practically settled, and that he points out to be, first, more extended commercial intercourse between the two countries. Now, Sir, when the treaty is complete, and when a Bill has been laid before this House by the Government to ask this House to assent to that treaty, I hold it to be the right of this House—no matter what the convenience of the Cabinet may be to hide what they have done and refused to do—I hold it to be the right of this House that everything in the shape of a proposition which was made, whether from Mr. Bayard to Sir Charles Tupper, or from Sir Charles Tupper, representing this Government, to the commissioners, should be laid before this House for our action, our consideration, and for the exercise of our judgment as to whether those gentlemen have done their duty or not. This position, I think, this House will sustain. I for one am not prepared to accept the *ipse dixit* of the hon. gentleman opposite, who says, in his judgment, it is not for the convenience of the Cabinet that only conclusions should be laid before us, and that the propositions upon which conclusions were not based should be ignored. I could understand, Sir, if he refused to lay the arguments before the House, although even there I think common candor to the people of Canada ought to dictate that the arguments, as well as the propositions, should be laid before Parliament; but without question the propositions ought to be laid on the Table, and I think it is the duty of this House to insist that the Government shall do so.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. the Prime Minister does not seem to agree with the Minister of Finance in regard to what ought to be or what ought not to be brought down. He has told us that if the documents asked for were brought down it would be impossible to make a treaty with any country. His Minister of Finance told us, a few days ago, that he hoped, and expected, and intended, that those very papers should be brought down. Here is a difference of opinion between the chief and his first lieutenant. I think the right hon. the Premier should explain that difference, or else he must remain responsible for the utterances of his second in command, who offered

and intended to bring those papers before the House. The right hon. gentleman says that even at the time of the Washington Treaty, although there was more brought down than now, that he did not tell us everything even then, and that he used his judgment as to what statements of fact should be brought down and what left behind. I find that this treaty is made specially subject to the action of this House. It is not proper that one party to the case—the Government who are on trial before this House—should be allowed to make their own case, and retain what suits them. It is evident that by submitting certain facts and retaining others a falsehood may practically be told to the House, and that the whole thing may be put in a false shape. In the case of the British Parliament it is quite different. A treaty does not come before that Parliament at all; but precedents that apply in England do not apply to this case. It is not necessary to tell the British Parliament everything that the Ministers have done in regard to a treaty, because Parliament is not asked to ratify that treaty. Here, by special agreement, we are asked to ratify this treaty, and we ought to know, and, if we have respect for ourselves we would know, before we ratify the treaty, what our representatives have done.

Mr. MULOCK. If I correctly understood the First Minister he has stated to the House that nothing further would be presented.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to call the hon. member's attention that there is now no question before the House, and therefore, the hon. member cannot make a speech. When the Orders of the Day are called, it has been the practice to allow questions to be put to Ministers about important public business, or about the conduct of the proceedings of the House, production of papers for example. But this must be confined to mere queries, and after the answer has been given no more remarks are allowed, and *a fortiori*, no discussion can take place at this stage, without a motion being made in the regular way. The hon. members are already out of order when they attempt to raise a debate now about the non-production of the papers mentioned by them.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. First Minister, if I understood him, has stated to the House that he will not give to the House or the country any further information on this subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I certainly said nothing of the kind.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to know exactly what the hon. First Minister—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, I shall be glad if you will endeavor to press on the hon. gentleman to attend more to his correspondence. I think I am in order now in addressing the House, and in consequence of the low tone in which the hon. First Minister spoke, not having been able to hear him, I desire to know to what extent the House and the country are to be informed as to the proposals and counter-proposals which passed between the plenipotentiaries. I would like to know whether he proposes to live up to the agreement made by the hon. Finance Minister on the 1st of March last. The hon. Minister of Finance then stated, in order to procure an adjournment of a certain debate, that the formal protocols would contain every proposal and counter-proposal made at

Washington, and he expressed his great surprise that the communications which had been forwarded by the protocolists did not contain those proposals and counter-proposals. If the hon. First Minister wishes to know what he said, I will refer him to *Hansard*, page 73:

"The question was, as I understood, practically settled when I left Washington, that the arguments were not to be embraced, that is to say, the reasoning upon the two sides would not be necessary; but it was a question as to how far the various papers put in, in support of the proposals or in opposition to the proposals, should form a part of the protocols; and when I was asked the question by telegraph to assent to the protocols being purely formal, I assumed and took it for granted that what was termed a formal protocol would contain the proposals and counter-proposals—that that, at all events, would be a part of it.

"Mr. MITCHELL. And the answer.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And I assented to it. Yes, the proposals and the answers. A proposal is put in and an answer is put in in relation to it; and I assumed that those protocols, what were termed formal protocols, would, at all events, contain the proposals and the replies on both sides."

That was the attitude taken by Sir Charles Tupper; that was what he considered would be laid before this House, and if the hon. First Minister or any other member of this Administration now proposes to give to the House less than the hon. Minister of Finance proposed to give, then they must be considering something other than the public interest. There cannot be an honest and full discussion of this question if the Government hold back part of the evidence. It must be clear to the mind of every man who read the letter of the 31st of May, 1887, from Mr. Bayard to Sir Charles Tupper, that the American Government courted larger trade relations between Canada and the United States, and it is perfectly evident that the failure on the part of our Government to promote those relations has been the outcome of the negotiations and correspondence, and, perhaps, debates as well. They have had the effect of militating against the highest interests of Canada. If there is nothing to conceal, why not bring down the whole record? If, however, the Government have something to conceal, if they have tied the hands of Sir Charles Tupper, or if the Imperial authorities have interfered with the negotiators, let Canada know it. We have a right to know whose interests were consulted—whether the doctrine of the First Minister of Canada first, Canada for the Canadians, was lived up to, or whether on this occasion, as on others, Imperial interests were preferred to those of Canada. For my part, I am sent here to represent the interests of Canada, and any Government at Ottawa who collude with other statesmen against the interests of Canada, are traitors to the country they represent. For these reasons, in order that this question may be discussed fully and fairly, I think they have a duty to perform, and they can only be trying to burk parliamentary enquiry by withholding what the hon. Finance Minister deemed to be due to Canada.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In withdrawing my motion to adjourn, I think the Premier is altogether in error in not carrying out the promise made by his plenipotentiary in this House. If he would give some good reason, *pro bono publico*, why those papers should be withheld, I would certainly yield, but he has not given any reason to justify the course he has now taken.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). It seems to me that the object of the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, in bringing down these papers, is to show what had taken place in regard to the commercial relations between the two countries. Now, we find that whilst Sir Charles Tupper on the 13th December made a proposal, a very important matter is left out. The American reply is not fully before this House, because reference is made to the proposals submitted on the 30th, and it seems to me that in order to complete the papers, that document should be submitted as well as the proposals of Sir Charles Tupper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I regret that the hon. Minister of Fisheries is not in his place, so that this conversation would not have been called for. Sir Charles Tupper left Washington before the protocols were formally settled. They were settled there in the manner he told us, by agreement between the plenipotentiaries on both sides as to what should go to the public. As those who were not plenipotentiaries are not in the secret, we cannot say what portion has been omitted and what portion has been included in those protocols; but they were sent according to the arrangements made between the representatives of the two nations. Sir Charles Tupper has expressed his disappointment that they were not so full in statement as he thought they would be; and after the discussion which took place here, he telegraphed to Washington for permission to lay the statement and counter-statement, so far as it related to trade, before the House, and he got the consent of the plenipotentiaries on the other side. That was to have been communicated to this House. As regards the point now raised, there is a statement of another proposition. Well, I have no doubt Sir Charles Tupper will communicate and ask permission to get that also, but without permission it cannot be given.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other, (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted).

That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

He said: I am not greatly given to indulging in conventional formalities, but it is not in the spirit of conventional formality that I say that I rise on this occasion to address this House, under a sense of grave and weighty responsibility. It is true that I am fortified and encouraged in bringing forward this motion by the knowledge that in so doing I only voice the opinions of the representatives of the Liberal party in this Parliament; and, furthermore, that I have every reason a man can have for believing that when I give utterance to their opinions, I also give utterance to the opinions of the vast majority of those who support us and of a very important section, to say the least of it, of those who, on other questions, have differed from us very widely. Were I called upon at present to produce evidence of that, I think it might be found in the fact that within a very few months, but not until after this question had been considerably agitated throughout the Dominion, we found the leading statesmen of the several Provincial Governments, who met at Quebec—all, I think, the more important Governments in Canada—uniting, without exception, in approving substantially of the proposition which I now submit to this House. Nevertheless, I cannot conceal from myself that this motion is one which is certain to raise issues of very great moment, not only to the people of Canada, but it may well be to other peoples also. There is no doubt that this motion is one which proposes, in some considerable degree, a new departure; there is no doubt whatever that if this proposition were assented to by the two countries chiefly concerned, very important changes would, beyond all question, take place in the mode of administering our public and commercial affairs, and therefore it is clear that this is a question which requires the most mature consideration and the most ample discussion at our hands. I am very glad indeed that the Government have recognised the importance of this matter, and I think it is to their credit that they raised no objection to my proposal to set apart a special day for its discussion, Mr. WELDON (St. John).

and also that the discussion once begun, it be carried on *de die in diem*. Sir, I believe it will be found that this is emphatically a question which will not go down; I believe it to be a question which must be faced; I believe that it is a question which, if it suits their purpose, hon. gentlemen opposite may, possibly, evade or delay, but on which, sooner or later, and in my judgment rather sooner than later, they will be required to take, and their friends in the House of Commons and out of it will be required to take, a distinct and plain stand. This is a case in which nature is too strong for us; and although it is my intention on the present occasion to abstain from alluding to a great many things which might theoretically strengthen my argument, but which would undoubtedly open the way to irrelevant discussion, still I think I may be pardoned in taking this opportunity for saying that we will all do well to remember that we are now discussing a problem which particularly affects the present interests of Canada to-day. We are not called upon to consider how or in what way we might have dealt with this proposal, had it been submitted to us under totally different conditions twenty, or even ten, years ago. The question is, what is best for the people of Canada in the year 1888, and not what may have been thought best for them in 1867 or in 1877. As for the charge of inconsistency, which has been levelled at some of us for supposed previous utterances on this question, I am in no wise concerned to waste time in justifying myself. Were I so disposed, it would be easy for me to show that I, at any rate, have been perfectly consistent to the root idea which underlies this whole proposition. But I do not intend to waste time over that. I may say this, however, that every man who has studied the subject, knows that I am simply speaking the truth when I say that within the last twenty years, or the last ten years, there have been very great economic and even social changes in the position of Canada, and that, therefore, it might very well be the case that propositions deserve discussion to-day which we would not have thought it prudent to discuss some ten or twenty years ago. Now, I propose to-day to confine myself chiefly to bringing the attention of this House and, so far as I can of the people of Canada, to certain patent and salient facts, which, I think, nobody who studies the matter is able to deny, and also to pointing out what appear to me the inevitable consequences which will result from those facts. I may differ from hon. gentlemen opposite on that point, but it appears to me it is idle to shut our eyes to these plain facts, and equally idle for us to say that our present position is in all respects satisfactory. I will take two facts alone which appear to me, and I think will appear to this House, to be of very great importance in this connection, and of which I have here as absolute evidence as it is possible for any man to have. I will take the movement of the population in this country in the last quarter of a century, beginning in the year 1861 and going down to the year 1886, which is the last moment for which I have absolutely accurate statistical information. What are these facts? Sir, they are facts which I state with pain. But I say that we have here incontestable evidence that in these twenty-five years, one in every four of the native born population of Canada has been compelled to seek a home in a foreign country, and that of all the immigrants whom we have imported at great cost, three out of four have been compelled to go low in the track of that fraction of the native born population. Now I say, no man who properly appreciates what these facts involve can deny that if I make good my case, if I am able to show this House that there is a great deal of substantial and a great deal of presumptive evidence to support it, if I can show this House that I am rather under than above the mark in making those statements, no man who understands what those facts mean, can doubt for one moment that I and those gentlemen who think with me are amply justified in saying this is a case which requires

our most earnest and serious consideration. Now, I will take those two statements respectively, and, first of all, I address myself to the statement which I made and to which I think I heard some murmurs of dissent on the other side, that in the last five-and-twenty years Canada has lost one out of every four of her native born population. In the first place, I have here, if any hon. gentlemen desire that the authority be produced, the formal reports of the United States, which show that in the year 1860 there were 249,000 persons of Canadian birth in the United States; that in ten years they had grown to 490,000 souls, and that in 1880, there were 707,000 Canadians in the United States. Now, it must be remembered that this by no means represents the total exodus of our people, because, when you come to deal with such large numbers as these, you must allow for the death rate which prevailed in the twenty years from 1860 to 1880. That death rate, after careful examination, I believe to have been about 71,000 in the first decade, and 120,000 in the second, in all equal to 194,000. It is clear therefore, it is clear to demonstration, it is as clear as any fact can be, that between 1860 and 1880, from some cause or other, which it is not my present purpose to analyse, at least 650,000 Canadians found homes in the United States. Now, up to that point, we go upon absolutely certain ground. We have the United States returns backed in the strongest possible fashion by our own census returns, which I have under my hand. The question is, how many have we lost since then, how many have gone from this country to the United States in the interval between 1880 and 1886? Now, we have also here pretty clear evidence of the movement of population, at any rate in the great Province of Ontario. We know what the increase in the Province of Ontario, according to natural laws, should have been; we know what the increase in Ontario is. We know from these hon. gentlemen's own returns what a mass of immigrants they allege to have been poured into this country in those six years to which I have alluded; and we find in brief that, according to our municipal statistics, which are likely rather to err, as experience has shown, in increasing than in diminishing the apparent population, all Ontario in these six years has to show is an increase of 128,000 souls. We find a huge gap here. We find that in those six years the natural growth alone of Ontario ought to have been 250,000 souls. We find that, even if you take my estimate that out of every four immigrants you pay for and bring to this country, you keep but one, there is the strongest ground for believing that at least 80,000 souls should have been added to the Province from that source alone, and after deducting the 20,000 Ontarians, whom the returns from Manitoba and the North-West show to have settled in that country, you still find over 180,000 unaccounted for from that source alone. I need not appeal to this audience as to the fact that Ontario of necessity, putting out of question the North-West and Manitoba, always has and must absorb the vast bulk of our immigration. I think my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island, my hon. friends from Nova Scotia, my hon. friends from New Brunswick, and my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec, on both sides of this House, will all admit that no very large proportion of immigrants have settled in those respective Provinces within the last six years; and, if any of them doubt the statement or think I err in that, it is open to them now and here to correct me, and I challenge the correction. If we admit that, and I see no possible ground on which those positions can be disputed, you have this result: that, allowing a very moderate proportion for the emigration that we know is going on of native born Canadians from the other Provinces, at least 900,000 of our population are to-day inhabitants of the United States, and in all probability rather over than under 1,000,000. So I submit that the first statement that I have made is, up to the year 1880, absolute-

ly true, and, as regards the period of six years which has since elapsed, is as nearly absolutely proved as it is possible at present for any such statement to be. More than that, you have only to look, if you dispute the United States statistics, to our own statistics, to our own census returns, to see, I regret to say, the strongest possible evidence of the substantial accuracy of my calculations. We find that, in 1861, the population in those Provinces which now form the Dominion of Canada was, as nearly as possible, 3,250,000 souls. We find that, in 1871, they had grown to 3,690,000, and in 1881, to 4,324,000 souls; while, if you like to take the four old Provinces, you find that they had in round numbers grown from 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 in a period of 20 years. Now, as our returns allege and profess to prove, we imported in those 20 years about 500,000 immigrants. I would like hon. gentlemen on both sides to compare for one moment the rate of progress manifested in those 20 years with the rate of progress manifested in the previous 20 years of our history. From 1841 to 1861, the old Province of Canada grew from 1,129,000 souls to 2,500,000. Thus the House will see that during the first 20 years, the growth of old Canada was at the rate of 115 per cent., while in these later 20 years it has shrunk to 30 per cent. Now I proceed to discuss the other position. I proceed to discuss not our success in what I deem a vastly more important matter, not our success in keeping our own people in our own territory, but our success in keeping the foreign immigration which, at vast cost, we have brought into this country. I made the statement a few minutes ago that, of the foreign population which we have brought in, three out of four have left this country and sought homes in the United States. I now proceed to give you the evidence, as I believe the incontrovertible evidence of the substantial accuracy of that statement, of its absolute accuracy for the first period of 20 years, and of its substantial accuracy for the last period of five or six years. I find that the foreign population in Canada in 1861 amounted to 665,000 souls, and that in 1881 that foreign population had shrunk to 570,000 souls. In other words, we lost 95,000 souls in those 20 years, although we had brought into the country during that interval 521,000 immigrants, according to the returns which have been laid on our Table by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture. Now, I will allow, as I did in the case of the emigrants to the United States from Canada, for a very large death rate. I will deduct 220,000 from the original foreign born population in Canada in 1861, and it is as clear as anything can be, that deducting 15,000 for settlers in British Columbia and Manitoba, of the 505,000 who remain, who came to this country in that interval, the uttermost who can by possibility have remained in Canada were 125,000, so that 380,000 had made Canada a mere place of transit at our expense. So there again you will find that up to 1881 the case is absolutely proven that we were unable to retain three out of four of all the multitude of immigrants that we brought to this country. How has it been in the interval between 1881 and 1886? Well, Sir, I find that in that interval 477,168 immigrants are alleged to have come to Canada as settlers I turn to the census returns of the North-West and Manitoba, and I find that the uttermost who can be accounted for there, amount to 25,000; so that there remain 452,000 to be accounted for still. I have just pointed out to this House that the great Province of Ontario, which has always absorbed the vast bulk of all the foreign immigrants, not merely does not show that it has absorbed 452,000 immigrants, but it shows that its total increase is barely one-half its natural increase. Again, I ask my hon. friends in the Maritime Provinces, again I ask my hon. friends in Quebec, do they suppose that any considerable proportion of this 452,000 can have strayed into Prince Edward Island, or New Brunswick, or Nova Scotia, or Quebec, without their knowledge? Is it not a patent fact that the vast bulk

of these, if they are to be found at all, must be found in the Province of Ontario? And is it not a patent fact that if the increase of Ontario be no larger than I have stated, the vast bulk of these immigrants must, as I have said, have sought homes in the United States? There is, Sir, but one alternative to that—let hon. gentlemen take which one they choose. It is, of course, theoretically possible, though practically impossible, that these immigrants may have stayed in Ontario and have displaced an immensely larger number of the native population than I have supposed possible. But I do not think that argument is likely to be advanced in this discussion by any resident of Ontario. Now, Sir, I could bring forward numerous details all tending in a very high degree to corroborate these statements. I confine myself, for the present, to these two. I point out, Sir, that we, who are accused of misrepresenting the number of the people who have left this country, on the contrary, as the *Hansard* record will show, gravely under-estimated the loss of population in Manitoba and the North-West. At the worst, when we were accused of making most pessimistic statements, we never imagined for one moment that the population of the North-West and the population of Manitoba could have sunk to anything like the low ebb which these returns, lately laid on the Table, in 1885 and 1886, prove to have been the case. I will call the attention of the House to another significant fact. Time and again, knowing, as I well know, that the chiefs of the Roman Catholic clergy in the Province of Quebec were admirably well informed as to the movement of the Catholic population of that Province, time and again I have challenged hon. gentlemen opposite, if they ventured to dispute my statement on that point, to obtain from those reverend gentlemen a statement of what the real facts of the case were in regard to that population. Time and again that challenge was refused, and I say, therefore, that we have every ground that men can have for believing that, in the statement I have made, I am stating but the simple and literal truth. Now, Sir, as regards the bulk of these facts and figures, you may just as well contradict the multiplication table as contradict them. They are there, with the sign-manual of the hon. gentlemen opposite attached to them, and if they be inaccurate, on their heads, and not on mine, the blame must rest. Now, what has been done in this matter, up to the present moment, may be thus defined. First, I am sorry to say, they have attempted to break the force of these arguments by desperate misrepresentations, of which I will give this House a proof, drawn from their own official reports: Sir, I have beside me the returns of the Department of Agriculture, and I call the attention of the House to them. Those returns state that, in 1881, 22,001 settled in Manitoba and the North-West. They are particular, you will observe, up to the very last unit. In 1882, there were 58,751; in 1883, 42,722; in 1884, 24,440; in 1885, for reasons which I will not distress hon. gentlemen by referring to, it was reduced to 7,240. Now, Sir, such was the measure of success of the immigration policy of the Government, of their liberal land and railway policy, that they succeeded in inducing, so they state, 155,154 persons to settle in Manitoba and the North-West between 1881 and 1886. But, Sir, when we come to count noses by actual census, I am very sorry to say that the 155,154 settlers, duly certified to us by the Department of Agriculture, had shrunk into 43,000; 16,000 in the North-West, and 27,000 in Manitoba. There, Sir, are their own returns; there are their own facts; there, out of their own mouths, are the proofs that we under-estimated very gravely the extraordinary loss which their misgovernment has brought about in that country. I might add that—with respect to the 16,000 souls from Ontario and from foreign countries, whom alone they were able to settle in those magnificent Provinces in the North-West—there is clear evidence that at least one-third are supported by Government, are pensioners or employés of the Government, and are paid out

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

of the taxes of the people of this country, and are in no proper sense or shape settlers at all. Then, Sir, beaten on that ground, they dare to tell us that this is of no consequence, that it is of no consequence to the people of Canada that they have lost, in 25 years, well nigh two millions of British subjects, one million of native born Canadians, and three-fourths of a million of British subjects whom they had induced to come to this country with the intention of settling here. Now, I have no desire to put a money value on my own countrymen, or upon the immigrants whom we bring to this country; but I will point out this, that if you are to accept the customary standard laid down in the United States, if you can venture to hold that every able-bodied man who comes to North America is worth, when he lands on the dock, \$1,000 to the State, then, Sir, whatever may be the cause, the result of all this is that, in losing these 2,000,000 of people, we have lost 500,000 of able-bodied men, or thereabouts, and we have lost a sum equivalent, according to that calculation, to \$500,000,000. Certainly had they been here, it is clear that both our debt and our taxes would have been substantially reduced, because we would have had so many more valuable settlers to share the burthen with us. But there is another argument brought forward by men who ought to know better. They tell us that we need take no concern of this, because substantially the same thing is going on in the great State of New York alongside of us. Sir, I demur to that argument. In the first place I may point out that when an American citizen leaves the State of New York for any reason, he generally does not leave the United States; he transfers himself from one part of his own country to another. Does the hon. gentleman suppose we are so ignorant as some of those hon. gentlemen appear to be of the history of North America? Do we not know that New York State was settled nearly 250 years ago—that in the days of William and Mary New York was a prosperous and important colony? Sir, the comparison is preposterous. We, when we lose anybody, and we know this to our cost, lose them, not to go to another part of the Dominion, but to transfer their allegiance to another country. Now, I take issue most strongly with those hon. gentlemen, that is to say, with those of them who, admitting my facts, venture to contend that this is a matter of no consequence. I say that even if we had under our control no territory beyond the four original Provinces of old Canada, this would be a serious calamity to us, because the four Provinces of old Canada, well administered, are abundantly capable of supporting a population two or three times as great as that they now contain. But when we remember that we have well nigh half a continent at our disposal, that the First Minister himself has stated in his place that we have 400,000 square miles, yet unoccupied, of the most fertile territory that the sun ever shone on, what shall I say of the folly of supposing that it is anything but a great misfortune, a great calamity, a great injury to the people of the country that so huge a portion not only of those who come to settle in Canada, but of those who belong to us, of those who are our own flesh and blood, our own kinsmen, have been obliged for lack of opportunity to leave Canada and seek a home elsewhere? I say that this is proof positive that we are in a state of retrogression. I say that, as regards the four old Provinces of Canada, our population is either in a stationary condition, relatively speaking, or, at all events, falls vastly short of increasing according to the laws of natural growth. And I say—although I am not going to enlarge on that subject at this present moment—that I have around me, I see on both sides of the House, if only hon. gentlemen will have the courage of their convictions and speak out what they know, many men intimately acquainted with the state of the agricultural population who could and who, before this debate closes, I hope will bear their testimony to the fact, that all over the four

Provinces there has been a very large and formidable reduction in the actual selling value of farm lands, and a still more formidable reduction in the price which farmers can obtain for the products they raise. Apply another test. If you choose to turn to the report of Trade and Navigation, which the Minister of Customs with commendable promptitude has laid on the Table, there you will find evidence which ought to convince this House that within the last 14 or 15 years, although there has been a considerable increase of population—though far inferior to that we ought to have had—there has been, and it is a noteworthy fact, a very large reduction in the total volume of trade. Here is the hon. gentleman's own blue book laid within these last few days on the Table of the House, and from that I see that in 1873, 15 years ago, the total volume of trade was \$217,500,000, with a population of 3,750,000, that to-day with a population which hon. gentlemen opposite estimate, though incorrectly, at 4,800,000, our total volume of trade and exports is \$202,000,000, being \$15,000,000 less than it was 15 years ago, although we have 1,000,000 of people or thereabouts more. Sir, apply another test. I find, in 1873, the average per head of exports and imports amounted to \$3 odd; according to the hon. gentleman's own statement the average per head of exports and imports to-day is \$41.50; in other words, the total volume of trade measured per head, the proper way of measuring, has declined nearly 50 per cent. I will allow for the reduced values of certain of those articles, but no man can contend that there is not proof of very serious retrogression in this one of the most important of those indexes which, more than many of those which have sometimes been alluded to here, go to mark the progress of a nation's prosperity. But it would be unjust to hon. gentlemen opposite to suppose they have been idle all this time. They could not keep our people here, they could not keep the emigrants they brought in here, they could not raise the value of farm lands, nor the prices of farmers' products; but what they could do they did. In these twenty years they have trebled our debt, in these twenty years they have trebled our taxes, and when the Budget comes to be brought down I think the House will find that the liabilities of the people of this country are very far indeed from being fully measured even by our present enormous debt. Sir, again, I say for the moment, I suspend my remarks on their failure to create an important inter-provincial trade. That is a question which requires a little more discussion than it suits me to give it at present; and here again I ask my friends from the Maritime Provinces, when the time comes, to contribute for the information of the House their views as to the success which has attended our efforts to create a trade in that direction. Nor will I dwell just now further on the lamentable failure, after the expenditure of over \$100,000,000 of public money, to produce any adequate settlement of the North-West. But I will say a word or two as to the utter failure to obtain any adequate return from our great public works. Sir, the Public Accounts are here, and those Public Accounts show that the people of Canada have expended well nigh \$200,000,000 in the construction of railways and canals, and divers other improvements. Time was when we hoped those would give us something like an adequate return, directly or indirectly, but the time has now arrived when we find these expectations very bitterly disappointed. How now stands the case? I take the Public Accounts for 1887, and I find, all told, a charge of \$3,970,000 for the expenses of operating those public works, and that is only the nominal charge. The real charge, if our accounts were kept as any other country on earth would keep them, would be nearer \$4,500,000, or, at all events, \$4,250,000 than \$3,970,000. Well, Sir, what do we get as a return? We get a total income of \$3,270,000. Not

only do we not receive one farthing of interest on the outlay of \$200,000,000, but there is a dead annual loss of \$700,000 a year, not to speak of the various important items which, under our most vicious system of book-keeping are charged, to capital account. Sir, again I pass over the question of our failure to keep immigrants, and again I pass for the moment from the question of why it is that we in Canada, with 400,000 square miles of most fertile territory, cannot even keep our own people in our own country. But I have the right, the House and the country has the right, to ask: Why is this? Is it because of the severity of our climate? I think not. The climate of Canada is in part a rigorous one, but it is eminently healthy and calculated to develop a vigorous and thrifty offspring. Is it the fault of our soil? Why, has not this House echoed and re-echoed again with declarations of hon. gentlemen opposite, that no country on earth possesses a region of such unexcelled fertility as we possess.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I agree with my friends opposite to a great extent. Then, Sir, I ask: Is it the fault of the people? Well, in part it is the fault of our people for being too credulous and too trusting to the promises of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Anybody who knows how our people conduct themselves when they leave our shores; any one who knows what distinguished positions a large percentage of that million of Canadians, whose absence I deplore, have obtained in the neighboring republic; who knows that they have shown themselves able to fight, and compete with, aye and even to beat our American friends with their own weapons, anybody who knows that will say that it is hardly the fault of the people of Canada if those things are so. But I think we may ask, if it is not the fault of the climate, if it is not the fault of the soil, and if it is not the fault of the people, whose fault then can it be? What am I to say of the threatened collapse of our federal constitution which has become so patent and so manifest in these later days? Have we not seen, almost every year and day, the very fundamental principles upon which federation depends torn into fragments and afterwards pinned together with bribes, as in the case of Nova Scotia? Do we not know, and does not the hon. the First Minister know, if he thinks for a moment, and I trust that he may, and take a second and a wiser thought, that he runs the most imminent risk if he persists in the tyrannical course heretofore pursued by him towards the young and rising Province of Manitoba, that he will have the choice offered to him, to recede from the tyranny or see the Manitobans assert their just rights at any cost.

Mr. MITCHELL. A third rebellion, I suppose.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I trust not.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope not too.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I believe and I hope that whatever the faults of the First Minister may be he will avoid that third and most fatal mistake. Sir, to a very great extent, as the enormous increase of our debt shows, we have during all this time been living on our credit, and a most mischievous policy it is. We may get temporary advantage from it, we may get temporary assistance, but every man knows, and more than all do men who have studied the early history of the United States know, that a young country in our position cannot pursue a more fatal course than to allow its debt to be increased with such unexampled rapidity as ours has been increased during the period to which I have alluded. Now what shall we say of the condition of that great interest upon which all other interests in this country depend? Who is there who does not know that there has been, within the last few years, an immense fall in the profits of our farmers, and at the same time a very great increase in the burdens laid

upon them? Who does not know, who has studied the history of the world, that at the self-same moment that you are heaping burdens and burdens upon our farmers, at that self-same moment they are being exposed to a totally unexpected and most intense competition in the market which they have hitherto controlled? Who does not know, Sir, that if this kind of thing goes on, our population, at least our farming population, may perhaps exist, but it certainly cannot be said to live, at any rate, in anything like the comfort it has hitherto enjoyed. More than that, I say distinctly, that I do not believe, unless we put a speedy check to it, that this system can last very long. In twenty years we have trebled our debt, we have trebled our taxes, and we have added 30 per cent. to our population. Suppose we go on for another twenty years, or even for another ten years—and I can tell the House that there are very serious signs that, unless such a check as I spoke of is put on very speedily, we will go on in the same headlong, reckless course—why, Sir, in twenty years at the same rate of increase of population, and the same rate of increase of debt and taxation, we will find ourselves with a population of six millions and an annual taxation of ninety millions of dollars. If we pursue that course in the future we will have done nothing more by 1907 than we have succeeded in doing in the twenty years between 1867 and 1887.

Mr. MITCHELL. The money would be all gone before that time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps so. Unhappily, all history shows that those evil precedents do not in the least prepare the way for better things. Even were the Government honestly disposed to amend their ways it is scarcely possible for them, under ordinary circumstances, to put a stop to this practice of intense, insane expense. More than that, they will do well to remember that if I am correct in the statement I have made (and I challenge the strictest scrutiny), if I am correct in saying that a million or thereabouts of the native born population of Canada have sought homes elsewhere, they must remember that the tendency of that exodus is altogether to increase. Who are the men who leave us? Everyone who pays attention to the character of that emigration knows that I am stating the simple literal fact when I say that, in a most unusual proportion, they are the very pick, and flower, and choicest portion of our population. Everybody knows, Sir, that the men who leave us are just the men whom wise statesmen would desire to retain in Canada. Now were our position such as that which formerly used to obtain between Scotland and England I would not complain so much, because if the same rule applied between ourselves and the United States as between Scotland and England we would still have the satisfaction of knowing that when our friends left us they went to swell the strength of the Empire, or the Dominion, as the case might be, in some other part of it. But, unfortunately, here the case is precisely the reverse. They are a double loss to us, because they go to swell the strength of our nearest neighbor, rival and competitor. Now, Sir, a matter for our consideration which, perhaps, is more important than all, is, what possible available remedies are there for such a state of things? So far as I can see these remedies are four. In the first place, I think that a very great improvement might be made by reforming our present most oppressive and unjust system of taxation. I say that an immense improvement might be made by so revising our constitution in the manner which we have pressed from this side of the House time and again, and in the manner which we have seen our friends—and not only our friends, but the friends of the Government—in conference assembled have lately likewise proposed; and by so altering the constitution that this tyrannical conduct on the part of the Federal authorities in attempting to trample on the rights and

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

privileges of the Local Legislatures should be put an end to forever; and, on the other hand, (which is equally important), that this system of bribes, and of frequent and incessant forays made by various Provincial Governments on the Dominion Treasury, whenever they have been extravagant and got into a scrape, may likewise be put a stop to; and, for a third remedy, Sir, that this most mischievous railway monopoly which has barred our progress up to the present time, and which has barred the settlement and prosperity of north-western Manitoba, should likewise be disposed of. But most of all, and most important of all, do I believe would be the consequence of obtaining the arrangement which I ask the Government to try and obtain, by the resolution now in your hands, the obtaining of perfect free trade with the people of the United States. I say, Sir, that that is worth all the rest. Give us that and, railway monopolies will cease to vex and harass you; give us that, and the federal relations will speedily adjust themselves, as federal relations ought to do, and as federal relations were intended to do; give us that, and the sting would be taken out of those tariff combines and exactions, more particularly if the United States, as there is now good hope that it will do, proceeds to emancipate itself from the trade fetters it most foolishly put on. It may be said that this is an heroic remedy. Well, all I can say is that if it be, never in the history of this country, at any rate, was a heroic remedy more needed. Now, I am not disposed to go further with this proposition without being ready to show that it is in the highest degree advantageous to both countries. I am very sorry, for many reasons, that the hon. Minister of Finance is not in his place to-day; but I dare say the House will remember how, in a fine glow of patriotic enthusiasm, that hon. gentleman, about a year ago, went the length of declaring that, if we only knew it, we in Canada possess the best half of this continent. Well, I will not venture to go quite that length, but I will say that we are able, man for man, dollar for dollar, to give a full and perfect equivalent to the United States for all we ask them to give us. I desire that it should be so. I do not believe this proposition or any other proposition for mutual trade can be successfully carried out unless we are able to give as much as we get; and I say that while such trade would undoubtedly, in my judgment, enrich four or five million Canadians, quite as much enrichment would come to four or five million, or it may be to eight or ten million Americans. Sir, the advantages to Canada are very obvious, but I will come to those presently. In the meantime, I take this opportunity to point out that free trade with Canada would give to the United States an extremely valuable market at their very doors—that free trade with Canada would open up to American enterprise vast new areas, equal to at least a dozen new States; and, Sir, in such a case as I suppose, I have no doubt whatever that the growth of Canada would be so rapid that we should become within an extremely short time, in all probability, the most valuable customer the United States possessed.

Mr. HESSON. Hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Americans.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hewers of wood and drawers of water! Sir, I have a better opinion, and I may say the Americans have a better opinion, of the ability and capacity of our fellow-countrymen than to suppose that they would consent to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. Does not my hon. friend, whose heart is better than his head in these matters—does he not know of his own experience that the Canadians who, unfortunately for us, leave this country, do not subside into hewers of wood and drawers of water on the other side of the border? Sir, as I have said, they take high places amongst the best citizens of the United States. Sir, we have, to say the least of it, enormous stores of raw material of great value to the industries of the United States, and these are very

thoroughly appreciated, let me tell the hon. gentleman opposite, by American economists of very high degree. I have quoted the passage before—it may be said to be a hackneyed passage—but, nevertheless I will take the liberty of quoting again in this connection the language in which one of the most eminent living authorities on political economy, in North America, at any rate, and perhaps in the world, has described the advantages which Canada has to offer, if it is allowed to obtain free trade with the United States. This is the passage, Sir, and I make no apology for repeating it to a Canadian audience:

“North of Lakes Erie and Ontario, and of the River St. Lawrence, and east of Lake Huron, south of the 45th parallel of latitude, and included mainly in the present Dominion of Canada, there is as fair a country as exists on the American continent, nearly as large in area as New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio combined, and equal, if not superior, as a whole, to those States in agricultural capability. It is the natural habitation on this continent of the combing-wool sheep. It is the land where grows the finest barley, which the brewing interest of the United States must have if it ever expects to rival Great Britain in its annual export of eleven millions sterling of malt products. It raises and grazes the finest cattle, with qualities specially desirable to make good the deterioration of stock in other sections, and its climatic conditions, created by an almost encirclement of the great lakes, especially fit to grow men. Such a country is one of the greatest gifts of Providence to the human race; better than bonanzas of silver or rivers whose sands run gold.”

Now, Sir, in all that you will find nothing of the vast virgin wheat fields of Manitoba; you will find nothing of the vast treasure troves which still exist scarcely scratched on the slopes of the Rocky Mountains, and west and north of our side of Lake Superior, and within the gorges of British Columbia. And, Sir, I could duplicate, nay I could produce twenty testimonies like this from Americans who know the value of Canada to the American people, in support of my contention that Canada most assuredly will be able to give a fair equivalent for all that, under my proposition, Canada is likely to ask the United States to give her. Does any hon. gentleman opposite choose to gainsay this proposition? Then, Sir, even as it is with all the absurdity of two hostile tariffs stretching for three thousand miles between these two countries, let hon. gentlemen consider what we do already in the way of mutual trade and intercourse. Of the \$202,000,000 which represents our total volume of trade, over \$80,000,000, in spite of all this foolish artificial legislation, or nearly one-half, and that the most profitable half, is with the United States. Sir, it is an interesting question, but it is a question on which I hardly dare to offer an opinion, if, with all these obstacles deliberately put in our way, such is the force of nature that it overleaps all these artificial obstacles and secures us a trade of over \$80,000,000, what might we not obtain if perfect unrestricted free trade were obtained? I will venture to say that it is well within the bounds of possibility that, with unrestricted intercourse with the United States, that \$80,000,000 might within a very few years swell to \$300,000,000; and if any hon. gentleman thinks that an exaggerated or unreasonable statement, I advise him to look carefully at that remarkable portion of Mr. Nimmo's report of the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States of 1884, in which he treats of the value of the United States internal trade, of which, on my hypothesis, Canada would share equally *per capita*. Sir, it is an extremely curious thing that Mr. Nimmo, who is a high authority on these matters, estimates the internal or inter-state trade of the United States at six or seven times the total volume of its export and import trade. Mr. Nimmo holds that the inter-state trade amounts to ten thousand millions of dollars. That is his calculation, not mine; and, Sir, if that were the case in 1883, when Mr. Nimmo wrote, you may depend upon it that the inter-state trade is vastly larger to-day; and if there be any sort of foundation for the statement he makes, then I, in naming \$300,000,000 as the possible figure to which the trade of Canada with the United States might attain, am

vastly within the mark. Sir, it appears to me that the House, in its anxiety to promote certain manufactures at home, has wholly and entirely lost sight of the enormous extent to which, under a better system, export and import trade have grown elsewhere. I took the trouble the other day to see how our export and import trade compared with the trade of Australasia—the Australian colonies and New Zealand. The facts are worthy the attention of the House, for whereas we have, according to these hon. gentlemen, 4,800,000 souls, and, according to my calculation, 4,600,000 souls, and whereas Australasia has 3,421,000 souls, I find the total export and import trade of Australasia amounted last year to £105,000,000 sterling (equal to \$525,000,000, for a population of three and a half millions) against an export and import trade of \$202,000,000 for our population of 4,600,000 or 4,800,000. Why, if our export and import trade compared *per capita* with that of Australasia, instead of being \$200,000,000 it would be \$730,000,000, according to the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite themselves. It is, I believe, scarcely necessary for me to insist on the enormous advantage which unrestricted trade with the United States would be to us. Who does not know that for an immense number of the products of the people of this country, the United States is not merely the best market, but substantially the only market. Now, I do not blame the Government much in that they have tried, at all hazards, to force trade among the various Provinces of this Dominion. I have always myself regarded it as very uphill work, about as profitable indeed as an attempt to make water run up hill, and the history of the Intercolonial Railway goes very far to show that I have been right in that contention. But I am going to give the House a curious practical test of the results which have attended the efforts made, I do not doubt, in all good faith, to promote inter-provincial trade among the several Provinces of the Dominion. Hon. gentlemen know very well that where there is much trade between different states or countries, you have one very good practical test where the climate and conditions of life are the same, and that test is the intermixture which takes place among the various peoples trading together. Now, I have here the census returns for 1881, and I have to call the attention of this House to a few very simple facts which these returns expose. I find that, in 1881, there were of natives of Ontario, 105 settled in Prince Edward Island, 310 in New Brunswick, and 333 in Nova Scotia; in all 748 natives of Ontario, settled in the Maritime Provinces. I find much the same state of things in Quebec, with the exception of two counties which border on certain counties in New Brunswick, where the population on both sides are essentially of the same origin. I find, and it may interest hon. gentlemen to know it, that at that same hour and day there were, of persons of United States birth, 609 in Prince Edward Island, 5,108 in New Brunswick, 3,004 in Nova Scotia, or, in rough terms, about thirteen times as many natives of the United States in the Maritime Provinces as there are natives of Ontario. Lest any hon. gentleman should say that the natural course of immigration is westward, I took the trouble to go back a few years, and I found that, twenty five years ago, in 1861, when we were not confederated together, when we had no Intercolonial Railway, 7,600 natives of the Maritime Provinces had taken up their quarters in Ontario; while, in 1881, after fifteen years of Confederation, and after knowing more about us, I suppose, only 7,200 were found there. The number had positively been reduced by several hundreds. Take the census returns. Turn to the Province of Lower Canada, and you will see eight or ten large, populous counties with a population of 150,000 or 200,000 souls, and not one representative of my hon. friends from the Maritime Provinces is to be found there. It is almost phenomenal, and what is a very curious fact, which appears in the census returns, is that there was far more immigration from

the Maritime Provinces to old Canada in the decade from 1851 to 1861 than from 1861 to 1881, in spite of the official connection. Is it not idle to deny such facts as these? Is it not idle to fight against such evidence? Must we not admit that, no matter how the Government may strive, no matter how the people may strive, you cannot establish any great inter-provincial trade from which any great profit can redound to the people of this country. What is the history of the Intercolonial Railway? It is contained here in our Public Accounts? We find that on the 30th of June, 1887, the Intercolonial Railway stood as an asset in the books of Canada for \$46,431,000; we find that the total expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for that year were \$2,808,000, and their total receipts \$2,596,000. Not only did the Intercolonial Railway not pay one copper of interest on its cost, but there is an admitted loss of \$231,000 in the running of that road for one single year, and a real loss, if we properly charge up the accounts, of \$400,000 or \$500,000; and in addition to that, every single year since I have had a seat in this House, a million dollars at least of extra expenditure has been charged to the capital account. Take the whole together, the interest and sinking fund, and they represent a dead annual loss of \$2,070,000, and the loss on running it must at least be \$400,000 or \$500,000, while we spend a million dollars on capital account every year besides, which we will continue to do for many years yet to come. Do hon. gentlemen venture to tell us there is any hope of improvement here? Does the House remember that, a few weeks ago, I put the question across the floor as to the result of the first seven months' running? And does the House remember that for this current year 1888, the Intercolonial Railway has cost us in seven months just \$340,000 more than we received from it? Just \$340,000 dead loss on seven months running of the Intercolonial Railway; and I may add, as if that were not enough, that we have recently been called on to subsidise a so-called short line for the express purpose of cutting up and destroying the value of the same Intercolonial Railway which has cost us near \$50,000,000, thus probably doubling the huge deficit that now exists. I think, Sir, that every hon. gentleman will admit I have shown conclusively that, do what you will, trade will seek, in spite of all your legislation, for its natural market. Who does not know, who dares deny, that the trade of Halifax naturally seeks Boston, that the trade of Toronto naturally seeks New York, that the trade of Winnipeg seeks St. Paul and the country south of it, and that the trade of Victoria naturally seeks San Francisco and the rest of the Pacific coast? There is an old saying, and I think a true saying in part, that trade follows the flag; but I tell this House that it is still more true that trade follows the people, and we have unhappily already sent out about two millions of missionaries to cultivate friendly trade relations with the United States. More than that, it is well to remember that great economic changes are in progress, that there has been a very material alteration in our position as regards the markets of the world. It is quite clear that, in older Canada, at any rate, grain production is on the wane, and that the only cereal which we can depend upon as likely to continue to be raised in large quantities is the article of barley, for which we have practically no market except in the United States. That is also true in a very high degree of the more important of our other agricultural productions, with, perhaps, the solitary exception of the important article of cheese. Now, I contend that for almost everything which our farmers have to sell, the United States, if only we had free and unrestricted trade with them, would afford us absolutely the best market; and I contend further that, besides being the best market, it is literally the only market for a great many important articles which we produce. See, in spite of all artificial obstacles, how huge a percentage of the total volume

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

of our trade is the volume of our trade with the United States. Out of a total volume of trade of \$202,000,000, the United States supply \$83,000,000. Out of \$31,000,000 of exports of our own produce, we sold to the United States last year over \$36,000,000, or very nearly one-half. Out of a total of goods entered for consumption of \$105,000,000, we bought \$45,000,000 from the United States. And to come to details, which is necessary in order to lay the case fairly before the House, what do we find as to an enormous number of articles produced by agriculturists in this country? These figures are instructive in a very high degree. We find that—

Of 18,779 horses, the United States bought	18,225
443,000 sheep do do	363,000
116,000 cattle do do	45,000
\$107,000 worth of poultry, the U.S. bought...	\$99,000
\$1,825,000 worth of eggs do ...	All.
\$693,000 worth of hides do ...	\$413,000
527,000 tons of coal do ...	494,000
140,000 tons of gypsum do ...	All.
Iron ore do ...	"
Salt that we sold do ...	"
Stone and marble that we sold do ...	"
\$6,875,000 worth of fish that we sold do ...	\$2,717,000
\$20,485,000 worth of lumber do ...	\$9,353,000
1,416,000 pounds of wool do ...	1,300,000
9,456,000 bushels of barley do ...	All.
\$743,000 worth of hay do ...	\$670,000
\$439,000 worth of potatoes do ...	\$328,000
\$83,000 worth of general vegetables do ...	\$75,000
\$254,000 worth of miscellaneous agricultural products, the United States bought	\$249,000

Without speaking of innumerable smaller articles, such as apples, flax and a great variety of other things; and, if the duties were once removed, no one who has ever been in Manitoba and the North-West but knows that the United States would become by all odds our best customer for a great deal of our high class wheat. Why, in the mere article of manufactures, the United States, out of a total of \$3,079,000, bought \$1,289,000 worth, and of miscellaneous articles the United States bought \$59,900 worth out of a total of \$644,000. There are two things to which I want to call the attention of all the members of this House. One is that, for very obvious reasons, our exports to the United States are largely undervalued. They do not at all fairly represent the amount we sell. So long as they maintain a high tariff, it is the obvious interest of every Canadian seller to underestimate the value of the articles he has to sell, and, as everyone knows, the thing is habitually and constantly done. In another respect it is very important that the House should know that in the case of an enormous number of the articles to which I have called specific attention, there is room for well nigh unlimited expansion. Given free trade, given unrestricted intercourse, and that trade might assume nearly unlimited proportions in regard to a great many of those articles; and these are two facts which should be borne in mind when we are considering the possible development of our American trade. Now, not only have I shown that, even fettered and thwarted and hampered as it is, our trade with the United States forms an immense proportion of our total trade with all the world, but I ask the House to consider what sort of a market it is that these resolutions of mine propose to open to the people of Canada. Why, look for one moment at the host of great and growing cities which stud our southern frontier alone—Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, Boston and New York. Those cities which I have named, with their environs alone, contain a population of something like five millions of people who are the very best customers on the face of the earth. Consider how conveniently they are situated to our markets. There is hardly one of all those I have named which is more than twelve hours distant from a Canadian market. The Canadian seller might talk over a telephone with the American buyer in almost every one of those cities. Then look at our railway system. I speak more particularly of

the railway system of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Look at the huge sums we have expended upon it, and the small returns up to date which that large outlay has brought. The returns show that we have about 12,000 miles of railway all over the Dominion, a very large percentage of which is centred in Ontario and Quebec. These railways are alleged to have cost \$653,000,000, and, although I believe a considerable amount of that is water—as it is technically called—still I believe our system of railways represents an outlay, or at any rate would be worth about \$500,000,000. Now, to-day the gross earnings of those roads are put down at about \$33,000,000, the expense of operating them at over \$24,000,000, and it is known that the amount returned as the expense of operating them does not include all that ought properly to be charged to that account. That \$65,000,000 of nominal cost, therefore, does not to-day on the average pay $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the nominal expenditure. Give us unrestricted intercourse with the United States, and I tell you that, as far at all events as the central Provinces are concerned, you will double the gross earnings and treble or quadruple the net profits of these railways, and from a very poor property convert these vast amounts, which have been largely supplied from abroad, into a very good, paying, profitable investment, to the great advantage of the people of Canada as well as to that of the men who originally supplied the money. Then another point. Let us consider how our population is distributed. We all know the natural impediments which arise to inter-provincial trade. We all know how conveniently the Maritime Provinces, Manitoba and British Columbia are situated for trade with the United States; and how exceedingly inconveniently they are placed for trade with the central Provinces. I apprehend that no man on either side will dispute my position that to the Maritime Provinces, at any rate, to Manitoba, to the North-West Territory, to British Columbia, free and unrestricted trade with the United States is of the most enormous importance. But, Mr. Speaker, I am coming to the country I know best—old Canada, from Quebec to Sarnia—how is the population distributed there? Why, Sir, it is known to every man here that nineteen-twentieths of the population of these two great Provinces is so distributed that it is literally within five hours rail, on the average, of the American frontier. Then consider the advantages of such a market. Remember that it is one of the most rapidly growing markets in the world. Within the last twenty-five years the American market has grown from 30,000,000 to over 60,000,000 of consumers, and it has not stopped growing. In all human probability before the next census is taken in 1890, the statisticians of the United States compute that the population will have grown to something like 64,000,000 or 65,000,000. More than that, the population, especially the population of the great cities I have alluded to, is one of the very richest populations on the earth. There is no population in the world, keen bargainers though the Americans are, no doubt, with whom it is so desirable to establish free trade relations for the agriculturists of any country, as it is with the population of the great American cities. It is perfectly well known to all who are familiar with that people, that there are no markets, I repeat, on the face of the earth, where the man who has a first-rate article, particularly of food, to sell, is half so sure of obtaining a first-rate price for it, as in the United States. Nowhere have I known men who spend so lavishly on their own personal living and for their own personal comfort, as not only the great millionaires, but the great bulk of the population of the great cities of the United States. And these, Sir, are reasons which make it more and more desirable to us that we should obtain free and unrestricted intercourse with them, so that we can take advantage of the very great facilities which our natural position, in Ontario and Quebec more especially, gives us for trading with

those great centres. They are at our very door. We do not require to make long journeys in order to make the personal acquaintance of our American customers. As I said before, we can literally talk to them by telephone. At the worst, a few hours' journey by rail will bring us face to face with them. We have no middlemen to fear in dealing with the United States. We can thoroughly understand the market, or it is our own fault if we do not. Every merchant, every man of business, knows what an enormous advantage it is to any country that the men who sell should understand thoroughly what the purchaser wants to buy. But, Sir, I do not know that it would be necessary for our people to give themselves the slightest trouble. I remember, and I dare say there are plenty of gentlemen who remember, what habitually took place under the old Reciprocity Treaty, during which Canada prospered more than she has ever done since. Why, Sir, when we had something approaching to free intercourse with the United States there was this curious peculiarity, that the buyer sought the seller and not the seller the buyer. It was a matter of everyday occurrence, particularly in the Province of Ontario, that our farmers, during the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty, were visited daily, and almost hourly, by American purchasers, who were ready to buy the apple off the tree, the crop on the ground, even the very unborn foal, if the farmer was willing to sell it. Again, I repeat that there is no market where a man who has got a good article to sell has anything like as good a chance of selling it as the American market. Sir, I have been taken to task on more than one occasion for venturing to say, what I now repeat, that in my poor judgment, one native born Canadian was worth more to this country than any half-dozen imported immigrants, and I say that without, in the slightest degree, desiring to reflect on the many good, worthy and industrious men who, in time past, have cast in their lot with us. My opinion always has been that as a taxpayer, and as a contributor to the development of the country, one native born Canadian is worth half a dozen of any other nationality. Sir, in the same way, one United States customer is worth to us in Canada, half a dozen English customers, and half a dozen dozen customers of any other nationality. And what is true of them to us, is true of us to them. I say that to the United States the trade of Canada is worth a great deal more than our present numbers would indicate; I say that our trade is worth that of many times such populations as those with which the Americans are now attempting to open up trade relations in Mexico, or in South America, or any other of those countries which extend below them, more especially if we prosper largely. Now, it is a curious thing—I do not know whether it has attracted the attention of any members of this House—that after all we have talked, after all we have said about the desirability of extending our trade with foreign countries, these same trade returns that I have here, go to show in a very remarkable way, that we have practically only two customers, after all said and done—and that one of these customers are the people of England and her colonies, and the other are the people of the United States. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen have considered the fact, but if they will look at the returns for 1887 they will see that of our own produce, Canada, in all, exported \$80,960,000, of which she sent to the United States, \$35,250,000; to Great Britain, \$38,750,000; to the British Colonies, about \$3,000,000, and to all the rest of the world, \$3,800,000—\$77,000,000 to the United States, to Great Britain and her colonies, and less than \$4,000,000 to all the rest of the world put together. In 1873, to show that this is no mere casual accident, I find that an identically similar state of things prevailed. Then our total exports amounted to \$76,500,000. The United States bought \$36,755,000; Great Britain bought \$31,421,000; the British Colonies bought \$3,953,000; all others put

together bought \$4,500,000. So when we trace the course of our commerce down for these 15 years, we find that it is literally true, for practical purposes, that we have but two customers, as yet, of any importance in the world, one the United States and the other the people of Great Britain and her colonies. And what is true of exports is true likewise of imports. Take 1887; we imported a total for consumption of \$105,639,000 worth. We bought from the United States, \$45,107,000 worth; we bought from Great Britain, \$44,962,000. Of \$105,000,000 worth, \$90,000,000 were purchased from our two chief customers. In 1873 we imported \$127,000,000 worth, and of this we purchased \$47,750,000 worth from the United States, from Great Britain \$68,500,000 worth, or \$115,000,000 out of \$127,000,000. That I contend is a matter of first-rate importance, for this reason: I have shown the House, that, say what we will, we have but two great customers, Great Britain and the United States. One admits our productions without the slightest let or hindrance: we and all the nations of the world in common with us have a perfectly free entrance to British markets; in the other case, partly by our own doing and partly by the action of the United States, the most formidable artificial restrictions are imposed on our commerce. But still the fact remains that we have but those two customers. Which of the two is likely to be more important to us? Well, there is an easy test. Twenty years ago the British population was about 30,000,000 to-day the British population is about 35,000,000. Twenty or twenty-five years ago the American population was 30,000,000; to-day the American population is 60,000,000 or 61,000,000. Judge, then, for yourselves which of those two countries, situated as they are, is likely to afford the greatest possible benefit to Canadian trade.

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

After Recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it will, I do not doubt, be a relief to the House, as it certainly is to myself, to be able to inform them that I do not think I will require to tax their attention with any great array of figures from this time out. I cannot but feel that I am indebted to both sides of the House for the uncommon patience with which they listened to the somewhat protracted array of statistics which it was my necessary duty to inflict upon them before dinner, Sir, when we separated I had just completed explaining to the House upon what grounds I based my statement relative to the movement of the population, on what grounds it was that I held that unrestricted trade with the United States would be likely to develop an enormous volume of trade between this country and that. I had also taken the opportunity of calling the attention of the House to the unfortunate failure, from causes which are patent to all of us, of our attempts to create any great inter-provincial trade; and I had pointed out a fact, which, I think, has not always been borne in mind, the great and growing character of the American market, and the plain and obvious fact that we in Canada, from our geographical position, are to a very great extent shut-in practically to two markets only, the markets of England and her colonies, and the markets of the United States. Now, Sir, it becomes my duty to consider, first of all, what classes of our population are likely to benefit by free and unrestricted trade with the United States; or possibly I should say, what classes of our population are *not* likely to be immensely benefited by free and unrestricted trade in that quarter. I will then have to consider the objections which have been urged from time to time in the press and elsewhere against propositions more or less analogous to that which I have placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, and then I may have a few general remarks to make on the

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

position in which we find ourselves to-day; but, as I have said, I trust to be able to spare the House for the most part from a repetition of those necessary but somewhat tedious statistics which occupied the major portion of the previous discussion. Sir, I think all the House will agree with me in saying that, whoever may or may not be benefited by this proposition, there can really be no ground for doubting that the whole great agricultural class from one end of the Dominion to the other will be enormous gainers if the markets of the United States are thrown open to them. I think, Sir, that no man will gainsay, least of all the gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces, that the fishermen of those Provinces will gain enormously from access to the United States markets. Surely no man will gainsay, and least of all my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Charlton), that the lumbermen of Canada, and all the vast interests connected with them, will gain enormously from access to the United States markets. The miners will gain enormously, the whole vast number of persons and the whole interests representing, as I have pointed out, \$500,000,000 or \$600,000,000 of capital, connected with the railroad and transportation service generally of this country, will also all gain enormously by free trade with the United States. Not only that, but besides all those great classes, collectively, representing the great producing classes of this Dominion, the vast majority of manufacturers who gain their living, practically, by ministering to and serving the classes I have named, must of necessity obtain great increase of prosperity if you increase the prosperity of the classes I have named. More than that, I believe, that although a great deal has been said—foolishly, I think—as to the risk the manufacturers of Canada will run in the event of our establishing unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, I believe that there are good grounds for saying that all manufacturers who deserve to flourish in Canada by reason of their pluck, and capital, and energy, will prosper likewise enormously if that great market be opened to them. It is due, I think, to the *Mail* newspaper to say that the energy and enterprise which that newspaper, in common with others, has displayed, in interviewing the great employers of labor throughout this country, has resulted, at least, in showing that those who stand highest in the opinion of the people as manufacturers are quite prepared, if you give them the United States market, to take their manufacturing existence in their hands, and that they have no doubt of the successful result. Who do the classes I have named represent, together with the classes who are dependent upon them? They represent nineteen-twentieths of the whole people of this country; I might with truth say ninety-nine-hundredths of the people of this country, and they will, beyond all dispute, be greatly benefited if you can obtain free and unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Now, another side of the question to be considered, is, who are the parties who are likely to lose if we establish free trade with the United States? I do not deny that when you introduce any great measure like this into a country that there will be considerable economic disturbance, and that some industries may be injured which we would like to preserve. That fact I do not deny. No great change ever has occurred or ever will occur without inconvenience in some way. No great change in machinery, for instance, can be introduced without rendering much existing machinery worthless, and without injuring a certain portion of the community, but I doubt if any great measure was ever proposed which was so little likely to injure those classes of the community whom the best minds in the community would desire to save, as this present one. I can see that certain interests will be injured, no doubt. I can see, for instance, that those worthy gentlemen whose proceedings are now being investigated by the committee presided over by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), those gentlemen who are, as I may say, pushing the protective doctrine

to its legitimate development and evolution—I can well conceive that the combines and trusts will have their troubles considerably increased, even if they escape the hon. gentleman's committee, by free and unrestricted trade with the United States. I can conceive, I honestly confess, that there are other industries, not very numerous but important, and some of them possibly dear to hon. members of this House, which may be injuriously affected if this policy should be carried into practical effect. There can be no doubt of one thing and that is that if this policy be carried into effect it will mean, for a considerable time to come, the enforcement of a much needed economy. I see, for instance, that that devoted and most industrious band of public servants who act from time to time as missionaries on the Government's behalf in disputed elections, may suffer. They may be dismounted and obliged to go a-foot, and it may be barefoot too. I say also that there is a danger, and I do not wish to gainsay it, that the electioneering cornucopia may run dry, and that if you adopt the system it will enforce, in your own despite, a rigorous economy. You will have to carry your bye-elections, or not to carry them, as the case may be, without promises of piers, and harbours, and post offices, and railway grants. There is danger, and a serious danger, too, that the subscriptions of the manufacturers' association to certain peculiar funds will grow smaller by degrees and beautifully less and may vanish altogether. It is possible, and it is a serious thing, that our modern Demetrius, and the craftsmen which are with him, may find that their occupation is gone, and the worship of the great Goddess Monopoly brought to naught. It is possible that the trade profits and emoluments of that valuable class of men, known as practical politicians, may be very greatly interfered with. All those things I see are possible if this measure be put in force, and if, as I stated, strict economy become, as it inevitably will in such a case become, the order of the day. Now, I do not deny—I never have denied—that, looking at the way in which Government has been administered in this country for many a long day, those are grave and serious changes, almost of a revolutionary character, and I can well understand that the venerable leader and father of this House, like the Duke of Wellington on a similar occasion, may shake his reverend locks and murmur to himself that he does not see how the Queen's Government in Canada is going to be carried on any longer in his own peculiar fashion. Knowing as I do how excellently well affected this House has always shown itself to vested interests, it may be—having regard to the fact that although those interests are few, that they are very important and very dear to many hon. and estimable members—that the House may say that it is better that the vulgar ninety-nine-hundredths should go on and toil and moil, and, as the reports of the Labor Commission which so lately sat in Montreal show, may starve, and suffer, and die, for the benefit of those righteous men who earn cent. per cent. dividends, and who thereafter tithe the money to keep this best of all possible Governments in power. This, Sir, is a tolerably correct statement of the men, and of the classes, who profit, and who will lose, by unrestricted reciprocity and free trade with the United States. The House will remember, I dare say, how I showed that there is ground for expecting an unprecedented and enormous increase of the whole volume of our trade, from one end of this country to the other, enriching all save the classes that I have excepted. And now comes the question, what is it that forbids the bans? What are the objections? What are the reasons which can fairly be urged by any hon. gentleman against this proposition? If I am correct or even approximately correct in my views as to the benefits which would result to the people of Canada from the adoption of this policy, what are the objections which can be urged for the purpose

of keeping asunder two countries which—I say it in no spirit of irreverence—God has joined for purposes of mutual benefit? Sir, I have heard some hon. gentlemen, or the organs of some hon. gentlemen, contend that, forsooth, however desirable this thing may be, the consequences of our own folly during the past ten or twenty years have been such that we cannot afford to have it; we will lose revenue—we have been bled so much that we cannot afford to be cured; for that is the argument. Sir, the ease is bad, I grant; but the case is not so bad as that. Put briefly their argument is this: they admit, or some of them admit, that this thing in itself, *per se*, would be very desirable; but they tell us that we cannot afford to lose the income which we derive from the customs duties that we now obtain from the American imports. Now, Sir, I do not suppose there is any man in Canada, certainly not one man on the floor of this House, who appreciates more thoroughly than I do, or who has declared from his place more emphatically than I, how very grievously the whole future of Canada has been injured, and damaged, and mortgaged by what I have repeatedly and justly described as the insane folly that has possessed the people and the Government of Canada in heaping up their debt and taxation at the moment when their great rival is reducing both. Sir, I am in the judgment of this House when I say that no man ever strove harder than did my hon. friend, Mr. Mackenzie, when he was Prime Minister of Canada, to put a check to that extravagance and folly, and his efforts were crowned with a good measure of success; and it is well to take this opportunity of reminding this House and the people of Canada that, if this be a desirable thing and if all that stands in our way is the financial difficulty, had Mr. Mackenzie's policy been maintained, and his Administration been continued in office, and had the people of Canada desired to make an alliance with the United States, there would have been no financial difficulty to grapple with. I say, and I speak with knowledge, that I could have done it had I been left in office. I say it would have been an easy task for an honest and intelligent Administration to have kept down the total expenditure of Canada to \$26,000,000 or \$27,000,000 at the uttermost, and the total taxation of Canada to \$20,000,000 at the uttermost, and withal to have placed half a million of the best settlers in the world in Manitoba, to their great profit and ours. Now, Sir, I wish to face this question squarely and fairly. I do not, for my part at all, pretend to tell this House that if we obtain immediately free and unrestricted intercourse with the United States, there might not be some temporary inconvenience accruing to us in the matter of the revenue; but, Sir, I have this to point out: This proposition of mine does not involve the addition of one cent or one farthing to the burdens of the people, but much the contrary. We do not purpose, Sir, as some have proposed in discussing schemes for the future of Canada, to add many millions a year to our annual expenditure. We are not talking, Sir, at this present moment of raising \$37,000,000 in place of \$30,000,000. We are simply talking of raising \$30,000,000, by a small alteration in the mode of taxation and by a readjustment of taxation in general. I repeat, it is possible, though not by any manner of means inevitable or necessary, that you may have to alter your mode of collection. It is not in the slightest degree necessary that you should add one penny to the total aggregate burdens of the people, but the contrary. Sir, allow me to say that this dread, whether it be real or pretended, of a possible recourse for revenue to direct taxation, has always struck me as a most exceedingly weak argument in a case like this. In the first place, Sir, *non constat* that you will require to have any direct taxation at all; let the House remember that. There is enormous room for judicious economy in our present administration of the affairs of this country. I do not say hon. gentlemen opposite can economise; but, Sir, I think I could put my

hand on members of this House who could effect some economy. While we did economise, we got small thanks for it; but perhaps the people are wiser now. Nay, most assuredly the people are wiser now; and could we appeal to the people on a fair division of the constituencies, with honest returning officers and deputy returning officers, without the scale weighted against us with grants for piers, harbors and bridges and railway branches, and every form of political influence, then, Sir, I think hon. gentlemen opposite would find that the results—I speak for my own Province, at least—will be as correctly reflected in the Parliament at Ottawa as they are in the Parliament at Toronto. However, Sir, we will pass over a point on which I can hardly expect those hon. gentlemen to agree with me. I desire to point out that the fundamental fact, for fact it is, on which this whole argument is based, is this: Give us free and unrestricted intercourse with the United States, and by that act you enormously increase the whole income of the vast majority of the people of Canada. You will enable them, and as I believe almost instantaneously, almost within year and day, to buy a great quantity of goods which they cannot now buy, a large proportion of which will be dutiable goods; and by consequence there is good and sound ground, if you admit my preliminary fact to be true, for saying that it is altogether likely that the remaining taxes will yield quite as much as those we now have under our artificially restricted system. But bear in mind that no increase whatever is contemplated; all that is required is a simple re-adjustment. It is possible—we will admit for argument's sake—that the hon. gentlemen are right, and that my contention is wrong that the people will grow enormously richer and yet will not consume more dutiable goods, though I know of no case in which that case has occurred. We will suppose, for argument's sake, that we have to face this bugbear of direct taxation—direct taxation, be it remembered, not for all our revenue, but a trifling portion of it alone. Now, Sir, I have to call the attention of the House in that connection to certain important facts. First of all, no man who has paid any attention to this subject will, I think, dare to deny the fact, which I think is recognised by every political economist, that direct taxation properly levied takes a great deal less out of the pockets of the people than indirect taxation, most of all than indirect taxation, levied as our system of indirect taxation is levied now. Sir, I desire to say that, in my judgment, we ought not—I do not think that this Government would dare, I do not think any other Government would wish—to add by direct taxation one farthing or one penny to the taxes that now press most heavily on the agricultural classes, on the fishermen, on the miners, on the lumbermen, on all the great producing classes in this community. I shall be prepared to prove in some detail, at the proper place and time, that among the many faults with which our system abounds, perhaps the greatest is this: that under it the hard-working, industrious, thrifty man is taxed enormously out of proportion to his earnings; and I say that with a system of direct taxation, if you must have recourse to it (although I doubt greatly whether you need, with proper economy, have recourse to it), that crying injustice must be redressed, and the respectable, well-to-do, monied classes must be made to pay their fair proportion—no more should be asked—to the burdens of the country. This proportion they most assuredly do not contribute to-day, and never will, under a system of purely indirect taxation. Further, we should bear in mind, as these hon. gentlemen are so intensely desirous of copying English precedents, that it is the system of the mother country in a very high degree; and if that precedent be followed here two very good results will accrue. First of all, Sir, you will remove that crying injustice of which I spoke, and by which the poor man contributes out of all proportion to-day, out of his scanty means, to the support of our Govern-

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

ment; and in the next place, you will produce this other admirable result, of giving all these respectable, well-to-do, monied men a keen practical interest in watching the public expenditure and checking extravagance. You will do more, if revenue must be got by that means—you will create a sound, wholesome, healthy public opinion, the want of which is so great an evil in Canada to-day. I dwell on that particularly, because I am aware that, at this very moment, there are certain persons, presumably in the interest of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who are losing no opportunity to impress upon the farmers of this country in particular, that if we get unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, the federal revenues will have to be raised by direct taxation, levied in the same way as the municipal taxes are to-day. I for one will protest to the uttermost of my power against any such injustice; I for one declare here, speaking on my responsibility in my place in Parliament, speaking with a knowledge of the subject, that our present system is monstrously unjust to the poor man and too favorable to the rich man, and that injustice ought to be redressed, not by adding to the burden of the farmer, the laborer, the artisan, the mechanic, the fisherman, the miner, the lumberman, but by removing the burdens from these and placing them upon the shoulders on which by right they ought to fall. It is almost too ridiculous. Here we are, here we have been, adding millions a year to the taxes of this country, and that without the slightest regard to the permanent welfare of the people; and we are told, forsooth, that although we may, without the least injury to the community, add many millions a year to our taxation, we must not alter the mode of collection one hair's breadth under penalty of producing the most terrible results. One is tempted to remember Oxenstein's old saying: "*Quam parva sapientia mundus gubernatur.*" Why, if one-quarter of what I have heard be true, the pickings and stealings wrung from the people by half-a-dozen combines, would more than equal any sum which it may be necessary to raise by indirect taxation. Our sage economists, forsooth, are not frightened in the least at having run up our taxes in ten years from \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000 nominally, really to \$40,000,000. I say again if the results were less grave, it would be positively ridiculous that such an argument should be presented to us. What does it mean? We have been so wasteful, forsooth, that we cannot afford to become rich. Now, the argument and the motive of that argument, to my mind, cover a very transparent fallacy, a fallacy so transparent that in earlier life I would have thought it impossible for reasonably intelligent men to have been deluded by it. But I have lived and have learned.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have learned a good deal. It used to be said: "Surely, in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird;" but as Mr. Lowell remarks in a rather celebrated political ditty of his:

"They did not know everything down in Judee."

And most assuredly when King Solomon penned the remark I have quoted, he had never made the acquaintance of that very remarkable biped the *anser Canadensis Conservativus*. Probably the creature was unknown in Palestine.

An hon. MEMBER. How do you know?

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. An hon. gentleman asks me, how do I know? Well, I have not certainly had the advantage of living in the days of King Solomon, but I do know well enough the doctrine on which all naturalists agree, and that is, the wild fowl of that particular species always follow their leader; and I think we know that their leader's line of flight is not in the least degree likely to lead him towards the Holy Land; quite the

contra-y. His natural instinct would lead him to lower latitudes and warmer climes—and take his faithful flock along with him—if you will pardon this little digression. There is another shaft in these gentlemen's quiver. Having proved to their own satisfaction, first of all, that Canada positively cannot afford to spend one dollar to gain a pound, having demonstrated that, according to the dictates of Canadian political economy, it is always more expensive to pay two cents cash for an article than four cents on credit, which is about the difference between direct and indirect taxation. These hon. gentlemen, the names of some of whom, to my certain knowledge were appended to a certain remarkable document, bearing date 1849, have been seized in their later days with an extraordinary paroxysm of loyalty; and to back their other startling propositions they lay down this other possible, if still more startling, proposition: If you make the Canadian people rich by free trade with the United States, if you make them more prosperous, happy and contented than they unfortunately are at present, there will be great danger to their loyalty. That is the position, in almost so many words. Has the hon. the First Minister been studying the political testament of that distinguished philanthropist, the late Cardinal Richelieu, and come to the conclusion that there is danger should the people wax fat and kick? If he has, he will do well to remember what occurred in France in 1788, after a century and a quarter's application of Cardinal Richelieu's maxims, and I warn him, if he perseveres in his course, he may find that here, in 1888, he is nearing the beginning of the end. I would not have alluded to this but that already across this House, time and again, there have been flung taunts to hon. gentlemen here, that we, forsooth, are disloyal because we desire to add greatly to the prosperity of Canada. I would have thought that those hon. gentlemen who ten years ago overrode all the protestations of Mr. Mackenzie and myself, when we pointed out to them that what they were doing was to adopt a policy which was a more servile imitation of the American policy, and which was in direct contradiction to the settled policy of the Empire. I say that these men would have done well, recollecting what occurred at that time, to have spared us all these disquisitions on the loyalty of the Opposition. Do we not recollect when we showed there was danger in the policy they adopted, how we were told that, if the so-called and mis-called National Policy was bad for British connection, so much the worse for British connection. These men have not hesitated to carry out a policy which has been largely responsible, in my judgment, for driving two millions of Her Majesty's North American subjects into exile, and which has risked the loss of all British North America to the Empire. It is time that we should clear our minds of cant on this subject. (I have, and I have as good a right as any hon. gentleman to say that I have, the interest of the Empire as much at heart as any man on that side of the House. I have considered, to the best of my opportunities and to the best of my ability, what policy in this crisis is the best in the real interests of the British Empire. I know that, in what I now say, I am but expressing the views of some of the ablest and highest of British statesmen, when I say that one great peril that threatens the British Empire to-day is the state of almost dangerous isolation into which she has come. What is her position to-day in the view of some of the ablest of her statesmen? It is that she has not a friend in one high class power in the world to-day. She is at enmity, more or less, with France by reason of her occupation of Egypt and her control of the Suez Canal; she cannot hope that Germany will raise her little finger in her behalf; she cannot expect any help from Austro-Hungary; and who does not know that the Indian taxpayer is even now groaning under the additional burdens imposed upon him for the purpose of checking an anticipated Russian attack on India? That is a dangerous

position of isolation; and I say that there is but one first-class power in the world with whom England can make a firm and lasting alliance, and that is her and our kinsmen and friends on the other side of the border. I have always felt, and I have not hesitated to express it to English statesmen as well as on the floor of this House, that the real problem which to-day awaits the decision of England is how, in the first place, by fair and honorable means—and no other should be used—to conciliate the good-will of the people of the United States, and to repair that most atrocious blunder which was committed a hundred years ago, and which led to violent collision between the two great divisions of the English race. That is one problem, and there is another which is most closely connected and interwoven with it, to the solution of which I would desire to lend my humble aid, and that is to add to the conciliation of the good-will of the United States, the conciliation and pacification of Ireland; and those questions are closely woven together. In this project which we are now bringing forward, if you take a broad view of the whole situation, if you remember what Mr. Joseph Chamberlain has taken good care to din into our ears and into the ears of the Government opposite during his recent visit, if you remember that the interest of England in maintaining friendly relations with the United States is so vast and so great that it outweighs very many times the comparatively trifling profit which she can derive from our trade, then I think you will see there is good ground for the position which I take, and that is that, by entering into close commercial relations with the United States, by establishing a close and friendly intercourse with them, we will render to the Empire the greatest service that any colony or dependency ever rendered to the parent State. It has been made a grave ground, it has been attempted to be set up as an insuperable ground of objection, that, when you propose to enter into a treaty for unrestricted trade with the United States, you must thereby, of necessity, discriminate against English manufactures and the manufactures of all other countries except the United States. Now, that is true. I admit that. More than that, I will admit that, *primâ facie*, what we propose to-day is a very unusual thing. I will admit—I am in no wise disposed to shrink from any argument which can be fairly advanced—I admit frankly that, when a semi-dependent state, proposes in one breath to tax the goods of the parent state and admit the goods of a foreign state free, while at the same time the parent state admits our goods and the goods of other countries free, and the foreign State taxes the goods of the parent state very heavily, it is a very unusual thing indeed. I grant that it is clean against all formulas. I admit that it appears to be reversing the action of 100 years ago when England lost half of this continent because she endeavored to tax their goods without giving them representation, and I admit that we are going a little far in the other direction in taxing her goods and not the goods of the people of the United States. I grant that this needs explanation, and I am prepared to say that I can give a full explanation why, in the interests of England itself, this thing should be done. I think I have stated the case as strongly as hon. gentlemen can well desire. Now, let us first of all look at the material results which will flow to England should this discrimination take place, and here let me say what is obvious to everyone who has given the subject a second thought, that, in our peculiar geographical position towards the United States, it is perfectly apparent that we cannot hope to gain free intercourse and unrestricted reciprocity with them without discriminating against the goods of other countries, unless and until the United States are prepared to go in for free trade with all the world, in which case our proposition would not be necessary. The thing, I grant, is of the essence of the bargain. I am not in the least degree desirous of concealing that fact, but, so far as the material side

is concerned, the practical results of assimilating our tariff in certain points to the American tariff as against England have been immensely and I suspect purposely exaggerated.) In the first place, the House ought to remember that at this very day our tariff is pretty nearly as hostile to English manufactures as that of the United States—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very nearly if not quite, but let me finish my sentence—and that there is very strong ground indeed, if things remain unchanged, for believing that in two or three years from this date our tariff will be much the more onerous of the two. Then it is well to bear in mind that, the tariff to the contrary notwithstanding, England has always managed to carry on a large trade with the United States, and especially with the northern portion of it. If I had the time at my disposal, I could advance very good reasons for believing that, suppose things remain exactly as they are, England would continue to have a trade relatively much larger with us than with the people of the United States, and, therefore, the absolute loss to them would be small. But I return again to the fundamental fact on which, as I said, this whole argument rests. There can be no doubt, I think, that if we succeed in getting unrestricted trade, we shall become much richer, and if we become much richer there is no doubt that we shall buy a much larger quantity of English goods than we do at present, though perhaps not in the same line. I believe that the result of England giving us a free hand in this matter, would be simply to make some little alteration in the character but not in the quantity of the goods she sells us, and that practically she would lose nothing in a material point of view. More than that, I know something of English manufacturers. I may say, by-the-bye, that this is a difficulty which it will be time enough to face when it arises. Our first business is to ascertain on what terms and conditions we can obtain unrestricted trade with the United States; when we know on what terms and conditions we can trade with them, then, perhaps this difficulty may arise, and that difficulty will have to be met. But I know something, as well as the hon. gentlemen, of English manufacturers, I know they are an eminently practical, hard-headed class of men. I know very well that English manufacturers, so long as their goods are excluded from North American markets, care precious little by whose name the ukase is signed which excludes them, whether it bears the name of Grover Cleveland, or Charles Tupper, or Mackenzie Bowell. Sir, you may depend upon it that English manufacturers, at any rate, are not to be caught with chaff. They understand that 80 per cent. duty on goods is 80 per cent. duty, whether it be imposed by an American Congress or a Canadian House of Commons, and they do not care very much who imposes it, so long as the duty is there. Sir, while I speak of these things as regards the mere material aspect of the case, in relation to English manufacturers, there are other arguments which the people of Canada may very justly use toward English statesmen and the English people. I say that the past history of this country supplies all Canadians, who care to study that history, with abundant arguments. Mr. Speaker, the position of Canada is exceptional, and in many important respects unique, so far as regards England. I am not going to dwell much on the fact that we are more than a colony, that we are a Dominion, charged with the responsibility of managing the affairs of half a continent, and entitled to claim for herself greater privileges and greater powers than should be granted to any ordinary colony. I do not dwell on that, but I will dwell a little on certain features in our past history which I contend give us a right to claim to be heard in this matter. Sir, England is the great colonising nation of modern times.

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

England has obtained colonies by exchange, by barter, by conquest, by direct purchase, by voluntary and involuntary settlement, and of all her hundred colonies, England has but one, and that is the premier Province of this Dominion, which was originally taken possession of, and has since been held by men who did not occupy or settle through any of the ordinary motives that induce men to forsake their native land and to give up their broad fields and pleasant homes for the purpose of maintaining their allegiance to the English flag. Sir, this question is being argued, to some extent, on the sentimental side, and I am ready for my friends there. To tell you a profound secret, Mr. Speaker, which I trust will not go outside the walls of this House, I have never been able exactly to understand the very deep obligation under which the people of Canada lay to England. In point of fact I rather think that the obligation is the other way. I do not think, Sir, that although we have cherished, I hope we will continue to cherish, the most friendly feeling toward the parent state, I do not think for my part, that we are under any deep debt of gratitude to English statesmen, that we owe them much, unless, perchance, it may be the duty, as Christian men, to forgive them for the atrocious blunders which have marked every treaty, or transaction, or negotiation that they have ever had with the United States where the interest of Canada were concerned, from the days of Benjamin Franklin to this hour, not excepting the first and second Treaty of Washington. I say there is no man here who does not know that, from the very first hour that the United Empire Loyalists took possession of Ontario and held it for the British Crown, down to this year 1888, there never has been a time except, perhaps, during the short paroxysm of the American Civil War, when the people could not have greatly benefited their material interests by throwing in their lot with the people on the other side. We have not chosen to do so, we do not now want to do so, we desire to maintain our autonomy. On that point, I am quite at one with some hon. gentlemen on the other side. But I say that, at this moment, a remarkable opportunity has presented itself in which a little skilful statesmanship and common honesty would enable us, at one and the same time, to obtain a great benefit for ourselves, and to render a most important service to the whole Empire, by aiding to reknit together those two great divisions of one race which were unfortunately sundered by the blunders and incompetence of English statesmen 100 years ago. Sir, if the hon. gentleman chooses, as I have said, to argue this matter on the ground of sentiment, all I can say is that a Canadian who understands and knows what his country's history means, will not find great difficulty in holding his own on these grounds. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I think that in this matter, supposing that we dismiss all other considerations, and look on it as a pure matter of right, we have some right to follow the example of England herself. No man knows better than the hon. gentleman opposite that England has always adopted a very different rule and measure, in dealing with the United States, from that which she has adopted in dealing with any country under her crown. I dare say that English statesmen could bring forward good reasons for their departure from their ordinary custom in such cases. Now, I am not here to criticise her right to do what she has done, at any rate I am not now criticising the reasons for doing what she has done, but I say that England has not hesitated, as the English plenipotentiary the other day was good enough to tell us, to give up the admitted legal rights of Canada for the purpose of conciliating the good-will of the people of the United States. So be it. We may have to bow, probably we will have to bow. But by every parity of reasoning, we, under these circumstances, are justified in saying to England: We give up at your behest, for your benefit, and for the sake of the Empire, our admitted legal rights, now do you make

us a little concession of your admitted legal rights in a matter in which we do not deny them, for your benefit and ours, and for the sake of conciliating the good-will of the American people. Sir, I said that was the lowest view. I believe that the great mass of Englishmen who have made investments in Canada, and notably in Canadian railways, would, like ourselves, be entirely satisfied if we carried out this proposition, and I believe that if all English investors in Canada were polled after having the case properly explained to them, they would go with us in saying that it was in the interests of England, that it was in the highest and largest sense for the interests of the Empire, that we should be permitted, if we desire to make such a bargain as this with the people of the United States. Sir, there is a third argument, which requires perhaps a little more consideration. We are asked when we make, or when we suggest that such a proposition be made, not by the right hon. gentleman opposite, who has maintained a most judicious reticence so far on this question, as far as I have noticed, but we are asked by some of his followers and myrmidons: What grounds have you for believing that, if you make this proposition, the people of the United States will agree? Well, Sir, what I have to say in answer to that is this: When two men are desirous of making a bargain, or when one man is desirous of making a bargain for his mutual benefit with another party, the time has come to enquire and negotiate on what terms and conditions a mutually advantageous bargain can be made. I say, moreover, that this is, in a pre-eminent degree, a matter for the two peoples of the United States and Canada. This is a thing which, if done at all, has got to be done in the broad light of day, not in dim diplomatic twilight. We know how the American Executive is constituted and how the American Congress is constituted. We know that this thing can only be done with the consent of Congress, and, practically, with the consent of the American people, and, therefore, it is that I have ventured to take, as I have said, the responsibility of bringing this matter forward on the floor of Parliament, because I know, and hon. gentlemen know, that it is not in their power to make an agreement, behind backs, with the American Executive which would be in any degree binding on the American people. More than that: I say the present moment is eminently in our favor on coming to the Americans with some such proposition as this, and I have good and fair proof of what I state. In the first place, everybody knows that an enormous reduction in the American tariff is imminent. Things have come to such a pass there that the people will insist on a very great reduction and alteration in their tariff. In the next place, we have got a very direct invitation, or, at all events, a very important expression of the good-will of the man who stands in the highest place to-day in the American republic, and who I trust for their sake will continue to enjoy the confidence of his countrymen for a second term. Sir, I note that President Cleveland in the recommendation which he addressed to Congress respecting the Fisheries Treaty after stating the advantages he thinks he has achieved, goes on to say:

"Our social and commercial intercourse with those populations who have been placed upon our borders and made forever our neighbors is made apparent by a list of the United States' common carriers, marine and inland, connecting their lines with Canada, which was returned by the Secretary-Treasury to the Senate on 7th February, in answer to a resolution of that body; and this is instructive as to the great volume of mutually profitable interchange which has come into existence during the last half century."

And then the President goes on to use these significant words, which coming from so high a source at such a time can be taken as nothing less than an invitation from the President of the United States to us to come forward and see on what terms we can negotiate for unrestricted reciprocity with them. Says President Cleveland:

"This intercourse is still but partially developed, and if the amicable enterprises and wholesome rivalry between the two populations be not obstructed, the promise of the future is full of the fruits of an unbounded prosperity on both sides of the border."

Sir, will any gentlemen here or elsewhere dare to maintain that when President Cleveland, in an official document of the highest importance, uses such terms as these with respect to intercourse with Canada, we, forsooth, should be debarred by any sense of dignity from responding to an invitation like that? I have another, not so formal, and yet even more important perhaps. I find that as long as a year ago, at a time when there was a danger of hostile collision between the two countries, Mr. Secretary Bayard, a man, as the First Minister knows, of the highest rank next to the President of the United States—a man who is virtually Premier of the President's Cabinet, a man whose name is honored and deservedly honored by friend and foe from one end of the United States to the other—I say that Mr. Bayard, the virtual Premier of the United States, wrote a year ago to Sir Charles Tupper in these terms:

"The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain, which has been *questio vexata* ever since it was concluded, and to-day is suffered to interfere with and seriously embarrass the good understanding of both countries in the important commercial relations and interests which have come into being since its ratification, and for the adjustment of which it is wholly inadequate as has been unhappily proved by the events of the past two years."

And then comes this important paragraph:

"I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I say commercial because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to effect the legislative independence of either country."

This is a just, a wise and a statesmanlike proposal from a man of the highest place and highest character in North America. Have we not seen within the last two weeks two distinguished members of Congress, Mr. Butlerworth and Mr. Hitt, both republicans, both opposed to the party of Mr. Bayard and President Cleveland, introducing Bills, one of which is substantially on the lines of the resolution I have placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker, and the other which goes further than, I think, it would be judicious or wise to go, but both in the direction of free trade and unrestricted reciprocity with Canada. Looking at this communication which has been placed in your hands, and as to which something was said to-night, I cannot but fear that a grand opportunity was lost by the delay of the Government in not endeavoring to settle the fishery question a considerable time ago in accordance with Mr. Bayard's suggestion. Their unhappy procrastination and unhappy delay I fear has been the cause why this negotiation was put off till the eleventh hour, to the most unfavorable moment that could by any possibility be selected, just on the eve of a presidential election, when even a baby in arms in the United States almost could have told hon. gentlemen opposite that no Government in the United States was free to deal as it would wish with great commercial questions, but they are all made subservient to the political exigencies of the times. Now, we do not know what passed, we do not know, and we will not know, I am afraid, in time for this debate, what really passed between these negotiators. We have not got the information, but we have got enough to see that there were proposals and counter-proposals, but what followed is concealed from the Parliament of Canada, which has a good right to know. I for one must say that I attach no sort of importance whatever to the fact that when Sir Charles Tupper tabled—I beg pardon for speaking of him by name—the very vague proposition which he did table, he was told by the American negotiators that they were not authorised to deal with it. It was patent

and apparent that they were not authorised to deal with it, and I beg to observe that, judging by their own action, the conduct of the Government had been so indiscreet in various ways as to render it excessively difficult, either for President Cleveland or his Cabinet, however favorable disposed they were—and I believe they were very favorably disposed to us—to render it very difficult for them to mix up the fishery question with our commercial relations at that date. You must remember that this matter had been publicly brought to the attention of the United States Congress, and that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, headed by Mr. Belmont, have declared :

“ That the motive and purpose have been plainly and openly avowed by Canada to be, first, the punishment of such vessels because the United States levies a duty on Canadian fish, not fresh, for immediate consumption, and, secondly, to coerce the United States to exempt such Canadian fish from all custom duties, and to enter into other new reciprocal customs relations with the Canadian Dominion and Newfoundland.”

And the Committee on Foreign Affairs went on to add : “ that this was a policy of threat and coercion, which should be instantly and summarily dealt with.” Under those circumstances it was absurd to say that anything could be deduced from the refusal of the American commissioners to discuss this question of reciprocal relations upon the very bald and brief memorandum furnished us by Sir Charles Tupper. I repeat one thing which I said before but it will bear repetition. It must always be remembered that Canada has a good deal to give as well as a good deal to get, and in making a bargain with the United States I for one would give very fair and full equivalents. I wish that the treaty should be perfectly and mutually beneficial, that for every dollar of profit we make they should make a dollar, and that for every Canadian who is benefited an American should be benefited likewise. It is on such a basis alone that a firm and permanent treaty of reciprocity, or a firm and permanent arrangement for free and unrestricted trade can be carried out. As I have said the people of the United States need new markets as well as we do. I do not contend, for it would be absurd to contend, that the thing is as important to them as it is to us. It is not as important to 60,000,000 to have the market of 5,000,000, as it is for 5,000,000 people to have the market of 60,000,000. That much is clear. But I do contend, Sir, that we have it in our power to give a full equivalent, and benefit quite as many Americans by this arrangement as Canadians will be benefited. I also say that this is emphatically one of those questions in which very nearly everything depends on how the question is presented to the various parties to the negotiation. You may approach this if you will in the spirit of statesmen, or you may approach it in the spirit of flunkys. It is a large question which demands a large treatment. Now, whatever the faults of England or English statesmen may be, I have always felt, I have always maintained, that England is essentially just, and that when England understands fairly and properly the grounds upon which we make this claim that England will, I believe, be prepared to concede it. As for the United States, I have no doubt that they have got their faults as we have got our faults, but with all their faults no man can have mixed much with the Americans without knowing that they are emphatically a great and a generous nation. I have heard one most foolish complaint and most foolish fear expressed, and I have heard that complaint made by men who ought to know better, the complaint that the people and the Government of the United States, forsooth, are not prepared to gush over or to rush into our arms or those of England at every pretty phrase. I do not blame them for that. As I have said I know something of the history of North America for the past one hundred years and something of the history of the dealings of England with the United States during that interval. Even during the last five and

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

twenty years I say, that we have not always so acted as to warrant us in expecting that the Americans will rush at once into our arms whenever we propose a friendly treaty for arrangement with them, but I do say that if you go to the United States and make fair, just and reasonable propositions to them that there is every reason—and we have, in the statements of their highest statesmen, proof that we will be so received—there is every reason to believe that we will be fairly and honorably received, and that it is in our power to make a treaty which shall be mutually advantageous, honorable and profitable to both nations. I do not gush over the United States either. I admire the United States, but I am in no way disposed to cringe to them. I think I may remind the House that the only negotiation during the last one hundred years in which Canada obtained a tolerable equivalent for her concessions was the negotiation conducted at Halifax under the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie and my lamented friend Sir Albert Smith. I take no shame to admit, and I have said it before, that for many a year I have made it my deliberate purpose to do all that one man could do, all that any man honorably could do, to make friends as far as I could, and to cause my people and the English people to become friends once more with the people of the United States. Our position towards the people of the United States has been vastly changed within the last five and twenty years, and it is well that this House should remember that. Five and twenty years ago but a small proportion of her population were in the United States. To-day, Sir, the United States, in the most emphatic possible manner, are becoming literally flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood. I think my friends from the Maritime Provinces and Quebec probably can affirm my statement, when I say that I know whole counties, I know great regions in Canada where you cannot find one single solitary Canadian family which has not a son, or a daughter, or a brother, or a sister or some very near and dear relative now inhabiting the United States. We will best do honor to the United Empire Loyalist traditions if we in our degree contribute to bring those two great races together, and to repair in this way what I have always looked upon as the great blot upon English policy during the last century. Now, there is another side of this question. Suppose the hon. gentlemen entered into those negotiations in good faith, suppose they tried their best, and suppose the negotiation fails, well, all I can say is that I would advise the people of Canada in that case to set to work and put their house in order. If we go on as we are going now, our position will soon become intolerable as compared with the United States. I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite have at all appreciated what the United States has done during the last dozen years. I do not think this House is at all aware of the fiscal position in which the United States stand to-day. I have here the last United States Treasury return, and what does it show? It shows, Sir, that the total expenditure of the United States, less sinking fund, was just \$268,000,000, of which \$35,500,000 came from miscellaneous receipts, and \$233,000,000 was all they required to raise by direct taxation. Now, they collect \$120,000,000 in round numbers by excise, and, therefore, all they require to raise by customs duties is a bare \$114,000,000. Sir, it would be in the power of the United States Secretary of the Treasury, if Congress gave him the authority, to raise the whole of the customs revenue in either of these three ways. He might maintain the existing tax on sugar and impose a very small income tax indeed, and raise all the revenue he wanted; he might maintain the tax on sugar and impose a very small *ad valorem* duty and raise all the revenue he wanted; or he might maintain the present sugar tax and add specific duties on a very few articles and make the rest of his trade list free. Now, I would like to direct the

attention of this House for a few moments to what might befall us if the United States adopted such a course. We have no less an authority than Mr. Joseph Chamberlain for saying that if the United States chose to reduce their tariff materially, they would become a most formidable competitor of England in the markets of the world; and if they could become a formidable competitor of England, what sort of a competitor would they be with our farmers and manufacturers under such circumstances—we heavily burdened with debt and the United States almost free? What, I should like to know, would the hon. gentlemen do in such a case? And it is a case which is imminent, a case which may occur at any moment? Will they go on and heap further taxes on the people? Do they think they could prevent a much more deplorable exodus than has occurred? Now, Sir, if the hon. gentlemen refuse to act—this is not a motion of want of confidence; they have not committed themselves, at least the First Minister has not, and I do not think his colleagues have committed themselves, against this special proposition—if they refuse to act, I ask them to consult their own Finance Minister as to whether I am not right, looking at the result of their fisheries negotiation, in saying that a most intense feeling of disappointment will pervade the whole of the Maritime Provinces at any rate. An intense feeling of disappointment, I know, will pervade a vast number of the farmers of Canada from one end of the Dominion to the other, and I think there will be a very great and bitter disappointment on the part of many of the inhabitants of Manitoba and probably also of British Columbia. Now, Sir, it must be borne in mind that our circumstances within a few years, not wholly by our own fault, not wholly by the fault of government, but in consequence of great economic changes which have been taking place of very great importance, have been materially changed. Then, it is notorious that our position, in comparison with that of the United States, has in twenty years been reversed, and reversed enormously to our detriment. Twenty years ago our taxes were one-third of the taxes of the United States; twenty years ago our debt was one-third of the debt of the United States. To-day, by the last returns I have here, our debt is two and a half times, as nearly as may be, greater per head than the debt of the United States; and the necessary taxes which the United States require to raise for the purpose of carrying on their government are one-third less than the necessary taxes the people of Canada require to pay. Then, Sir, the European market, to which we formerly looked, is dwindling for us, so far as we are concerned. We are exposed to intense competition from every part of the world. On the other hand the American market is growing with immense rapidity, and has become vastly richer to-day than it was a short time ago, while we are stationary and not even able to keep our own people, not to speak of the emigrants we bring here. As I said before, a great change in the United States is imminent, and it is our business to prepare to meet it. Sir, let me review our course for the last twenty years. Can hon. gentlemen opposite, with the Public Accounts in their hands, venture to deny that within twenty years our debt has trebled, having risen from \$73,000,000 or \$75,000,000 to \$230,000,000, and that our taxes have trebled likewise, having risen from \$11,500,000 to \$30,000,000? And that does not at all represent the real increase of taxation. Can they deny, Sir, that there is proof, absolutely conclusive proof, as far as the greater part of the Dominion is concerned, that we have lost three emigrants out of every four that we brought here, and one in four of our own people? Can they deny that there has been an enormous reduction in the volume of trade, until the volume of trade to-day is nearly 50 per cent. per head less than it was in 1873? Can they deny that there has been a very great fall in the prices of the chief

articles produced by our agriculturists, on whom we mainly depend? What shall I say of the immigration returns for the last six years? I have only got the municipal statistics of Ontario to go upon, but what a sorry story they have to tell us. I have the returns of every rural municipality and of every town and village of Ontario for the last six years, and what do I find? I find that of forty-four counties in Ontario, barely three have increased their rural population more than the natural growth of the population warrants; of the remainder, twenty-two are either stationary or have gained less than their natural growth; and nineteen have absolutely lost population. The total gain in the rural portion of Ontario, from 1881 to 1886, is about 13,000 souls on a rural population of over 1,100,000. In those six years we have gained about one-half of one per cent., according to the municipal statistics of Ontario. Of 206 towns and villages, 38 have increased in size more than their natural growth of population; 91 are stationary or have less than their natural growth, and 67 have lost population absolutely. 168 out of 206 have either lost absolutely in population or have grown less than the natural growth of population warrants. I need not go over the list of rural municipalities in detail, because they show precisely the same results; and I am sorry to say that I find, from information furnished me within the last few days by my esteemed friend Mr. Blue, the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, that the record for the year 1887, is rather worse, if that be possible, than the records for the years that have preceded. What shall I say of the comparison between Manitoba and Dakota? Manitoba and Dakota started seventeen years ago on equal terms. Each had a white population 14,000 strong. In about ten years Dakota had added a little over 100,000 to its population; Manitoba had added a little over 50,000 to its population. In 1881, Dakota had 130,000; Manitoba had 65,000. Then, Sir, we began to spend the money of the public by tens of millions in making railroads and promoting immigration to Manitoba. In 1886, we find that after spending \$100,000,000 of public money, and perhaps nearly half as much private funds, the population of Manitoba has grown but 30,000, and, according to the last statistics I have been able to obtain, in 1886, the population of Dakota considerably exceeds 500,000. They have added nearly 400,000 to their population within the last six years, while Manitoba has added but 30,000 according to the last census, after an expenditure of \$100,000,000. Now, do you call that satisfactory? If you do not, then the time has come to search for some appropriate remedy. I say again that, rightly understood and fairly understood, the interests of Canada, and the United States, and the mother country are really identical; and that the time is come, and is not far distant, when, at any rate the best, the wisest, and the most intelligent men of all these countries will realise that if they do not realise it now. I am no annexationist and I do not propose to become one. I have no desire to see our country merged in the United States, and I can tell the House that after conferences with a good many distinguished Americans, I am well advised they do not particularly desire to add to their heavy responsibilities by seeing us politically incorporated with them. I have always held and declared that I regard annexation as undesirable. I have no more wish to see my country merge her existence in that of the great state to the south of us—although I admire much in the institutions of the latter—than I would have to merge my own individual existence in that of another man's, because I admire his abilities or envy his great estate. We have a plain duty to discharge. We are, some of us, Privy Counsellors, and it is our bounden duty to advise Her Majesty the Queen of Canada in the true interests of the people of Canada, whatever those may be. That may carry us far. To a very considerable extent the choice lies with the people of Canada, to decide whether

they shall continue to fulfil the somewhat ignoble office that they now fulfil, of being practically, and in fact, a sort of hostage to the United States for the good behavior of England, or whether they will rise equal to the situation and become a link of union and amity between the two great English races. Which is the safer, which is the more honorable, which is the wiser, which is the more statesmanlike policy? I have abstained of set purpose from alluding to the fishery question, except in a most cursory way. I do not wish to animadvert on the conduct of the English plenipotentiaries in that matter, but I may take this opportunity of pointing out to the House, and the First Minister and his friends, that they can produce no argument to warrant them in asking the people of Canada to ratify that treaty, except practically this great argument that it is, in a high degree, the interest of the Empire to conciliate the good-will of the people of the United States by all fair and honorable means. And that very argument which they will doubtless bring to induce this House to consent to the treaty, applies with equal force to my contention that it is in the highest degree for the interest of the Empire that we, on our side, should endeavor, through the very proposition I now submit, to knit Canada and the United States together in a closer and more friendly alliance. We must rise above the craving for precedents, so dear to a certain order of legal mind. We are in a new world, and we own half a continent in it. It may be that there is no precedent to fit our case. My proposal is new and so is our situation, and, Sir, I have to say if there is no precedent to fit, it is our business to make one. Hon. gentlemen may contend that the views I express are not those held, by the majority of the people, at any rate as they are represented on the floor of this House; but if these hon. gentlemen could make up their minds, for once, to depart from their precedents—and if there ever was a case in which we would be warranted in departing from precedents it is this—and would dare to submit this question to the plebiscitum of the people, they know, and I know that the answer would be decisively in its favor. They know that an overwhelming majority of the people would be at our backs in demanding that no reasonable effort should be spared to obtain free trade with the United States; and if it were possible that this plebiscitum should be voted on by every native-born Canadian in North America, we would roll up a larger majority in its favor than has ever yet been recorded in our annals on any vote of any kind whatever. I do not say, and it is false to assert that I have ever said, that Canada has not made any progress during the past twenty years. I admit considerable progress has been made in certain directions. But what I contend for is this: that the progress has been partial, inadequate, far below what the natural resources of our country would warrant. It is also far below what we made ourselves in the twenty years before 1861, and as much below what the United States made in the first twenty years of their existence, when their population was equal to ours. I am quite willing to grant that a few towns have grown and prospered within the past few years, but I say it is none the less true that over many wide areas in this country our population is stationary and even retrograde. It is none the less true that from one end of Canada to the other, the value of farm lands is less to-day than it was six, seven or eight years ago; it is none the less true that the value of farm products is enormously lowered, and that our farmers are exposed to a far more intense competition than they have hitherto experienced. Great new forces are coming into existence, the full effect of which we are only beginning to feel. There is danger lest Canada, so far as regards our native born population, should sink into a mere residuum, a country from which the best and most intelligent of our people are fleeing, not by hundreds or by thousands, but by millions. Then as to foreign immigrants,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

if these statistics can be relied upon, it is clear that we are at the same time becoming a mere dumping ground for the refuse of those whom we import into this country. It is quite clear we are not growing up towards the light, and I hold it to be a very miserable symptom of our political growth, that there should exist here this craving to hang on to our mother's apron strings. Under such circumstances, it is our bounden duty to ascertain, at the earliest moment we can, what are the views of the people of the United States on this great question. This is not a question of etiquette. We have here, to all intents and purposes, the invitation of the President, and of the virtual Premier of the United States, to go and treat with them on fair and equal terms; and if it were a question of etiquette, the hon. gentleman is a Shakesperian student, and he knows that "nice customs courtesy to mighty kings." If two peoples desire to have a great boon like this, they need not stand on little paltry questions as to which shall make the first advance. If we fail, it will then be time to consider the situation anew. But I repeat that our real interests are those of England, and the United States are perfectly identical, and will be substantially furthered by this proposition. In conclusion let me say that I hope that, in this discussion, on both sides of the House, every man who speaks will remember that he is here as a Canadian representative, that he is here as a trustee of a certain section of the Canadian people, that our business here, all that warrants us in being here, is for the purpose of discussing the welfare of Canada, and I hope that we will be spared certain stale and tawdry hypocrisies of which we have heard too much. I have the greatest possible respect for genuine loyalty and for genuine loyalists wherever I may meet them. Even if they are sometimes a little wooden-headed and perverse, the thing is good in itself that I can excuse a good deal, but there is a certain class of loyalty, and there is a certain class of loyalists to whom I cannot extend any consideration at all. I must say that I have not much respect for 35 per cent. tariff protection loyalty, or for 35 per cent. tariff protection loyalists; and I think, if the right hon. gentleman will permit me to say so, that the First Minister showed that he appreciated correctly that class of loyalty and of loyalists in the famous parable he delivered a few years ago, wherein he compared himself—it is his comparison, not mine—to a monkey who had stolen into a farmer's orchard and was shaking down the apples for the benefit of the herd of swine that were grunting and gormandising below. England can take care of herself, as England has shown many a time and oft. If the English Cabinet, when this matter is fully represented to them, as it ought to be, see fit to object, it will be time enough for us to take up the question. In discussing it, I admit that all men who think that this will hurt Canada either morally or materially—because I do not desire to keep the question down to the mere ground of material interest—have good and fair grounds for expressing their views, but I say that none else should be heard on any pretext in this House, and I say that the worst foe of British connection is the man who would attempt to stifle discussion on that ground. More than that, I say what every one who has thought on the subject must know and feel to be true, that, in many important respects, our position is anomalous and transitional. No one supposed, when we came together in this Confederation, stretching over half a continent, that we were to remain semi-dependent forever. We are growing in stature, not as fast as hon. gentlemen say, but still we are growing, and we are entitled to a larger measure of responsibilities and to a larger measure of rights. One thing is clear, that everyone, as I have said, who thinks twice on the subject knows and feels, that things are not satisfactory for us in many ways. Why, even the Imperial Federationists know this. They

do not know exactly what they want, I grant; they know still less how they are to get it, I grant; but they know that there is a want and a lack in our present relations, and they desire to fill it. I have looked at that question long and often, and, as far as Canada is concerned, I see no way out for them, I see no way of our becoming a valuable member of a British Federation save only on one consideration, and that is that you broaden your base and take care that you unite yourselves with the United States in the bonds of a firm and friendly alliance which is not likely to be broken, and there is no way in which that is more likely to be done than by greatly increasing and promoting the trade between the two countries. In mutual advantage and benefit the surest bond of union will be found to exist, and I believe that Mr. Goldwin Smith was eminently right in saying that it was an idle and silly delusion to say that either England or the United States profited by the great struggle of the last century, that it was a thousand pities that the violent collision took place, and I know that not only Goldwin Smith expressed those views, but that they were held by the greatest and best of the Americans of that day, by men like George Washington himself, by men like Alexander Hamilton, by men even like the Adams, though they had strong republican leanings; that they were held by many of the best thinkers of the last century; and that these are the views which are held by the best and wisest Americans of the present time, and those were substantially the views, as their correspondence and records exist to prove, which were held by our own United Empire Loyalist forefathers, who did not desire to see Great Britain tax the colonies for her own benefit, but did desire to testify to the great and grand idea of a united British Empire and a united British people all over North America. It is idle for any human being to rise up and tell this House that, when we have lost a number equal to half the whole population that now remains, things are satisfactory with us. There is not another country, except perhaps Ireland, that has sustained so heavy a bleeding as we have done during the last few years. I say the time has come when Canada may justly claim the right to make her own commercial treaties. I say it is for the interest of the Empire that she should have that right. These things at any rate are perfectly clear. It is quite clear to any one who will carefully study those trade returns and will study the figures which I submitted before recess, that the United States market, if it were only made free, is worth more than twice over to Canada than of all the rest of the world put together. It is perfectly clear that it is the only market open to us for a great amount of our own productions. It is perfectly clear to me—it may not be to hon. gentlemen opposite—that our position relatively to the United States may become intolerable, and that there is need of present action in this regard. If we do nothing, and the United States act wisely, we may prepare—farmers and manufacturers alike—for a very severe competition, for a great and increasing exodus, and for very great and increasing dissatisfaction among our various Provinces. I must not be misunderstood. I do not say that there are no other expedients possible for us, but what I do say is that the expedient I now propose for the consideration of the House is the surest, the simplest, and the easiest expedient open to us; that it commends itself in a very high degree to the instincts of our people, as has been unmistakably shown; that it is in itself a fair, just and reasonable proposition; that it is best for us, best for the whole Empire, best for our kinsmen and neighbors on the other side of the line; and, believing that that it is so, I beg to move the resolution of which I have given notice.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Mr. Speaker, I have frequently listened to the greater part of the hon. gentleman's speech, delivered here this evening, but I confess that on no former occasion have I heard him deliver it with greater weakness,

if he will allow me that expression, than he has done to-night. During the earlier part of his speech, the hon. gentleman dwelt almost exclusively upon the statement that this country has not been progressing. The old story of loss of population, the old story of loss of trade, the old story that we are not progressing as we ought, was repeated *ad nauseam*. It appeared so well to please him that, although he dropped it from time to time in order to go on with the subject which is more particularly before us, the House will remember that he invariably fell back upon the same old statement, the same old Jeremiads of ruin and decay for this country. Sir, I cannot do better than give to the hon. gentleman the advice which the leading organ of his own party gave him, and gave to this country—if, indeed, the *Toronto Globe* may now be called the leading organ of hon. gentlemen opposite. Only a few weeks ago the *Globe* said:

“Distrust all figures professing to show that Canada has retrograded instead of advancing. Eschew association with the teachers of despair. Old men who, with worn-out powers, assert that national suicide is the only course to national salvation, may be excused by considerations of their senility, but young men who echo their doleful refrain can never seem otherwise than contemptible.”

These, Mr. Speaker, are not the words of a Tory newspaper, or of a Tory public man; they are the advice given to the young men of the country by the leading organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I commend them as the best possible answer to the statements that we have heard to-night. I think we have a right to complain, also, that the hon. gentleman was not as distinct as could be desired in his statement of what his resolution really means—whether it is commercial union that we are to have, or whether it is unrestricted reciprocity, which would leave us free to deal with other nations as we thought proper. That was not very definitely stated by the hon. gentleman, unless, indeed, we take one sentence in which he suggested that the position taken by Mr. Hitt, a member of Congress, embodied principles which went rather further than he would desire to go. But, Sir, what is it that has led to the sudden discovery of this panacea for the ills of Canada? What is it that has brought us, in this Session of Parliament, to discuss a question of this kind as the only course which offers to us any assurance for the future well-being of Canada? We can remember that, although the question of a Reciprocity Treaty is an old one, so far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, and so far as any public man in Canada, having the responsibility of a public man upon him, is concerned, until the last few months, we never heard of this question of commercial union, or the question of unrestricted reciprocity, as a remedy for the ills which are alleged to exist. Sir, all the statements made by the hon. gentleman against the policy of the Government were made over and over again before the last elections—aye, I may say that before the elections which preceded the last, all these statements were made. When we came to the last election, the two parties faced the electorate, nominally at any rate, upon distinct issues. The late leader of the Liberal party went through Ontario and delivered speeches which, for elaborateness of preparation, for devotion to detail, have, perhaps, never been exceeded by the speeches delivered by any other public man in Canada. They form a volume which I hold in my hand. And yet, Mr. Speaker, what will hon. gentlemen say when I tell them that in the whole of these speeches, the only reference to reciprocity is embodied in two single lines of type, delivered, first at Welland, and next, if I mistake not, at Malvern. The hon. gentlemen pledged themselves, through their leader, to a particular course in the last elections. I have the pledges here, and it is worth while reading them, delivered by their late leader. He delivered them, remember, not as an ordinary citizen, but as the leader of the party, speaking for the party, declaring himself to be authorised to speak for the party, and what did he say?

"I spoke in 1882, I spoke a few weeks ago in Toronto, I speak now as the leader of the party, expounding on all questions of principle, not merely my individual views, but the common sense, as I understand it, of the great body of the party, the general lines upon which the party, as a whole, would act, if entrusted, as they will soon be, with power."

They were not entrusted with power, and they are now acting upon different principles from those which they pledged themselves to the people of this country they would act upon, if they were entrusted with power. He went on to say:

"What I have said, and am about to say, on all questions of principle, you may then take as authoritative, to whatever extent a leader has authority, and so far from there being divergence, I can assure you that there is, in my belief, a general concurrence of sentiment between us, including Sir Richard Cartwright, whom I name only because our adversaries delight to represent him as holding other views."

Then, Sir, what more did he say?

"We have no longer a large surplus to dispense of. We have a large deficit and a greatly increased scale of expenditure to meet, and it is clearer than ever that a very high scale of taxation must be retained, and that manufacturers have nothing to fear. I then declared that any re-adjustment should be effected with due regard to the legitimate interests of all concerned. In that phrase, 'all concerned,' I hope no one will object to my including, as I do, the general public. In any re-adjustment I maintain that we should look especially to such reduction of expenditure as may allow of a reduction of taxation, to the lightening of sectional taxes; to the lightening of taxation upon the prime necessities of life, and upon the raw materials of manufacture, to a more equitable arrangement of the taxes which now bear unfairly upon the poor as compared with the rich, to a taxation of luxuries just so high as will not thwart our object by greatly checking consumption, to the curbing of monopolies of production in cases where, by combination or otherwise, the tariff allows an undue and exorbitant profit to be exacted from consumers, and to the effort—a most important point—to promote reciprocal trade with our neighbors to the south."

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the only reference in this whole book setting forth the policy of the Liberal party—that is the only reference whatever to the question of reciprocity. I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite smile; I notice that they think they have something because the term reciprocity is used here; but how do they reconcile this principle of reciprocity, if it be unrestricted reciprocity that was meant, with the promise that the manufacturers have nothing to fear, with the promise that the tariff cannot be materially reduced, with the promise that our large expenditures will require a high tariff to be maintained, while their policy to-day as announced is that the tariff is to be abolished altogether, in so far as the trade between our neighbors, our great competitors, and ourselves are concerned. I find the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) went on further to say:

"No man, I care not how convinced an advocate of absolutely free trade for Canada he may be, has yet suggested, no man I believe can suggest, a practicable plan whereby our great revenue needs can be met, otherwise than by the continued imposition of very high duties on goods similar to those we make or can make within our bounds; or on the raw materials. I invite the most ardent free trader in public life to present a plausible solution of this problem; and I contend that he is bound to do so before he talks of free trade as practicable in Canada. I have not believed it soluble in my day; and any chance of its solubility, if any chance there were, has been destroyed by the vast increase of our yearly charge, and by the other conditions which have been created. The thing is removed from the domain of practical politics."

And yet within a little over one year from the day when that speech was delivered and that pledge made, as indicating what would be the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, if their anticipations had been realised, and they had occupied these Treasury benches, we have a three and-a-half hours' speech delivered in this House for the purpose of showing us that free trade is not only practical but is absolutely essential if this country is to escape the ruin which threatens it. I might go on quoting other passages from that speech, but I will not detain the House longer. I might point out where the hon. gentleman declared that the idea of direct taxation was absurd, was not even to be thought of, and could not be thought of in connection with our affairs in Canada; but I have read enough to show that in assuming the position which hon. gentlemen opposite have taken to-night, they have entirely changed their position from that which they occupied when appealing

MR. WHITE (Cardwell).

to the people a little over a year ago, and I think they are bound to show that our condition has so changed since that time as to justify that remarkable change of position on their part. One might speculate, but of course we will not do it, that it is not so much the interests of the country as the necessities of the party that have caused this change. They had been taunted by their own friends, as well as by their political opponents, as being a party without a policy. They had been taunted with being a party of negations without any positive idea to submit for the acceptance of the people, and as they were beaten at two elections and as bye-election after bye-election gave the same record and the people showed their confidence in the policy represented by this Government, hon. gentlemen opposite have made up their minds that something new is required, and they submit a policy, not a policy which this Government could carry out if they would, not a policy which those hon. gentlemen could carry out if they were on this side of the House, but a policy dependent upon the action of a foreign Government without whose consent nothing could be done. So that after nearly ten years of Opposition, after ten years of groping after something through which they might appeal to the people, hon. gentlemen have come down to a policy which is a safe one for them because they could not adopt it if they were on the Treasury benches, and the adoption of which depends entirely on the action of a foreign Government. They have come with a policy for the United States for the acceptance of the people of Canada. That is the position in which we find hon. gentlemen to-day. Sir, this question of reciprocity is an old question. Both political parties in Canada have been in favor of it—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Both parties have been in favor of reciprocal trade in the natural productions of this country; both parties have been in favor of reciprocal trade, in so far as that reciprocal trade can be carried out, having regard to the great industrial interests of this country. What has been the history of negotiations in the direction of reciprocity? The Treaty of 1854, commonly known as the Elgin Treaty, was, if I mistake not, negotiated under the direction of the Liberal-Conservative party, the McNabb-Morin Government being in power at that time. The treaty was denounced at the very first moment it could be denounced by the United States. From that day to this, this Government, both parties I may say in Canada, have been ready to enter into negotiations for a fair interchange of the commodities of the two countries. In 1874, the late Government sent Mr. George Brown to Washington, and he and Mr. Fish drafted a treaty, which was going to be, in the opinion of every one who favored it, of great advantage to Canada. What was the fate of it? It dealt not only with the natural productions of the country, but also with a considerable line of manufactures. It went even further than that: it ensured the Americans the use of our great public works. It went further than that: it obliged the people of Canada to build a new canal, commonly known as the Caughnawaga Canal, which would give easy access for the lumber of the west to the American market. And yet, in spite of the great advantages to be given to the United States by that treaty, in spite of the fact that it went as far as the people of this country could possibly go in negotiations of that kind, what was the result of it? Why, it was simply hung up in the Senate, denied even the courtesy of a reference to the ordinary committee, and from that day to this all efforts to get a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States have failed. What was the position of the hon. gentleman at that time? Why, I find that the hon. gentleman who has addressed the House at such great length to-night, when addressing a meeting in Charlottetown, dealt with this subject. He said:

"They say we must have reciprocity, and we cannot live without it as a Dominion. I take exception to that statement. While reciprocity is desirable, we are not in such a state of subjection to the United States that we cannot live without it. We have men and ships, and 'will carry the war into Africa.' We will find new markets for ourselves, and cut them out. There is nothing better calculated to prevent the bringing about of reciprocity than to tell the Americans we cannot live without them. It would induce them to believe that they had the power to drive us to their own terms."

I shall not make other quotations as I might make them to show that this was the current of public opinion in this country at that time. I do not quote this with the object of putting the hon. gentleman in contradiction to himself. I quote it as I might quote extracts from the leading organ of that party at the same time, to show what was the current of public opinion then, which was that, having made every effort that we possibly could make to secure reciprocal free trade with our friends on the other side of the line, so far as we could do it consistently with the interests, and welfare, and revenue requirement of this country, we ought to go on and develop our own interests and our own destiny in our own fashion. Now what did this Government do? Under the Act of 1879—an Act which embodied the mandate of the people at that time—commonly known as the National Policy Act, we incorporated a clause which gave to the Governor General in Council the power practically of entering into a reciprocal treaty for the free interchange of products between this country and the United States. That Act is on the Statute-book to-day, and it remains there an authority to the Government, whenever the United States will show any disposition to meet us, to enter into freer trade relations with them in so far as we can do. I think I may fairly say, therefore, that our record in the past, at any rate, is such that the people of Canada can say to our friends on the other side of the line: "We are ready to consider the question whenever you shall signify your decision for such consideration; we are ready to consider with you the best means of promoting the free interchange of such products in this country as we can exchange with you, having regard to our great interests;" and until the people of the United States are so ready, the history of the past clearly shows that the true policy of Canada is to act upon the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman himself in the extract which I have just quoted, that is, to work out our own destiny in our own way. This question, however, of Commercial Union or of unrestricted reciprocity—the latter term being apparently a modification of the former principle—is not altogether a new one. In 1871, I had myself the privilege of being present at a meeting of the National Board of Trade of the United States, in the city of St. Louis, and on that occasion the chairman of the Canadian delegation, the late Hon. John Young, consented to a scheme for unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. But there is this fact to be remembered in connection with that: Mr. Young, as everyone knows, was in favor of the separation of this country from the mother country, in order that we might enter into such an arrangement. He took the ground at St. Louis, as he did in the city of Montreal, and in the press when he discussed this question, that without independence we could not enter into arrangements of this kind, and that, therefore, as precedent to such an arrangement and for the purpose of bringing about such arrangement, the true interests of Canada lay in her separation from the mother country. Did any public man in Canada, having the responsibility of a public man upon him, sanction that view at that time? No. Although Mr. Young was a prominent Liberal, although he was a strong supporter of the Liberal party, although he was a man of great influence, who had been a Minister of the Crown, the *Toronto Globe*, then edited by the late Hon. George Brown, denounced him and denounced his proposition as utterly opposed to the best interests of this country and as impossible of fulfilment, except on

terms of annexation itself. That was the position taken at that time in connection with this question. What is meant by this question of commercial union? I take the opinions of those who may fairly be assumed to be, at any rate, the best authorities upon that subject. We would never have heard of it, apparently so at any rate, had not Mr. Erastus Wiman, a gentleman of great influence and of great ability in the United States, a Canadian by birth and I believe still a Canadian by allegiance, took it into his head, having plenty of leisure on his hands, to come to Canada and carve out a policy for the people of this country. He did the constituency of Cardwell, which I have the honor to represent here, the kindness to make his first *début* on that question there, and from that day to this he has, in the press and in public meetings, said a great deal upon this subject, so that he has come to be recognised, if not the leader of the Liberal party at least the leader of this particular policy of the Liberal party. It seems to me that in any discussion of the question in this country we should know precisely what is contemplated by this scheme. Now what does Mr. Wiman say? Writing to the American press on this subject he says:

"That by the operation of a uniform continental tariff equal in height to that always prevailing in the United States, the goods and merchandise of all foreign countries, including Great Britain, would be discriminated against in favor of American manufactures."

Then, Sir, in a letter which he addressed to the *Mail*, or rather in a speech which he delivered in Detroit and reported in the *Mail*, he said:

"That as against all the rest of the world the same rates of duty should be collected by Canada as are now levied by the United States, while between those two countries of North America the customs line should be completely obliterated, in other words, the proposition is that around the whole continent of North America the customs line should exist and have precisely a uniform height."

Now, what does that involve? I take a leading newspaper of the western States, and the *Chicago Times* I think may be considered the leading newspaper of the western States, as giving a statement of what that really involves. Here is what the *Times* says:

"This proposition implies a complete surrender by the Dominion Parliament to the American Congress of all control of the principal source of the Dominion revenue—the tariff. Whatever it may please the American Congress to do regarding the tariff the Dominion must forthwith accept. The people of the Dominion would have neither a vote nor a voice in Washington under the proposed Commercial Union."

Then, Sir, the same paper says further:

"Not only would our Congress prescribe and change at pleasure the taxes exacted from the people of Canada, but our executive officers and our courts would make all the rulings and decisions affecting rates for the Dominion as well as for the United States."

Again I will quote another extract from the same paper:

"If the Dominion will take our tariff laws as they are, and as Congress may choose to modify them, and as our Treasury Department and courts may construe them, well and good. This country may agree to such an arrangement as that, but it will never agree to accept the Dominion laws, or to put the whole business of tariff-making out of Congress, or into the hands of some joint high commission. Unless, therefore, the Dominion is prepared to make a complete and unconditional surrender of all control over its own tariff, and accept whatever tariff our own Congress may choose to enact from time to time, the scheme of Commercial Union, in the sense in which that phrase is used, is entirely out of the question."

But, Mr. Speaker, I have an extract from a speech by a gentleman whose opinion on this subject is, perhaps, to us in this House, of still more importance, because he speaks with the responsibility of a Canadian public man, and a leading and distinguished member of his own party. I refer to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who, at Jarvis, during the Haldimand election, delivered a speech in which he declared for Commercial Union. What the hon. gentleman said, I will admit, differs in some respects from the suggestion or hint of the hon. gentleman who has spoken to us to-night; but I think we have a

right to assume that a speech delivered so recently, and by a gentleman occupying so distinguished a position as the hon. member for North Norfolk must be held to embody, at any rate, the views of a considerable section of his party. He said :

"It was simply a customs union between two or more independent states where a common tariff and excise laws were adopted, and the revenue collected, after deducting expenses of collection, was divided among the participants upon the basis of population, or any other basis that might be agreed upon, while all trade restrictions between them were removed. The application of the principle between Canada and the United States would require that the two countries should have the same excise rates and the same tariff upon imports from all other countries; that the revenue thus collected in both countries should be divided upon conditions hereafter to be arranged; that the customs line between the two countries from ocean to ocean should be removed, and that trade between Canada and the States should be in every respect as free and untrammelled as trade between the different States of the American Union was at the present moment."

That is a statement of the case as submitted by the hon. member for North Norfolk, and I am bound to say—and I think this honorable House will agree with me—that in directness and clearness of statement it is far preferable to the speech to which we have listened to-night from the hon. member for South Oxford. Then, Sir, we have a still more important authority in this case—the authority on whose support and assistance hon. gentlemen depend for the realisation of their hopes. What is it that is proposed in Congress to-day. Mr. Butterworth introduced a Bill, and that Bill was submitted to the proper committee of the House of Representatives; but, although we are not in the secrets of that committee, although we do not know what was done there or how it happened, what we do know is that Mr. Hitt afterwards introduced a resolution to the House of Representatives which was submitted to the same committee, and that Mr. Butterworth telegraphed a practical abandonment of his own scheme and the adoption of the scheme embodied in the resolution of Mr. Hitt. I have not the resolution itself, but here is a Washington despatch giving the substance of it:—

"WASHINGTON, 5th March.

"In the House of Representatives to-day Congressman Hitt introduced a joint resolution for the promotion of Commercial Union with Canada. It was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It provides that when it shall be duly certified to the President that the Government of the Dominion of Canada has declared a desire to establish Commercial Union with the United States, having a uniform revenue system, like internal taxes to be collected, and like import duties to be imposed on articles brought into either country from other nations, and no duties upon trade between the United States and Canada, he shall appoint three commissioners to meet those who may be likewise designated to represent the Government of Canada to prepare a plan for the assimilation of the import duties and internal revenue taxes of the two countries, and an equitable division of receipts under Commercial Union, and said commissioners shall report to the President, who shall lay the report before Congress."

Now, that is the only proposal before the Congress of the United States to-day, and I think we have a right, therefore, to ask hon. gentlemen whether they are prepared to accept that proposal, or if they are not, why they should, in view of the past history of this question, trifle with the time of Parliament in discussing this matter. Now, Sir, this does not mean unrestricted reciprocity, because Mr. Hitt, in a letter to the press says:

"The tariff would have to be the same in Canada and the United States, or there would be infinite fraud and disturbance of trade."

So that you will see that upon that question Mr. Hitt speaks with no uncertain sound, and that the only proposition which comes from anybody in the United States is a proposition for a union or a reciprocity different, I take it, from that which is embodied in this resolution, although the same as that which, up to the time the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), wrote his letter to Mr. Wiman, was accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite, including the hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. member for North Norfolk. The change came suddenly. The hon. member for West Ontario—the power behind the
Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.)

throne under the late leader, and I assume the power behind the throne under the present leader as well, if we may judge of the wonderful effect of that letter—wrote to Mr. Wiman, to say that the people of Canada were so enamored of the term "custom houses," that they loved the existence of the custom house so much, that the proposal which suggested the abolition of the custom houses along the line would not likely meet with general support in Canada; and, therefore, he suggested that we should have all the advantages of Commercial Union plus the expense of keeping up the line of custom houses between the two countries; and that is the proposal we have here. Now, Mr. Speaker, what does this proposition which is submitted to us involve? In the first place, I take it that it involves, as I think I have shown, similar customs duties to those imposed by the United States against all other countries in the world except the United States; and I take it, notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman has said, that that practically means separation from the mother country. Now, I am not going to raise the loyalty cry in any sense whatever. I accept the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman that we should deal with this question from the standpoint of our own interests, that we should deal with it as it affects Canada; and I do not feel disposed, therefore, at this time to raise the general question of loyalty to the mother country, and the danger and ingratitude involved in the separation from the mother country. But I think it is important, when we are discussing the question, that the facts should be stated, and let the people draw their own inference and their conclusion from those facts. For anyone seriously to pretend that this country should remain connected with the mother country, after adopting a principle by which we became commercially a portion of a foreign nation, and charged against the mother country the same duties that foreign nation charged, seems to me to ask people to believe that which no reasonable person can very well believe. So that we must take the proposition as meaning separation from the mother country. I doubt very much whether a high spirited people like the people of Canada would be mean enough to accept a continuance of the connection under such conditions as would be involved in that arrangement, even if the mother country were generous enough to consent to it. Then, Sir, it affects our finances seriously; and I think you will agree with me, that, having regard to the fact that the hon. member who has addressed us at so great length to-night is an ex-Finance Minister, whose specialty it is to deal with finance, the House has reason to complain that upon that branch of the subject he was not very distinct nor very clear. Now, Sir, let us look for a moment at how we stand financially to-day. Our expenditure for the fiscal year of 1887, amounted to \$35,658,000. Of this,

The charges on debt amounted to.....	\$ 9,970,671
Subsidies to Provinces	4,169,341
Sinking fund.....	1,592,952
Collection of revenue.....	8,375,926
Total.....	\$24,108,890

Now, I think the House will agree with me that these are charges that no Commercial Union, no unrestricted reciprocity, would enable us to escape. They are the fixed charges of the country, and cannot be got rid of in any way whatever. Then we have the charges for other expenses, a little over \$11,500,000. How are these met? Civil Government, \$1,211,850. It may be, if hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side, they might possibly take a few hundred dollars off that, or they might not. I think it will be found on examination, especially if you look at the Estimates, for instance, of this year, where hardly an increase has taken place except the ordinary statutory increase, that the expenditure under this head cannot very well be reduced. Administration of Justice, \$675,114. That

is an item which cannot be reduced. Fisheries, the protections and bounties to fishermen, \$415,443. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen opposite will abandon protection to the fisheries or the system of bounties to fishermen; but unless they do so that item cannot be reduced. Then there is the expenditure on the Indians in the North-West Territories, \$1,201,301, and in view of the fact that the only complaint we have from hon. gentlemen opposite is that we permit the Indians to starve, that we do not give them enough food, and, therefore, do not expend enough on them, I do not think that is an item that can very well be reduced. Legislation costs us \$977,502. That cannot be reduced. Militia, \$1,193,692; Lighthouse and Coast Service, \$572,811; Mounted Police, \$781,644; Penitentiaries, \$311,267; and Public Works rather under \$2,133,315—or in all \$9,395,759. And I think I may fairly say that by no process of economy, even if the hon. gentlemen, with their cheese-paring methods, were on this side of the House, could these amounts be materially reduced, or at any rate so reduced as in the slightest degree to affect the general question of the application of this policy for carrying on the government of the country. How do we meet these expenses to-day? We have a revenue altogether of \$35,754,993, of which the Customs yielded \$21,377,800, leaving a balance from other sources of \$13,376,193. On the imports we get from the United States to day the duty amounts to \$7,299,591, so that we have a revenue, from Customs duties on imports from other countries, of \$15,079,209, and adding to this the revenue from other sources, which, as I have stated, amounts to a little over \$13,250,000, we have a total of \$28,455,402, irrespective of the duties on American imports. The deficit, therefore, if we gave up the revenue from the imports from the United States, which we would have, on our present expenditure and present general receipts, would amount to very nearly \$7,250,000. That, I take it, must be made up by direct taxation. It is quite clear, as I have pointed out, that we cannot, if we are to carry on the government of the country and proceed with the public improvements necessary to develop the country, do with a less expenditure than that which we have to-day; so that if we give up this amount that we receive from Customs duties on the imports from the United States, we will have the large deficit to meet of \$7,300,000. But that is not all. That is assuming that all our imports from other countries would come in as they come in to-day. That is assuming we would still have English goods coming by the St. Lawrence or landing at Boston or New York and coming here in bond. Can anyone pretend to say that would be the result? Immediately we would find the overwhelming proportion of the goods we now receive from Great Britain would be displaced by goods of a similar character manufactured in the United States, and we would find, not that we lost simply the \$7,300,000 which we now derive from Customs duty on imports from the United States, but also at least one-half of the Customs duties that we receive from goods imported from England. I venture to say it would be very much more than one-half, and that practically we would surrender the whole of our Customs revenue. But that is not all. We would find also that the large importing trade of Canada would be transferred from the St. Lawrence, where a great part of it is done to-day, to American ports. We would actually by this process destroy the great trade by the St. Lawrence, which, I believe, both sides in this House desire to see built up. Gentlemen may say that if our duties were somewhat lower than those of the United States, that British goods for consumption in the western States would come by the St. Lawrence. I do not think this hope would be realised. Why should ships come by the St. Lawrence, why should goods take that route and pay us large duties, and then again pay the American duties when entering the western States, when they could go to the American ports, pay

duties there and be scattered through the United States, while we would receive goods of American manufacture in their place? There would be really no motive for these goods coming by the St. Lawrence at all, and thus we would destroy not only the manufacturing industries of the country, but another trade as well, which is too seldom thought of when we are dealing with the question of the trade interests of the country, and that is the great distributing trade of the country. You would find, Sir, American merchants in their great cities all along the border becoming the distributors to the retailers of the Dominion, thus verifying the statement made by prominent Americans in support of Commercial Union, that the effect would be to place American goods direct from the American warehouse into the retail stores all over the Dominion. A great injury would thus be done to the importing and distributing trade of Canada. How are we going to make up this revenue? The hon. gentleman does not seem to feel very much alarmed at direct taxation. He thinks direct taxation is more readily collected, and costs less, and is more equitable in its distribution, than the system of taxation which we now have by means of Customs duties. I will not burden this debate by a general discussion of that question, although I think I could show, and that without much difficulty, that the people who would suffer, relatively, the most from the system of direct taxation are those very poor people in whom the hon. gentleman affects to be so much interested. What did we see a short time ago in the city of Toronto, when the publication was made of the assessed incomes of a number of the wealthy people of that city? We saw that the poor man, with his income of \$500 or \$600 a year, was assessed to the full amount; but in regard to the millionaire with his \$10,000 or \$50,000 a year, no assessor would think of putting him down for that, and he was put at \$5,000 or \$6,000 or, perhaps, \$10,000 a year. And, as with incomes, so with real property. If you go into any of our large cities, you will find that the poor man's house can be easily assessed at its full value; but, if you take the rich man's house, which has cost him \$50,000 or \$100,000, with its almost park-like lawns around it, you will find that it is assessed at one-third or one-fourth of its value, for no assessor would think of putting it down at its full value. That is known to every one who has watched the record of the assessment rolls. So this system of direct taxation, instead of being one which would relieve the poor of an excessive burden, would really impose upon the poor far more than their proper proportion of taxation. Under the present system, the poor man can get on practically without any taxation at all. Our taxes are largely upon luxuries. It is the wealthy, under the present system, who pay the large proportion, because it is upon the expensive goods that the larger proportion of the taxation of the country is levied, while a poor man can sit down and look over what he eats and what he wears, and see what he pays for it, and can ascertain the fact for his comfort that the taxation he pays is practically nil in this happy country of ours. Nor can we adopt the principle of Excise duties, in relation to which I think, if I read the resolution of the hon. gentleman aright, he proposes a special exception. We cannot put on extra duties of Excise, for this reason: that there is a limit beyond which you cannot go in Excise duties. You must have regard, in the imposition of these duties, particularly in this country, where for between three and four thousand miles our territory adjoins our neighbors on the other side, to the duties imposed by them and the general cost of the article in order to know what amount of Excise duty is collectable under any system you may adopt, and therefore we are restricted even in the matter of Excise duties. We would have to adopt direct taxation. No other means could possibly be adopted. Of course, there is one way in which we might reduce our expenditures to some extent.

We spend to-day some four million dollars on provincial subsidies. The hon. gentleman opposite referred to the action of the Quebec conference, the members of which, in a lapse of excessive candour, he described as his friends, correcting himself immediately afterwards; and he referred to the resolutions passed by that conference as if they were the embodiment of the wisdom of this country, as I believe they are to be the embodiment of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. But they do not contemplate a reduction in the matter of subsidies. On the contrary, the very thing which will commend them to some of the Provinces is that resolution which proposes largely to increase the subsidies. It is true that the hon. gentleman, after speaking of these resolutions as the embodiment of wisdom, said that this Commercial Union would prevent absolutely an increase of the expenses of the country, but if we are to reduce the expenditure, if we are to resort to direct taxation, I think the people of this country will at once say that it would be little less than absurd that the Dominion Government, the central authority, should impose direct taxation through the machinery of municipal government—because there is hardly any other way in which to do it—in order to distribute a portion of the proceeds back again to the Provinces. I am not going to say whether we ought to do away with provincial subsidies or not. The hon. gentleman in a former Session of Parliament, did suggest that he believed it would be for the interests of Canada if the provincial subsidies were done away with altogether. I leave him on that subject to make his account with his hon. friends on that side from the other Provinces, and I think he will find some difficulty in convincing them that that would be a wise system to adopt in Canada. So you see, by the adoption of this policy, we are to find ourselves reduced to a system of direct taxation by which we are to levy at least \$15,000,000 to make up for the loss in Customs duties which the adoption of this system of so-called unrestricted reciprocity or Commercial Union would impose upon us. Now, what is Canada to gain as a return for this sacrifice, because, after all, this is a business matter, and ought to be discussed as a business proposition. What are we to gain for this sacrifice? We give up a large portion of our revenue, we sacrifice our distributing trade, we sacrifice or we risk the sacrificing of the manufacturing interests of the country. What are we to get in return for all this? Hon. gentlemen tell us we are to get an enlarged market in the United States. I suppose it is really the enlarged market which is the chief advantage proposed. The market which is to be opened in this country for our friends on the other side is their side of the subject. Our side is that we are to get an enlarged market in the United States. How do we stand in regard to that matter at present? Let us look at our exports to the United States and to Great Britain. Our exports to the United States amount to \$32,273,033, and to Great Britain they amount to \$38,714,331. Here are the figures as presented by the Canadian returns:

Produce of	To United States.	To Great Britain.
The mine.....	\$3,085,431	\$ 477,722
Fisheries.....	2,717,509	1,704,190
Forest.....	9,353,506	9,445,491
Animals.....	7,291,369	16,315,474
Agriculture.....	7,966,249	9,438,408
Manufactures.....	1,289,052	1,270,162
Miscellaneous.....	569,918	62,884
Totals.....	\$32,273,033	\$38,714,331

I will deal simply with the exports to United States, and if we examine the figures, we will find this result: Of the \$9,353,506 worth of the products of the forest, \$1,600,000 enters free under the present system, and the duty on the remaining portion is proposed to be remitted by the Tariff Bill now before Congress. Of the exports of the mine, coal amounts to about \$1,252,867; gold quartz to \$1,017,401; gyp-

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell.)

sum, crude, to about \$165,497; copper ore, \$181,010; iron ore, \$71,930; stone and marble, \$69,300; making the total of \$2,754,009. Coal, as the hon. gentlemen know, over a million dollars worth of it, in fact nearly the whole export of coal to the United States goes from the coal fields of Vancouver Island to the markets of the United States on the Pacific coast, chiefly to San Francisco. Now, the question of duty on that might be an important matter, but I am inclined to think in that case we may accept the general view which hon. gentlemen opposite, in former controversies on the National Policy, have impressed on us, namely, that it is the consumer who pays the duty. Of the fisheries, \$2,717,000, no less than \$1,130,000 worth is already admitted free, so that the advantages of a free market, undoubtedly very great, may be, after all, over-estimated. Everyone who has watched the progress of the fisheries and the fishing trade during the last two years in our Maritime Provinces, knows that there has never been—I think I am within the mark in saying—there has never been in the history of the Maritime Provinces more profitable fishing than that which occurred during the last year or two. Now we find in regard to the fisheries that new markets are being opened up all the time. Here, for instance, is what the Halifax Chamber of Commerce said upon this subject on 7th March, only a few days ago:

“ Now that we have been for a time in sole possession of our fisheries, we are realising more than ever their very great value. The product of our fisheries is stated at about twenty millions of dollars. Of this great industry Nova Scotia is credited with at least one-half of the whole. While the available consuming population is rapidly increasing, a single square mile cannot be added to these productive grounds, the product of which must, in the very nature of things, continue to increase in value. Their accessibility, productiveness and extent place them before us as the most valuable in the world. The markets of the world are wide enough if properly cultivated for all we catch for export, with an ever-increasing demand. Our merchants seem fairly alive to the value of these more distant markets and each year ought to find them more capable of utilising them. Let us then be alive to the great value of this source of wealth and employment, quite satisfied, while in full possession of our own, to allow our neighbors across the line the full possession of their own, and get ready, should they come to a just and equitable view of the whole premises, to meet them in a Reciprocity Treaty of friendly commerce worthy of the two most advanced nations of the world, and members at the same time of one great family.”

Now, Sir, you will see that the Chamber of Commerce of Halifax, thoroughly familiar with the position of the fisheries, recognise that they have, under the present conditions, opportunities for the profitable employment of those fisheries, and that they look forward to them as a great source of wealth, and believe that other large markets may be opened for them, even if the United States should, unfortunately, continue the policy which they have adopted in the past. Now, of animals and their produce, we exported \$7,291,369, and of these there were already free of duty \$2,669,628, leaving a little over four millions and a quarter subject to duty; and the exports of the products of the farm reached \$7,400,777. With a view of ascertaining the duty which we pay on our exports, I take the American trade returns, because they give the exact amount of duty paid upon the exports of Canada into that country. The imports into the United States from Canada in 1887, which were subject to duty, amounted to \$15,997,113. I have taken the details of \$24,000,000 of this sum; the others were very small amounts, and in the hurry I did not go into them. But upon \$24,000,000 of exports, the duty paid was \$4,715,464, or on the whole exports from Canada into the United States, the duty paid was about \$5,000,000. Unrestricted reciprocity would remove that, so that as a mere matter of bargain, as a mere matter of profit and loss, we would receive about \$5,000,000, assuming, of course, that the exporter pays the duty, that the producer pays the duty, which is rather strange doctrine, coming from hon. gentlemen opposite, in view of the discussions we have had in the past. But assuming that the producer pays the duty, we save \$5,000,000, and for that we would sacrifice the

duties on American goods coming into Canada, amounting to over seven millions and a quarter. It is a new doctrine that we are to give up seven and a quarter million dollars in order that we may get five millions in return. Now, Sir, it is impossible, in the discussion of this question, to avoid some reference of what is going on in the Congress of the United States. A Bill, as hon. gentlemen know, has been submitted to Congress, putting on the free list a large number of articles which are now subject to duty. The articles that would be exempt from duty, and the present extent of our exports of these articles, are as follows:—

Lumber.....	\$7,829,811
Flax.....	298,079
Tin plates.....	222
Copper ore.....	188,329
Potatoes.....	329,163
Beans and peas.....	556,430
Wool.....	356,284

In all, \$9,800,000 worth of exports from Canada to the United States, out of the \$25,000,000 that are now paying duty, would be exempt from duties if that Bill passed. Now, the amount of the duty on the articles which would be remitted if that Bill passes, amounts to \$2,778,964. As to the balance of the articles, this fact ought to be remembered, that our trade with the United States is a trade of competition and not a trade of exchange. The articles that would go into the United States are articles which are largely produced by the people of that country. When the hon. gentleman tells us that we are to give up a market of 5,000,000 for a market of 60,000,000 of people, he ought also in fairness, to tell us that we give up our market of 5,000,000 for a market of 60,000,000 which is already so fully occupied that precisely the same articles we export to them, they actually are exporting a larger amount of their surplus to other countries. No one, therefore, can say that this is a market open to us in the sense in which hon. gentlemen use that term. The distinction between competition and exchange in matters of trade cannot be too strongly emphasised. We would thus find that the balance which we would receive, supposing that the Bill now before Congress passes, from duty on the balance of the articles, would amount to \$2,780,000, and for the remission of that amount the people of Canada, as I have said, are expected to give up \$7,300,000. We are in addition to risk the transfer of our import trade to United States ports, we are to introduce discriminating rates against Great Britain and to disturb our entire fiscal and industrial system, for the hon. gentleman himself admits that that would be the immediate result at all events, whatever might be the ultimate result of the adoption of this principle of unrestricted reciprocity. A few words as to the question of this large market, because that, after all, is the one argument produced to induce us to accept this principle. First, as to manufactures. I am relieved considerably from the necessity of dealing with this question by the admission of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that the effect would be certainly to injure many of the manufactures of Canada. Is it in the interests of this country that we should injure those manufactures? What have the manufacturers of this country done that an injury of this kind, proposed to be inflicted on them, should be treated as a matter not only of no consequence but as a matter that actually should be received with considerable self-complacency by Parliament? True, it is said that the effect would be to induce us to do as is done in the United States, to adopt special classes of manufactures, that with the large market of 65,000,000 to supply instead of 5,000,000, manufacturers would adopt special lines, and having adopted those special lines, on the whole the manufacturing interests of this country would be promoted rather than retarded, after, of course the immediate disturbance has passed away, which the hon. gentleman admits is inevitable. But the adoption of those special lines involves

a change of our manufactures altogether, the introduction of new machinery, the introduction of new capital; and I will ask any hon. gentleman whether he thinks any man would be so foolish as to invest large capital in Canada for special lines of manufactures in the hope that we might thereby get a market in the United States as well as in Canada, when by simply crossing the line he could secure for all time a market of 60,000,000 at all events, and for the time being the market of Canada as well. Remember that this reciprocity arrangement is not to be—I do not so understand it—a permanent arrangement, I mean an absolutely permanent arrangement. It will be a time treaty, and everyone knows that in a time treaty there will always be the termination of the treaty in the view of any man who is proposing to invest a single dollar in industries which may be affected by its conditions. They will look at the past. They will remember that every treaty that we have had with the United States has been denounced the very moment the terms of the treaty permitted it. More than that. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says we are still to remain an independent community on this continent, that is independent so far as political connection with the United States is concerned, and we are still to remain connected with the mother country. The hon. gentleman disavows any desire that we should separate from the mother country. There is, therefore, still the contingency which constantly must arise between nations of disagreement and rupture, and a rupture of friendly relations, as everybody knows, ends a treaty, so that the manufacturer who is going to invest his money, having regard to this market of 65,000,000, would stop to consider the contingency of a disagreement arising between the two nations, stopping trade and leaving him with all his investment he had made for a trade with 65,000,000 of people and only a market of 5,000,000 in which he could employ it. He would go, I say, to the other side of the line if he had the business capacity, the business foresight, and business enterprise which manufacturers are generally acknowledged to possess. So much for the manufacturers and for the wholesale merchants whose distributing trade would be affected by such a treaty. But we are told the farmers are the men who are going to gain largely by this treaty. We are told, and told truthfully, that they are the great majority of the people of Canada, that they are the people whose interests, if we could be shown that they were to be materially affected, ought to govern and supersede all other considerations in connection with the legislation of this Parliament. What is the fact in regard to them? Why not more than 10 per cent. of the entire products of Canada go to the United States. I hear an hon. gentleman behind me, who is thoroughly familiar with this subject, say that not more than 5 per cent. goes to the United States, but I place the quantity at 10 per cent.

Mr. WELSH. More than 20 per cent. goes.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The overwhelming proportion is consumed in Canada. I think I may fairly say that \$360,000,000 worth is consumed in Canada out of some \$400,000,000 worth, the entire production of the farms in Canada. So that the interests of the farmer are to be advanced, not by improving the market for his 10 per cent., but by improving the market for the overwhelming quantity he sells at home, by causing an improvement of the home market. That is the true policy with regard to the interests of the farmer in Canada. How is the home market to be improved? All will admit that it is by building up urban populations that the home market is improved to the farmer. Has that been going on during the last few years? Look at the city of Toronto. The hon. gentleman says one or two of our towns have made progress. I say that all the important towns of Canada have made progress. Take the city of Toronto, whose assessed

value in six years has increased \$42,000,000, and there are very few cities in the United States that can be said to have shown greater relative progress during the same time. Take the city of Montreal. Its assessed value in one single year has increased \$7,500,000, and that increased assessed value represents a largely increased population, a largely increased consuming population, consuming the products of the farmers of the country. The same progress substantially, though perhaps not absolutely, may be said to have characterised all the great centres of Canada. Now, what is the condition of the farmers at this moment? The hon. gentleman has told us they are in a very desperate condition, that the cost of farm lands has gone down, that the cost of farm produce has gone down; and he proposes to increase the price of farm land and increase the cost of the various products by destroying the manufacturing interests of Canada, by compelling us to resort to direct taxation, by stopping public works of every kind, because that is part of the hon. gentleman's policy; he proposes to increase the value of farm lands and of farm products by doing this, in order that he may obtain reciprocal free trade or rather unrestricted reciprocity, with the United States. Now I will take some figures from an authority which can hardly be said to be an unfavorable authority, at any rate to hon. gentlemen opposite. The figures are given in the report of Mr. Blue. Mr. Blue, as is well known, has developed into somewhat of a politician, and he is to-day I believe, an ardent advocate of Commercial Union. Although it is none of my business, and I have no right to interfere with the officer of another Government, I am bound to say that, having regard to the fact that he is the statistician of the Government that he has to give figures and returns on those very important matters to the people of Ontario, as a whole, irrespective of politics, I think greater confidence might be reposed in him if it were not known—I do not mean to say, recollect, that he has misstated any figures—but greater confidence would be bestowed upon him if it were not known that he is interested in a movement which will be promoted by showing that the interests of the farmers are failing, and that their profits are disappearing. But I take his figures, which cannot be regarded as unfavorable figures by hon. gentlemen opposite. Ontario, according to Mr. Blue contains 22,000,000 acres of farm land occupied, of which 10,940,000 are cleared, 8,670,000 wood lands, and acreage in field crops 7,403,000, and in orchards and gardens 186,616, the remainder being occupied by barns, buildings and minor crops. The total acreage of the Province in wheat (fall and spring) was 1,464,000 in 1886, and the product that year (it was less last year), was 27,900,000 bushels. The average price of farm land according to Mr. Blue in 1886 was \$29.78 per acre, and that instead of being a reduction of price was actually, according to Mr. Blue again, 22 cents per acre above the average in the years from 1882 to 1886. That is the statement made by Mr. Blue. The average value of the farm buildings was \$344 per acre, and the increase of 69 cents per acre over the average of 1882 and 1886. The average value of farming implements was \$2.32 per acre, or 21 cents increase over the average from 1882 to 1886. The value of the live stock was 37 cents per acre above the five years' average. I think that those figures at any rate do not show that the values in the hands of the farmers are decreasing, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) would have led us to believe in his speech. We have here a very large increase in farm lands, buildings, stock and agricultural implements. We have on those an average increase of \$1.50 an acre in 1886 over the average of the preceding five years, or an aggregate increase of \$30,000,000 in the pockets of the farmers of Ontario in 1886 over the average of the previous five years. That is not by any

Mr. WHIME (Cardwell.)

means an evidence of that poverty of which we hear so much from hon. gentlemen opposite. But they have told us and will probably tell us that those farms are all mortgaged, that the farmers are hopelessly in debt, and that, therefore, on that account they find that the burden of paying the interest on their debt, having regard to the prices that they are now getting for their products, is a burden which is intolerable to them, although how they are going to get out of that by unrestricted reciprocity I have not yet been able to discover. I think I will be able to show before I get through that this policy would send them to the wrong market to get relief of that kind. Now, there are sixty-five loan and building societies who make reports to the Finance Department of Canada. The loans represented by these companies who report to the Finance Department represent between \$80,000,000 and \$85,000,000. The value of property from 1880 to 1883, according to those reports, in the Provinces of Canada, increased \$32,000,000. The value of mortgages on property increased \$18,000,000. Between 1883 and 1886 the value of property again increased, curiously enough, \$32,000,000, while the value of mortgages on property increased \$12,000,000. In 1880, the default through the non-payment of interest or principal was about 8 per cent. of the whole. In 1886 the default was reduced to four seven-tenths per cent., and in 1887 the condition of things was even better. I take two companies as an illustration, because recently they have held their meetings and have made their statements. The Canadian Company held its annual meeting in London, England, since the beginning of the present year. From the report of the remarks of the chairman I take the following:—

"The chairman referred to two facts, first, that the company had reduced their rate of interest one per cent. because other companies were offering money at reduced rates; and, secondly, that the proceeds obtained last year (1887) from the sale of lands in Canada were 25 per cent. higher than the value in December, 1886."

Those were the actual sales, forced sales I presume some of them, as well as sales not forced, but of land falling as the result of foreclosure into the hands of the loan company. The North of Scotland Canadian Mortgage Company also held its meeting since the beginning of the new year:

"The chairman referred to the falling off in interest received in 1887 on mortgages in Canada. That is explained by the fact that a very considerable number of the mortgages made three or four years ago at a higher rate of interest have fallen in and the money has been lent out at the much less rate of interest current now."

They also report:

"The amount of real estate fallen into the hands of the company through foreclosure was but £8,000 out of £800,000 the company had invested, or only about one per cent."

Yet hon. gentlemen, in the face of those facts—facts which ought to be open to them if they were anxious to say something good of the country—tell us that the farmers of Canada have nothing but ruin staring them in the face. The rate of interest has fallen within the last six years at least two per cent., or a saving to the mortgagors in the operations of loan companies of a million and a half of dollars in a year. The value of farms has increased, money is cheaper, and defaults are 70 per cent. less than five years ago. The savings of the farmers are increasing rapidly, and the loan companies are vying with each other to make loans on farm land. That is the position of things in Canada in relation to the farmers of the country. Now, hon. gentlemen tell us that the farmers will be better off if they went to the States. Happily for us, we have the record of the farmers in the States. They will be, I have no doubt, interesting. I think I can say this with perfect truth, that on the face of God's earth there are not to-day a body of men, take them on an average, who are as well to do as the farmers of Ontario at

the present time. Now, Sir, I take the report for the State of New York, right alongside of us, a wealthy State, with a large urban population and great cities which can afford immediate markets for the ordinary products of the land. This report is from the Washington Department of Agriculture, and the following reference is made to the farmers in New York. It is an official report made to Congress and it says:

"On the whole farmers are more in debt than they were ten years ago. There are a large number of farms which were purchased a few years ago and mortgaged which would not now sell for more than the face of the mortgages, owing to the depreciation of the farming lands, which on an average is fully 33 per cent. in ten years. Probably one-third of the farms in the State would not sell for more than the cost of buildings and other improvements, owing to this shrinkage."

In the United States generally the value of farm stock is declining in exact proportion to the increase in the number. The statistician of the Washington Bureau of Agriculture says:

"The decline of value in horses, mules and cattle has been in progress for two years. It averages 3 per cent. for horses and mules, 8 per cent. in cattle, 11 per cent. in sheep and 15 per cent. in swine. While numbers have increased except of sheep in two years past the aggregate valuation of farm animals is less by something over \$100,000,000."

During the same two years in which in the United States there was a decrease in value of farm stock to the above amount, notwithstanding the increase in numbers, Ontario had an increase in the number, excepting sheep and swine, and in the value of the live stock on her farms, to the amount of \$8,250,000. In the United States it is estimated that in ten States, including such generally reputed wealthy States as Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, &c., the total value of the farm products is \$1,000,000,000, and that one-half of the farms are mortgaged. These produce \$500,000,000 in value; of this \$230,000,000 goes to pay interest, leaving \$261,000,000 to support 886,000 farmers and their families, or \$294 a year. These are the official records published at Washington for the information of the American Government and Congress, and I think they go to show that if the farmers of Canada want to improve their condition, it is not to the United States that they will have to go, because these farmers of Michigan and Illinois have all the advantages of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity—all the advantages which hon. gentlemen opposite promise to the people of Canada, if they will only accept their panacea for the ills under which we are laboring. Now, what is the condition of the farmers of Canada. I take the statement of Prof. Wm. Brown, of the Ontario Agricultural College, an institution under the control of the Local Government of Ontario. He says:

"The average farmer of the Province of Ontario is doing well, is actually making money. He has by his own admission to our statistical department during the past five years been receiving a total crop value of \$1,925, say \$2,000 from all sources; this is the first proof and admission doubted by no one."

So that I think, Mr. Speaker, in the face of these facts and figures, which are official on both sides of the line—from the officers of the Ontario Government, so far as Ontario is concerned, and from the officers of the American Government, so far as the United States is concerned—we may fairly say that the farmers of Canada find nothing to envy in the position of their neighbors on the other side of the line.

An hon. MEMBER. Why do they go there then?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Now, Sir, I will give the hon. gentleman an extract from a newspaper from which I have already quoted, I think the leading newspaper in the western States, the *Chicago Times*, in regard to the condition of the farmers in those States:

"Farm mortgages are swallowing up millions of acres of land in southern and western States and Territories. The syndicates that loan money at from 1 to 3 per cent. per month are mainly made up of Scotch, English and New England capitalists, who have their agents throughout the south and west. These mortgages are falling due, and soon an immense number of southern and western farms will be in the hands of foreign mortgagees. It is said that \$200,000,000 has been loaned on farm mortgages in the south-west; in Kansas, \$20,000,000, and nearly as much in Nebraska. The Territories are covered with mortgages on new farms not yet patented. In some of them the law has permitted outrageous interest, so that the farm mortgage business has grown into immense proportions. In many land districts half of the settlers borrow money at high interest to pay the small price required by the Government on proving up. This is leading to widespread disaster. The object of the pre-emption law is perverted. Eastern and foreign capitalists get the land with such improvements as the settler has put upon it. The settler loses all by reason of the exorbitant interest he is compelled to pay."

An hon. gentleman on the other side asks me why farmers leave Canada to go to the western States. One reason is precisely such speeches as we have heard to-night. The farmers of Canada, listening to the statements of the hon. gentleman, who speaks as an ex-Minister of Finance, and whose statements the public have a right to assume, at any rate, ought to be taken as exact, finding that their condition is bad, and that in the United States everything is *couleur de rose*, have gone, many of them, to the United States. But I know what is going on in Dakota to-day, and I tell the hon. gentlemen that as they have been compelled to realise that time has been their great enemy in the past, so they will find in the future that Canadians who have been entrapped into going to Dakota by statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, are now beginning to come back to Canada, so that at this moment the movement of population, instead of being from the north to the south, is from the south to the north.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Tell us about Canadians who invest in Texas ranches.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If the hon. gentleman desires to insult any members of this House, perhaps if enquiries were made into some of his own investments—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have made no investments in the United States.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). We are told of this enormous passage of population from Canada to the United States. It is quite true there are Canadians in the United States, just as it is quite true that there are Americans in Canada. It is quite true that in Canada, as in the eastern States, there has been a movement of population westward. Up to quite recently we had no North-West of our own where those people could go to. They are beginning to go there now. We have in this House to-day representatives from those Territories, who I venture to say will give the hon. gentleman his answer with regard to them, probably before this debate is ended. But what is the fact with regard to the movement of population? I take the New England States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Maine, and what do we find? That in 50 years the increase in the population of those States has been 2,056,309, that is from 1,953,717 to a little over 4,000,000, while in Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, during the same period, the population has increased from 1,065,215 to 4,142,951, or an increase of 3,087,736. Canada, which started fifty years ago with a population of 1,000,000 less than that of the New England States, which, I think, hon. gentlemen will admit with me stand relatively under very much the same conditions as we do, finds itself at the end of the fifty years with a population of 140,000 more than they. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite contend that the people of this country are leaving because they cannot make a living. Now, there is another question, and that is the question of the prices which are paid for products

in the two countries. Mr. Wiman, as I have said before, did my constituency the honor of visiting it on the 1st July last, and making his first speech there on Commercial Union in Canada. I regret very much I was not able to be present, not for the purpose of replying to him, but of joining with my constituents in extending to Mr. Wiman, and the distinguished American who accompanied him, a courteous welcome to the county. In that speech Mr. Wiman, speaking to the farmers, made some statements, of which we have heard the like to-night from the hon. member for South Oxford. He told the farmers of Cardwell that he knew a good many people in the city of New York, who live at the magnificent rate of millionaires, and to whom the question of what they pay for the articles they put on their tables was a matter of no consequence. For "broilers," he said, a term which I find a good many people knew nothing about, for broilers they would pay three dollars a pair, and for the finest class of butter 60 cents a pound, and so on with a number of articles, leaving the impression upon the minds of the people he was addressing that if they had only Commercial Union, they would find themselves supplying broilers to the tables of millionaires and also supplying fancy articles of butter. We have had statements of that kind to-night from the hon. member for South Oxford. Were they fair statements? Did he take the trouble before making them, to examine the prices of ordinary articles of the farm in the towns of the United States and Canada and make a comparison? I do not think he did. Now, what is the fact. After reading Mr. Wiman's speech I had the curiosity to compare the markets, on the first of July, of Buffalo and Toronto with each other; and curiously enough, as to the majority of these ordinary articles, the price was higher in Toronto, although the farmers of Albany and the surrounding district were in much closer proximity to the wealthy millionaires upon whose tables broilers, &c., were used, than were the farmers of Toronto. On the 9th of this month, taking the prices of ordinary articles upon the market of Buffalo and Toronto, I find they compare as follows:—

	TORONTO.		BUFFALO.	
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Oats, per bushel	0 44 to	0 45	0 39 to	0 40
Hay, per ton	14 00 to	16 00	12 00 to	14 00
Potatoes, per bag	1 00 to	1 10	0 85 to	0 90
Butter, choice, per lb	0 20 to	0 21	0 22 to	0 24
do fair to good, per lb.....	0 15 to	0 18	0 18 to	0 20
Turkeys, per lb	0 12 to	0 13	0 10 to	0 12
Chickens, per lb.....	0 12 to	0 13	0 10 to	0 12
Geese, per lb	0 10 to	0 10½	0 07 to	0 10
Apples, per brl.....	1 75 to	2 60	1 25 to	2 50
Onions, per bag	1 50 to	2 00	1 25 to	1 50
Turnips do	0 40 to	0 50	0 40 to	0 50
Carrots do	0 50 to	0 60	0 55 to	0 65

So that hon. gentlemen will see that in relation to these ordinary articles which the farmers produce and carry to the market of Buffalo on the one side and of Toronto on the other, the farmer in the vicinity of Toronto is better off on the whole, although the farmer in the vicinity of Buffalo has unrestricted reciprocity with the other parts of the American Union, although he has, in fact, Commercial Union. How do the prices in Toronto and Milwaukee compare? I have not examined the figures myself, but have taken them from the *New York Witness*, which, I presume, is a good authority. They compare as follows:—

	TORONTO.		MILWAUKEE.	
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Wheat.....	0 73 to	0 83½	0 60 to	0 70
Oats	0 45 to	0 47	0 32 to	0 38
Barley	0 70 to	0 82	0 60 to	0 68
Live hogs.....	5 00 to	5 80	4 60 to	4 60
Cattle.....	2 56 to	4 50	2 50 to	4 00
Eggs	0 22 to	0 30	0 17 to	0 18
Butter	0 18 to	0 25	0 18 to	0 20

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

These are simply the ordinary market prices paid directly to the farmer, showing one reason, I fancy, why the official statistician for the Province of Ontario can report a so much more favorable condition of affairs to farmers of that Province than the official statistics of the United States can record with reference to the farmers of the latter. I will not detain the House longer. As I said in commencing, the people of this country have always been and are still ready to enter into the freest commercial relations with our neighbors, consistent with the great policy of developing our own industries. I protest against the character of speeches such as that to which we have listened to-night. If hon. gentlemen opposite have sat on that side for ten years, they owe that fact chiefly to just such speeches as the one we have just heard from the hon. member for South Oxford. They mistake the temper of the people of Canada, they mistake the temper of the electors of this country, if they imagine that those electors will tolerate this perpetual depreciation of the country itself; and I cannot, in this sense, do better than to offer as a heritage to hon. gentlemen opposite, and through them to the country the words of a former leader of the Liberal party, a great leader, who, whatever difference of opinion may have existed as to his methods and opinions upon some questions was at least a sincere and devoted Canadian and loyalist—I allude to the late Hon. George Brown. I cannot do better in concluding my remarks than to quote his words:

A heritage, it seems to me,
Well worth our while to hold in fee.

"Neither politically nor commercially does Canada need to change her position to secure a high degree of prosperity. In all that conduces to personal comfort and happiness, in the steady development of home and foreign trade, in the extension of public enterprise, in the flourishing condition of our farmers, and in the unlimited scope for the employment of a vast population, Canada has all that a nation can desire."

Mr. DAVIES moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

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

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to ask what effort the Postmaster General has made to expedite the delivery of mails. From Monday last there has not been a mail which has arrived here from west of Toronto, and this is Wednesday. Has anything been done in this matter?

Mr. McLELAN. There has been a blockade on several of the railways in consequence of the snowstorm.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am aware of that, but what I want to know is whether the Minister has made any effort to get the mails forwarded.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 15th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

COST OF RAILWAYS IN CANADA.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the nominal cost, as given to 1st January, 1888, of all railways in the Dominion of Canada?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have made enquiries in order to get a return to this question, but I am informed

that this information can only be given to the 1st of July, 1887. The figures that are given to me to that date are as follows:—The subscribed capital is \$716,970,950, and the paid up capital is \$678,182,769.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The paid up capital?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the House will permit me, I rather think the hon. gentleman has been a little misinformed on that subject. It is scarcely possible that it can amount to as much, because, exclusive of paid up capital, there would be a huge charge for bonds and other matters of that kind. However, it is vastly above the figures I named, so that it does not hurt my argument. But I think the hon. gentleman will find that there has been an error in the statement. It might, probably, be as well to have it correct. I know the details myself pretty well in the railway statistics, and if the hon. gentleman will compare these details, he will see that it is scarcely within the limits of possibility that there should have been \$678,000,000 of capital paid up. The total cost may have amounted to that.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That I do not know. I communicated with the chief engineer of railways, Mr. Schreiber, and these are the figures he sent me yesterday.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LABOR.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL asked, Whether the Government have received any complaint, whether verbal or written, respecting the conduct of the chairman or of any member of the Royal Commission on Labor, in the discharge of his official duties; and if so, what is the nature of such complaint?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I have to say that no complaint has been received in regard to this matter.

DEPOSITIONS TAKEN BY THE LABOR COMMISSION

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL asked, Whether the Government received from the chairman of the Royal Commission on Labor, an application for authority to furnish to parties interested duly certified copies of the depositions taken by the said Commission; and if so, what authorisation did they receive?

Mr. BOWELL. Application was made by some parties to the Commission for the evidence here mentioned. The Government declined to permit the evidence to be given to any interested party until it had been reported to the Government.

LEGAL TENDER IN GOLD.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, 1. Is it the intention of the Government to compel the banks to keep a requisite reserve—that is, a fixed percentage of circulation and deposit? 2. To abolish the present dual legal tender making American gold the sole legal tender? 3. Is the Government aware that by refusing to redeem the legal tender notes in American gold (whilst holding plenty) a grievous burden is imposed upon the community—exchange on New York being forced to a premium sufficient to recoup for the loss sustained by the remittance of British gold?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole question of banks and the banking system is now under the consideration of the Government, and I presume will also come under the consideration of the House of Commons. Hon. gentlemen know that the bank charters expire in 1890,

and in the meantime the whole subject will be fully studied with a view to consider the whole question of our banking and commerce.

Mr. MITCHELL. The right hon. gentleman will notice that this enquiry refers more particularly to the action of the Government, than to the banks.

BOUNDARY BETWEEN ALASKA AND CANADA.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Whether, in consequence of the discovery of gold on the upper waters of the Yukon River, and the growing importance of having the boundary between Alaska and the Dominion of Canada defined, steps have been taken to secure an early location of the same by joint action and agreement of the United States and Canada?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Communications have been going on between the United States and Her Majesty's Government, and also with Canada, with a view, if possible, of settling by agreement the boundary between Alaska and Canada.

COST OF THE NORTH-WEST REBELLION.

Mr. MULOCK asked, What is the total amount of money disbursed by the Government in consequence of the North-West rebellion?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the absence of the hon. Minister of Militia, I would say to the hon. gentleman that the question involves a number of accounts in several departments. If the hon. gentleman will allow it to stand as a notice for a return, the return will be brought down at once, and the same for the next question.

VENTILATION OF THE CHAMBER.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to direct the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that on this side of the House my hon. friend beside me, and myself in particular, are exposed to a very heavy draught. It is all fair that the Opposition should be kept in the cold shades, but I object to being kept in a draught, and I hope the Minister of Public Works, who is responsible for this building, will endeavor to take some steps so as to prevent this very serious inconvenience. It is not quite fair that a man should be required to make a long speech here with a draught striking on him.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right, and we on this side of the House have felt the draught as well. The attention of the chief architect of the department has been called to this. He has examined the building, and some defects in the windows have been remedied; but the constant opening of the doors in the chamber and the opening of doors leading to the galleries, some of which are occasionally left open, make it very difficult not to have draughts. Of course, hon. gentlemen opposite will understand that we do not want to treat them, in that respect at all events, different from ourselves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope the Minister will take the matter into his consideration, as it is a very serious annoyance.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. I desire to direct attention to one feature, which is, that it is impossible to get fresh air without having a current of air when it comes in. If we put an end to draughts we will sit in a very injurious atmosphere, and while I admit that the matter is very difficult to regulate, it will be better I think to have the fresh air.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You wish to honor them drafts.

REPORT.

Civil Service List of Canada, on the 1st July, 1887, pursuant to section 59 of "The Civil Service Act."—(Mr. Chapleau.)

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LANDSDOWN.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I acknowledge with thanks the loyal Address you have voted in answer to the Speech with which I opened the session.

I receive with satisfaction your assurance that your earnest and careful attention will be given to the important measures which are to be submitted for your consideration.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
Ottawa, 13th March, 1888.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps, at an early date, to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is felt on both sides of the House that no question of more importance could engage its attention at the present time than that embodied in the resolution submitted by my hon. friend for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is a matter of deep regret that upon the present occasion above all others the hon. Minister of Finance is unable, through sickness, to take part in our deliberations. It would have been to those on this side of the House a great pleasure to have heard him in reply to the speech which was delivered by the mover of this resolution. Whether he would have taken the course that the gentleman who took his place adopted or not, I am not prepared to say; but his intimate knowledge of public affairs, his special knowledge of the wants of the Maritime Provinces of this Dominion, and the knowledge he has gained while acting as one of Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries in the late Fisheries conference, would, I am sure, have qualified him to have grappled with the very large and important question before us in a manner in which I may say, without any disrespect to the hon. gentleman opposite, he failed to do. Sir, the hon. gentleman who opened the debate opened it in a speech which I think is admitted on all sides to have been equal to the occasion. He recognised not only the importance but the gravity of the issues which were contained in the resolution he submitted, and I think it will be admitted that for power, ability and eloquence this House has seldom listened to a more able exposition of the commercial relations of Canada and other countries. I do not think that the hon. gentleman, who replied to the hon. member for South Oxford, did fully appreciate the arguments which were advanced by the mover. It struck me that the hon. gentleman delivered a speech which had been prepared for a different occasion. He seemed to me for a long time to be barking up the wrong tree; he seemed, either wilfully or otherwise, not to have recognised the proposition submitted in the resolution, which is in writing and which seems to be very clear and unambiguous, and the hon. gentleman discussed at great length a proposition for Commercial Union and advanced

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

certain objections to that proposition which to his mind seemed to be insuperable. I should like to know whether the hon. Minister of Finance, if he had been here, would have endorsed the line of argument taken by the hon. gentleman. I am not so sure that the Premier himself, before this debate is over, will be prepared thoroughly to endorse that line of argument. If he does he will have to go back upon his past record in some respects, to go back on it very seriously; and I am rather inclined to think that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) went further, perhaps, than his brief warranted. He started out with the assertion that the resolution embodied a new panacea for the solution of Canada's difficulties. He endeavored to lead the House to believe that the advocacy of freer and better and larger commercial relations with the United States was a new plank in the platform of the Liberal party, forgetting that so long as that party has been a party the desire to obtain freer, better and wider commercial relations with the United States has been one of the principal planks in its platform. Why, he surely could not have remembered that when my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was Premier, negotiations were entered into between his Government and that of the United States, which resulted in a draft treaty being agreed to for enlarged commercial relations with that country, not confined to the natural products of the country, as the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) would like our treaties to be confined, but extending far and beyond that, and embracing in addition to our natural productions a large number of manufactured articles. Does he forget, too, that in the years 1884 and 1885 the Liberal party proposed in this House a resolution on each occasion, asking the endorsement of the House to the proposition that it was the duty of the Government for the time being to move in the direction of obtaining extended trade relations with the United States? Does he forget on that occasion, the last occasion, that the resolution declared that:

"In view of the early termination of the fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington, this House is of opinion the negotiations should be opened with the United States of America, as well as for the renewal of reciprocal privileges accorded by that treaty to American citizens and British subjects respectively, as for the opening up of additional reciprocal trade relations between Canada and the United States; and that in the conduct of negotiations, Canada should be directly represented."

In the face of these propositions how can the hon. gentleman have the hardihood to assert that the proposition now before the House, submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford, is a new proposition and affords a new panacea for the difficulties of Canada? The hon. gentleman referred at some length, at undue and unnecessary length I think, to the speech delivered by Mr. Blake at Malvern, a year ago, and he started out with a declaration that that speech did not lay down any platform such as that which we have embodied in the resolution here. But before the hon. member finished his quotation he was obliged to read the words, "that one of the planks in the platform of the Liberal party was to obtain reciprocal trade with the United States of America." The hon. gentleman objected that Mr. Blake, upon that occasion, did not enlarge upon that plank; did not treat his hearers to three or four pages of arguments in favor of it; but Mr. Blake was then laying down what the platform of the Liberal party was, and it would take, I think, even an abler and more eloquent gentleman than Mr. Blake to exhaust all the arguments in favor of the numerous propositions which he was advancing on behalf of the Liberal party and which he thought the country ought to accept. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman went further. He fairly glorified in the fact that on that occasion Mr. Blake admitted that such had been the extravagance of the Government which had charge of the administration of affairs in this country for the last eight or ten years, and such were the permanent heavy charges that they have added on to Canada, that the taxation and

the expenditure now had to be kept up to a very much larger sum than they ought to be, and much beyond what the Liberal party had hoped to reduce them. He gloried in that fact, Sir. He, a Minister of the Crown, knew that the expenditure and the taxation had been increased by the political party to which he gave in his adhesion, and that he was one of those who had, by their reckless extravagance, increased the taxation by a sum nearly up to \$11,000,000, bringing the affairs of this country to such a pass that the fixed expenditure was such that Mr. Blake was not able to promise as much reduction in the tariff as he would like to have promised. The hon. gentleman gloried in that state of affairs, and said that this showed that the Reform party had gone back on their free trade principles. It shows nothing of the kind. The Reform party have not gone back on their desire for free trade principles, or on their desire to extend to Canada those free trade principles as far as it is possible to extend them. But the Reform party cannot ignore the fact that eight or ten years of reckless misgovernment and extravagance have landed this country in such a financial state that it was impossible to apply free trade principles as fully, and as freely, and as strongly as they would like to do. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman, in his speech—which I may say was more remarkable for its omissions than for what it did contain—did not grapple or attempt to grapple with the statesmanlike propositions which had been advanced by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). That hon. gentleman in proposing his motion did not seek to hide the fact that the new departure, if accepted, would be surrounded with a great many difficulties. We know, Sir, that you cannot have a change in our foreign trade relations, to the large extent that is proposed here, without that change largely affecting our internal commerce and traffic. This, no doubt, would involve us in a great many difficulties; but, Sir, it is the duty of statesmen to meet those difficulties, and my hon. friend, I think, laid down the lines on which he would proceed, and he argued at great length, taking up each difficulty, one after the other, and showed how they could be met. I did not hear the hon. the Minister of Interior attempt to answer any of those arguments. I did not hear him reply to the facts upon which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) based his proposition. Let me recall the attention of the House to a few of those facts. I will not detain the House very long, nor enlarge upon them. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) made the assertion here—with all the experience he had gained as a former Finance Minister, and in connection with the responsible position which he holds as financial critic of this side of the House—that if the policy pursued by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) when in power had been pursued to this day, there would be at least a saving of \$10,000,000 in the taxation of the country, and instead of the pitiful increase we have of 40,000 people in Manitoba and the North-West, that country which we looked to a few years ago as the salvation almost of this Dominion, there would be at least half a million people there to-day. Did the Minister of Interior attempt to deny any one of those propositions? He did not. A reference to the Public Accounts will show that to-day the taxation of this country is eleven or twelve million dollars more than it was when Mr. Mackenzie went out of power; and the hon. gentleman knows by the returns which he and his colleagues have brought down that, so far from there being one tithe or one-twentieth of the number of people in the North-West that they predicted there would be there, there is a pitiful 40,000 of an increase in population since Mr. Mackenzie went out of power. That statement was one deserving of serious attention. If the statement is based on truth it requires an answer, if it is true and the remedy which the hon. gentleman proposes under the circumstances which now exist is not a correct one, the hon. the Minister of the

Interior himself ought to have proposed some other remedy. But what is the remedy he proposed? And after a two hours' speech he has no remedy at all. The policy of increasing taxation and extravagance is to go on year after year until, Sir, in the near future, when the people's backs can bear the burden no longer, some constitutional or unconstitutional change must take place to give them relief. Then, Sir, there was another statement of fact which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) brought to the notice of the House. He had mentioned it before, but it is an important fact and will bear repetition again. It was that between 1881 and 1886, while we had spent \$2,000,000 in bringing emigrants into this country, and while we have brought 477,000 emigrants here, there were but 25,000 of those settlers in the North-West and Manitoba, and that 452,000 of the immigrants brought into this country, at a very large expense to the public exchequer, had left this country after they came here. Why did they leave? The hon. gentleman knows, and his colleagues know, that those emigrants came to a country as fine as the sun shines upon. Whether you go to the Maritime Provinces, possessing the richest fisheries in the world, mines which cannot be surpassed in any part of the world, agricultural lands capable of feeding thousands and hundreds of thousands more people than at present occupy them, whether he goes to the fertile region of Ontario, the valley of the St. Lawrence, or the great, rich plains of the North-West, he must see that in Canada we have natural advantages which cannot be surpassed by any country on this side of the Atlantic. And when he was asked to say why the hundreds of thousands of people brought here at the public expense, after they had come and surveyed the land, had left the country and joined a foreign power, the hon. gentleman was silent and passed it by without comment. Perhaps he was discreet, Sir, perhaps he would have had to acknowledge that the extravagance and the taxation which now bears so heavily on the people of this country had frightened them away; and the only answer he could give was the pitiful, childish answer that those immigrants—whom I will undertake to say not one in a thousand has ever read a political speech—were frightened out of the country through remarks made from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Sir, it is true that the Government, some years ago, when they paid a large sum of money for some wonderful books to circulate among the emigrants who came into this country, circulated books printed in English among Germans and people of other nationalities who could not speak the English language. I do not think, Sir, that they ever took the trouble to submit to any of those foreign immigrants, the speeches of my hon. friend, which was said to be so lugubrious, amongst people whom I undertake to say could not read English at all. What took them away? Was it because the country was not as good a country as they were led to believe? The hon. gentleman knows it is not so. It was not because our country did not possess the advantages which they expected to find when they came here; but it was because the country has been cursed with an extravagant, and I will say it, a corrupt Government—a Government that has not sought primarily to develop the North-West so much as it has sought, by reckless and extravagant expenditure, to maintain itself in power and to line the pockets of its hangers-on. The hon. gentleman, Sir, did not grapple with the statement made with reference to the debt and taxation of this country, as compared with the debt and taxation of the country south of us. We know that if immigrants come to this country, whether the hard-headed canny Scotch from Scotland, or shrewd Irish or English people, and begin to compare its advantages with those of the neighboring country, they will at once see that Canada possesses a great many natural advantages over the

United States; but, Sir, if they find that while we have been rolling up our debt and taxation at a rate unparalleled in the history of any British colony, the people to the south have been reducing theirs in an inverse ratio, I think those shrewd people will say: We prefer going to the country that is reducing its expenditure and taxation rather than to a new country which is rolling up both at the rate Canada is. We learn that, twenty years ago, our debt per head was not one-third of the debt per head of the United States, whereas today it is two and a-half times as great, and that at the same period our necessary taxation was one-third that of the United States, whereas to-day it is 50 per cent. higher than theirs. If these are not facts, and if the hon. member for South Oxford overstated them in any way, then it was the duty of the hon. gentleman who replied to him to deny their truthfulness or expose the exaggeration. But the hon. gentleman gave no answer because he knew he could not give it; he gave no answer because he could not question the accuracy of the facts stated. Now, Sir, the hon. member for South Oxford stated as a reason why we should seek to extend our commercial relations with other countries, that we had attempted to build up a large inter-provincial trade, and that this attempt, although it may have been conceived with the best motives, had not been successful. He stated why, but he did not give all the reasons. We have built an Intercolonial Railway at a cost of nearly \$50,000,000; we have tried to build up an inter-provincial commerce between the Maritime Provinces and Ontario, and between Ontario and the great West, and yet, after spending many millions of dollars, our attempt has been a comparative failure; and why? For one reason, that the circumstances of the different Provinces are such that there never can be a very large inter-provincial trade between them. The natural market of the group of Provinces, known as the Maritime Provinces, lies to the south of them in the New England States; and you may attempt to fight against geography, you may build all the railroads you like, but the results of a practical experience of twenty years have shown that while you may dam back the trade a little, and prevent the people of the Maritime Provinces from trading with the people with whom they ought to have natural trade relations, you cannot force their trade into an unnatural channel. Have you succeeded in your attempt to do so? What trade is there to-day between the Maritime Provinces and the upper Provinces of the Dominion? How much oats, how much fish, how much of any of the natural products of the soil, or of the mine, or of the forest, do we send you? You carry the products of the mine almost for nothing over the Intercolonial Railway, in order to force this trade, but the result is that your Intercolonial Railway at the present time is sinking in working expenses, and outside of interest, on its cost, \$300,000 or \$400,000 a year. Then, Sir, the hon. gentlemen say, in reply to the statement, that the people are leaving the Maritime Provinces in large numbers every year: Ob, yes, but the people are going west. Well, Sir, we had the statement made yesterday that this is not the fact. The census returns are examined, and we find that there are, practically speaking, none of the Maritime people in the Province of Ontario, or in the Province of Quebec, and a very few in the Province of Manitoba. Where have they gone, then? To a country which hon. gentlemen term a foreign country—to the United States of America; and while the exodus from the eastern part of British North America has been to a foreign country, the people who leave the New England States go to the western States and remain in their own country. In Canada, owing to the want of the freer trade relations that we ought to possess, our people are driven, not to our own western prairies, where they might and would go, but to the south of the line. Do you suppose

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

if the people of Manitoba and the North-West Territories had not been hampered as they have been with the unnatural trade restrictions which you have placed upon them preventing them dealing with those who are their natural neighbors, and who are prepared to deal with them—to buy what they have to sell and to sell to them what they want to buy—do you suppose the country would not have been filled up with the hardy yeomen of the Maritime Provinces who have gone west during the past few years? These men do not leave British North America because they are disloyal to the flag. They are loyal to the flag, and they would prefer to live in Canada under their Sovereign if they were allowed to remain; but in order to build up monopolies, to enrich colonisation companies, to fill the pockets of political favorites, to make rich a few favorite manufacturers who contribute to your election funds—in order to do this, you place a damper on the trade relations that ought to exist between this country and the United States; and the result is that those people, not being able to find a place in this country where they could farm successfully and live, are driven across the border. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman did not grapple with any of those statements. This is a very large question, and there are very many points which a gentleman speaking on the Government side might be pardoned for overlooking; but there was a point mentioned by the hon. member for South Oxford which, I think, ought to have challenged a moment's attention from the hon. member for Cardwell. Why, Sir, he mentioned a fact, which has been repeated to-day, that over \$300,000,000 has been locked up in railroads in this country. We have spent money with a lavish hand—public moneys which we have voted, and private moneys which have been invested—in railway enterprises in this country; and all for what? To give us better means of communication, for carrying away the surplus products of the land; and after you have built your railways at such an enormous cost, you place a barrier at the border, so that the trade may not be carried to the people who want to buy it. A more insane policy was never conceived. What has the hon. gentleman to say in reply to the natural demand which has gone up from every section of this country—from the farmers, the fishermen, the miners and all the producing classes of the country—for freer trade relations? The answer of the hon. gentleman to-day is the answer he gave this House and this country when I had the honor of first sitting in this House some years ago. He says we have placed our policy on the Statute-book; the people know, he says, we have made a statutory offer of exchange in natural products with the United States. Why, we know that statutory offer is a farce, and the hon. gentleman knows it was a farce and a blind from the day it was made. How many years has it been on the Statute-book? It has been there ever since the introduction of the National Policy. Has it ever evoked a responsive offer from the other side of the line? Never. The hon. gentleman talks of our offer to export to the United States all our natural products in return for the privilege of purchasing all their natural products. And what do we ever purchase of their products? Outside of the article of Indian corn, we purchase scarcely anything at all. The hon. gentleman knows, and his Government know, that they are merely playing with this question, when they tell the people they are willing to establish restricted reciprocity in the natural products of the two countries. I say there is no reciprocity in that offer. The hon. gentleman evaded the principle set down in the resolution; he set up a man of straw and then proceeded to knock him down. He discussed the question of Commercial Union at very great length. I was not aware that the question of Commercial Union was embodied in this resolution before the House. That question may come up for discussion in this

House, and the speech which the hon. gentleman fired off at half-cock may then be appropriate, but it was utterly irrelevant on this occasion, and no answer to the proposition laid down or the arguments advanced in support of that proposition by my hon. friend for South Oxford. The policy of the Liberal party, the policy agreed upon and formulated by the hon. member for South Oxford, is contained in that resolution, and that is not the policy advocated at present by Mr. Erastus Wiman, and which the hon. gentleman took such pains to answer yesterday. The policy of Mr. Wiman is not the policy which is propounded here, and the hon. gentleman therefore wasted, in discussing it, a large part of the time of this House that he might profitably have employed in answering the arguments submitted on this side, were he able to do so. He declared that the resolution implied and involved the raising of our tariff as high as that of the United States. When and where did he learn that? It is not in the resolution; it was not declared to be his policy by the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution; it cannot be deduced from anything contained in that resolution. It is not the fact. The policy of unrestricted reciprocity does not imply at all that the tariff of this country, as against the world, shall be raised up to the tariff of the United States. The tariff of this country, if unrestricted reciprocity were carried to-morrow, would be just as this Parliament, which would retain supreme control over it, would choose to adopt. Therefore, when the hon. gentleman started out on his argument with the statement that unrestricted reciprocity involved the assimilation of our tariff with that of the United States, he made a statement which neither the resolution nor the argument advanced in support of the resolution justified. Then the hon. gentleman stated further that this proposition was going to destroy the trade of the St. Lawrence. Why will it destroy the trade of the St. Lawrence? If our tariff remains as it is to-day and the tariff of the United States remains as it is to-day, will not the trade, not only of Canada but the trade of the great western country belonging to the United States, naturally flow by the St. Lawrence. Will not the productions of that great western country flow from there down the St. Lawrence? What will restrict it? What will hamper it? Is not the St. Lawrence the natural channel which Providence intended for the traffic to and from that great western country. The hon. gentleman well knows it is, and therefore to make the bald assertion, without a single vestige of proof to support it, that our proposition will have the effect of destroying the trade of the St. Lawrence, is utterly absurd. But the hon. gentleman stated that we were a happy country, and that if there was one part of the National Policy of which he was more proud than another, it was that which related to the incidence of taxation. In this country, he said, under this unrestricted reciprocity policy, there must be direct taxation. That was also a bugbear of the hon. gentleman's own imagination; that was also a man of straw of his own making. That does not at all necessarily follow our proposition. It was not propounded as part of the policy necessarily by my hon. friend from South Huron. And it does not follow it must necessarily take place. But, he says, if there was one part of the policy he approved of, it was that part of the National Policy by which the incidence of taxation bear almost entirely upon the rich and not upon the poor. Why, the hon. gentleman knows—no man knows better—that the evil underlying the National Policy is that it bears more heavily upon the poor than upon the rich man. The specific duties upon articles imported bear more heavily upon the coarse articles consumed by the poor than upon the fine articles consumed by the rich. If the hon. gentleman will take the articles which enter into the necessary consumption of the ordinary workingman, say a man whose income amounts to \$400 per year, and making first allowance for clothing, boots and shoes, he will find that for

sugar, for groceries, for crockery and the little miscellaneous articles alone, the workingman, whose income is \$400, pays not less than \$35 to the revenue upon it.

Mr. BERGIN. Name the articles.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—

Clothing	\$16 50
Boots and shoes	4 50
Stoves	1 40
Sugar	5 00
Other groceries	2 80
Tools, crockery and miscellaneous	4 09
	<hr/>
	\$34 00

Let the hon. gentleman take the articles, and he will find it is true. When a poor man pays at that rate on the necessaries of life, for an hon. Minister of the experience of the hon. member for Cardwell to stand up in this House and say that a poor man's taxation is practically *nil*, is to insult the intelligence of this House and the country. But there is more than that. If the National Policy was intended to have, and if it has any effect at all, it should operate to exclude from this country those manufactures which, the hon. gentleman said, can be made in it. Therefore, the poor man, if he does not directly pay to the national exchequer, pays into the pockets of the manufacturers, and the latter have taken the best possible means of establishing that he shall pay to the uttermost farthing. We hear of combines made in every branch of manufacture which is protected by this National Policy. To-day we have these manufacturers combining in all branches of trade—for what? To mulct the poor man still more. But the hon. gentleman reached the climax when he came to speak with reference to what he called the doleful wail set up by the hon. member for South Oxford. It appears to me that these hon. gentlemen, or a few of them, believe it is the duty of a representative of the people to hide and cover up the truth. I contend, on the contrary, that it is the duty of a representative of the people to discover the truth, to lay bare the grievance, in order that he may discover and propose a remedy for the grievance, and I say that he is no loyal man to the people or to the country who desires to hide the grievances or the evils under which the country labors. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) pointed out that for the last few years there had been a wonderful depression in the agricultural interests of this country; that in this young country, whose agricultural prosperity ought to proceed, not by slow degrees but by leaps and bounds as it did years ago, the agricultural industry appeared now to be stricken by paralysis, and that stagnation appeared to be the order of the day; that, while a few years ago our agricultural population were able to increase their wealth to a marvellous degree, to lay the wheels of progress have been turned backwards, and we are retrograding rather than progressing. The hon. member, for Cardwell (Mr. White) replied to the hon. member, and, with that jaunty air which he assumes when he wants the House to imagine that he knows everything on every subject, he said the House need not be alarmed, that all this was wrong, and this new Daniel who had come to judgment said he had in his hands the proof of the position he took. He said that if there was one thing which he admitted, it was the truth of the statistics prepared by his friend, Mr. Blue, of Ontario, and he commended the enterprise of the Ontario Government in the preparation of those statistics, and he said, I am going to destroy the Goliath of the other side with a single stone from my sling, I, the young David of the House. How did he do that? He asked us to place, as he said he was prepared to place, the most implicit confidence in the statistics of Mr. Blue. He told us they showed that it was not true that Canada was not progressing, and that he would show from those statistics that, during a certain number of years which he mentioned, the agricultural

wealth of Ontario had developed, and he rolled it under his tongue as a sweet morsel, to the extent of some thirty millions of dollars, and he asked us to fall down and worship the system which had produced such results. The hon. gentleman has acquired, perhaps from his having been a writer upon the daily press, a habit of jumping too hastily to hastily formed conclusions. He takes a bird's-eye view of certain statistics in the same way as he would if he were writing an article for the *Montreal Gazette*. But let us take the very statistics the hon. gentleman has referred to. I am prepared for the nonce to assume that they are accurate, and that they point out correctly the relative increase in the agricultural wealth of the Province of Ontario during the time when my hon. friend from East York presided over the destinies of this country, and when the policy promoted by him and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was in force, and I am willing to compare that with the time during which the Government of which the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who has his panacea for all the evils of the country, has been in power. What do I find by this blue-book which he vouches for?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yellow book.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yellow book, if you like. What do I find from this yellow book? What do I find as the result of the stone which he has picked out of it and slung to destroy the effect of the speech of the Goliath opposite to him? We find that in the year 1873, when the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) took charge of the administration of affairs in this country, the average value of real estate in Ontario amounted to \$10.02 per acre. I ask, as a favor, the attention of my hon. friend the member for Cardwell to this statement. In the year 1873 the average acreable value of land in the rural district of Ontario was \$10.02 per acre. I find that under the system of economy and prudence in the management of affairs, and keeping down the taxes of the country, and developing the resources of the country, practiced by the Government of that day, the value of real estate in the rural districts rose until, in 1878, it had reached the enormous sum of \$18.14 per acre. Does the hon. gentleman know what that means? It means that in that period of time, about five years, the increase in value of the rural lands in the Province of Ontario amounted to \$160,000,000. There are about 20,000,000 acres of land in Ontario, and, according to the statements contained in this book to which the hon. gentleman gives his adhesion, the increase has been that which I have stated, which cannot be paralleled in the history of any country on this side of the Atlantic. It is a record of which the Government of Ontario ought to be proud, and of which any Government which had the direction of the affairs of the country would have a right to be proud. Then we had the National Policy brought into operation, putting taxes on all the consumers. While the value was \$18.14 per acre in 1878, nearly eight years ago, and in 1885, the last year I find recorded in this book which the hon. gentleman presents to the House as being undoubtedly true, I find that the acreable value had only gone up to \$19.71, or an increase per acre of \$1.57 in the seven years as against an increase of \$8.12 per acre in the previous five years. There you see that \$1.57 per acre represents the wonderful increase of \$30,000,000 that the hon. gentleman speaks of, while \$160,000,000 of increase took place in the five years when Mr. Mackenzie was in power. The hon. gentleman can take his pencil and see how much the ratio per cent. under the old régime was over the increase under the National Policy. I think it is just about 700 per cent., or that as nearly as possible. I have not a blackboard on which to make the calculation accurately, but if I am wrong he can correct it. I say that, in that statement, I have given an answer to the hour-and-a-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

half speech of the hon. gentleman. The statements which have been made from time to time by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, as to the lamentable fact that progress has been stayed by this policy in the greatest Province in this Dominion, are proved by the figures for the accuracy of which he himself has vouched; but, if that is the case in the Province of Ontario, it is ten times more the case in the Province, or in the part of the Dominion from which I come. Go back to 1873 or to a few years before that, and, as we have no statistics which reduce the question to a certainty of mathematical accuracy as we have here, I will appeal to the knowledge of fact possessed by every man from the Province from which I come, and from the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and what do they tell you? What will they tell you? Will they tell you that the agricultural interests have become wealthy during the past eight or nine years under the ægis and protection of the National Policy? Oh, no! Our agricultural industry is depressed, our farmers are living without hope; our young men, the bone and sinew of the country—

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman who says "no" must be speaking without any practical knowledge whatever. I think he comes from the Province of Nova Scotia. I can take him through county after county of Cape Breton from which the young men have fled, as from a plague, almost. I can take him to the Province of Prince Edward Island, and he will go through large districts where the young men, who ought to have remained at home to till the soil, and enrich the community, and make new homes for themselves, have abandoned that land and gone off to the United States; and I tell the hon. gentleman, that if it had not been for the returns of their earnings which these young men make yearly to their parents and their friends, the sad tale, as it stands to-day, would be ten times worse. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman wanted to show, to confirm his argument, that things are not so bad in Ontario as gentlemen on this side of the House have stated. I am not acquainted, personally, with the actual condition of affairs in Ontario, but I am acquainted with them in the Maritime Provinces. I give you my version; the deductions I draw from what I have seen, and know, and felt, and I give you from the blue-book the truth of what takes place there. The hon. gentleman says: "I will prove to you, from statistics of the United States, that the farmers are much more heavily mortgaged there than they are in Ontario; that the condition of the Ontario farmer, in respect to mortgages, is not half so bad as in some parts of the United States; that the exodus from Ontario is not so bad as it is from some of the States." How does he do it? The hon. gentleman takes the loan companies of Ontario and the lists of their mortgages, and he assumes that they form a fair statement of the mortgage debt upon the farms of Ontario. Well, I am informed by those who are conversant with the facts, that in a number of the largest counties of Ontario, the company's mortgage list does not show one-tenth of the mortgages that really exist upon the farms of the country. But with regard to the exodus question and the increase of agricultural wealth, with what States does the hon. gentleman compare the great Province of Ontario? He takes the State of Vermont and the State of New Hampshire, and one or two other States, that do not possess one-tenth of the fertility, that do not possess one-tenth of the natural resources of the great and rich Province of Ontario—not one-hundredth, as an hon. friend beside me says—the sterile, rocky districts of Vermont and New Hampshire, and he says that they have only progressed in a certain ratio, and if Ontario has kept up, she ought to be satisfied. Sir, is that the way for an hon. gentleman to talk who wants to hold up his country properly in the eyes of the world? He could not use more

depreciatory language than to compare Ontario and New Hampshire, or the progress of Vermont and New Hampshire, with the progress of Ontario, or even of the Maritime Provinces. The natural resources of those States are not one-twentieth as great; and, therefore, while it is perfectly natural that young men should go from the rocks and the poor soil of Vermont and New Hampshire, to the richer soil of the western country, it is unnatural, and it is wrong, and it is owing to man's bad fiscal regulations, that the young men are driven from Ontario. What is natural in one case is artificial and unnatural in the other. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have referred to the hon. gentleman's speech at greater length, perhaps, than its importance justifies; but I think I have been enabled to show that one or two, at any rate, of his main propositions are utterly untenable. Now, I want to call the attention of the House for a very short time to the record of the Trade and Navigation Returns of this country, to ascertain whether the people should be satisfied with the continuance of the existing state of affairs. Is it true, or is it not true, that the people are satisfied? Is it true, or is it not true, that the people of the Maritime Provinces, or the people of Quebec, or the people of Ontario, or the people of the North-West, are satisfied that the present state of affairs should continue? The hon. member for Cardwell says they are. He says, I have nothing to offer you, we must go on as we are going, doubling the taxation, doubling the expenditure in so many years. We must depend on our own resources, and keep the present Government in power, and adopt no new-fangled schemes for the relief of the great mass of the people. There are just one or two prominent facts that I want to notice. I am aware they have been noticed before, but they are so important, in my opinion, that they will bear repeating. Sir, we were told a few years ago that there were few countries on the face of the globe that were increasing in prosperity in the same ratio as Canada; we were told that the best index to that increase of prosperity was to be found in our navigation returns; that a country which from year to year added tens of thousands to its exports, and consequently tens of thousands to its wealth, was an improving country, a country that would afford a welcome asylum to the over-taxed and over-burdened people of other parts of the world. Sir, it is true that for years and years the export trade of Canada did increase largely, did go up by leaps and bounds; but what do we find to-day under the blighting influence of the National Policy? Has that increase continued? Has our reasonable expectations in that regard been realised? In the year 1873, the exports of this country reached the sum of \$39,789,000; in the year 1887 we find it stationary, hardly a dollar of increase in the surplus exports of our products—\$39,000,000 in 1873, and \$39,000,000 only in 1887. I say that fact, bold and bald as it is, ought to open our eyes, and calls for more serious treatment than it has received at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. It shows us that our affairs are not in the satisfactory condition they would lead us to believe. It shows us we must find some remedy other than that we now possess. What have we been doing during all this time? Why have we reason to expect that our surplus products for export should be largely increased? Not only because of the richness of our soil, not only because of the inexhaustible nature of our fisheries, and our mines, and our forests, but because we have been borrowing, for a number of years past, largely in the money markets of the world, and bringing millions of dollars here and spending them in developing the resources of the country. This policy of rapid construction of railways, of rapid construction of public works, and the expenditure of millions of borrowed money, has gone on from year to year, and it has circulated an enormous amount of money among the people, and has created in some places an apparent prosperity. But this expenditure is about ceasing now.

We have danced right merrily and now we must pay the piper. I think the more prudent on the Government side have long ago come to the conclusion that we cannot go on borrowing as we have done in the past, unless we can show that our wealth is increasing in such a degree as to justify us in believing we will be fairly able to bear the burdens which increased borrowing places upon us. Let us look at our great wealth producing interests and see how we can develop and promote them. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) stated, in his address yesterday, that we should not be so concerned about foreign markets. He said: You must remember that after all is said and done, the home market is the great market for the people; he said that while the value of our whole products reached \$100,000,000—I think those are the correct figures, although I am only speaking from memory—only about 10 per cent. of the products were exported. Assuming his statement to be true, does it at all follow from it that the foreign market which purchases the \$10,000,000 of surplus products we export is not of vital importance to us? Why, the hon. gentleman ought to know, the hon. gentleman does know, I venture to say—if he does not he has not learned one of the elementary principles of political economy—that it is the foreign market which controls the price we get for our products. Sir, if you want to know the price of oats, or wheat, or any of the products, a surplus of which we send abroad, you must look at the foreign markets which determine the price. It is the English market that determines the price of oats and the price of wheat, and, in fact, it is the market abroad which receives the surplus that determines the price of our products at home. The hon. gentleman knows that, and, therefore, the price we obtain for the portion of our products we consume depends on the foreign market. The quantity we keep at home and sell in the home market is regulated entirely by the price we get abroad, and the price we get abroad is, therefore, of vital importance. Now, let us compare the exports of to-day; and what do we find them to be? We find that out of total exports of \$80,000,000 from this country, there were \$3,805,000 products of the soil, \$6,875,000 of the fisheries, \$20,484,000 of the forest, \$21,247,000 animals and their products, \$3,000,000 odd for manufactures, and \$644,000 for miscellaneous, which, together with short returns of exports to the United States from our inland towns, makes a total of \$80,000,000. What fact does this convey to any thinking man? Compare the wonderful amount of exports of surplus products from the farm, from the forest, from the fisheries and from the mines, with the tawdry and paltry amount of manufactures we export, and then you can judge of the real relative importance of those industries to our people. A paltry \$3,000,000 worth of manufactures are exported from Canada, a sum less by hundreds of thousands than we exported from the country before the National Policy ever was introduced; and yet we are asked to sacrifice the interests of the people, who produce and export \$75,000,000 worth of products, in order to bolster and build up and make wealthy that class which exported \$3,000,000 worth. I hold that the farming community and those interested in the lumber interest, and the other interests I have mentioned, deserve more serious attention at the hands of this Parliament than the handful of people who are engaged in manufactures here, of which they export only \$3,000,000 worth. We cannot consume these products. Those \$80,000,000 worth of products we export we cannot consume here, that is evident. We must have a market for those products. You have developed as far as you can our trade by building the Intercolonial and other railways. You have endeavored to force on the Maritime Provinces as much of your surplus products as you can. You have forced upon the Province of Quebec all the coal from the Maritime Provinces you can force by carrying it almost for nothing. You have forced trade wherever possible, and

after all is said and done you have \$77,000,000 worth of the products of the mine, forest, land and sea to export abroad. Now, where does it go? We find there are two great countries which consume the large proportion of it. We can almost put out of sight, in considering this question, those other countries of the world which, a few years ago, some of the statesmen supposed would become great purchasers of our surplus products. We find that Great Britain took \$38,000,000 of our surplus products, and the United States took \$35,000,000 worth. So, then, it is to those two countries that we must look for the sale of those products. Let us analyse just a little further those surplus products and find where they go. We find that of the products of the mine, of the value of \$3,800,000, the United States took over \$3,000,000 worth. It is true you have restricted the trade as much as possible. It is true that by building up barriers on this side and maintaining barriers on that, the statesmen of both countries have prevented the trade from reaching one-half of what it might have been; but even to-day, with all the restrictions, with all that men can do to stop the flow of traffic between the two countries, the surplus products of the mine are practically purchased by our neighbors in the great American Republic. So it is with regard to our fisheries. Of a total value of \$6,800,000 exported, the United States took nearly \$3,000,000 worth; and be it remembered that is the only market to which we are able to send those \$3,000,000 worth of products. We have no other market in the world for our mackerel except the United States, and we have no other market for our fresh fish. That is our market and our sole market, and it is well known to all who have studied the question, that you are hampering and destroying, as far as it is in the power of man to do, those great industries to which I have referred, by unnatural restrictions. Why, Sir, of the exports of our forests the United States takes \$9,000,000; of animals and their products, \$7,291,000; agricultural products outside of that, \$7,966,248; and manufactures, \$1,250,000. Therefore, without wearying the House and going into some details—details which have been given by my hon. friend, but which I have looked up and which are unnecessary to repeat—we find, Sir, that to the south of us lies one country which, next to Great Britain, takes all the surplus products we have to sell. Now, Sir, the question is whether it is desirable or whether it is not desirable that we should remove all artificial barriers which interrupt the freest interchange of the surplus products of this country with the surplus products of the country south of us. What would be the effect if we did this? Why, Sir, the effects of the old Reciprocity Treaty, all confined as they were to natural products, have never been forgotten by the people of the Maritime Provinces. I do not know whether they were as profitable to the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Well, then, if they were, the people of Quebec and Ontario must have as warm a heart for the return of those good old times as we have in the Maritime Provinces. It is true that, under that old Reciprocity Treaty, to which I wish to call attention, the profits, benefits, and advantages were not confined to the Dominion of Canada. I do not claim that we possessed greater advantages under it than the United States. I mean to say that under the treaty the United States benefited largely, and I mean to say that the figures show that, so far as the balance of trade is concerned, was largely in their favor. We bought from them and they bought from us during the period the Reciprocity Treaty was in force. And, Sir, I would just call the attention of the House for a few moments to the marvellous strides which the trade of this country received at the time when the annual products of both countries were allowed to flow free between the Dominion of

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Canada and the nation to the south of us. I find, Sir, on looking up the returns, that before the Reciprocity Treaty came into force the entire traffic between Canada and the United States was very small. In 1845 it was \$8,000,000, in 1846 \$9,000,000, in 1847 it increased to \$10,000,000, in 1848 to \$12,000,000, in 1850 to \$15,000,000, and in 1851 to \$18,000,000—slow, up-hill progress, but all the progress that could be made under the system of government and under the restrictions to trade which then existed. I find that in the year last before the Reciprocity Treaty, 1853, that the entire trade between the Provinces that now comprise the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America was \$20,000,000. I find, Sir, the first year after that treaty took place that the trade bounded up from \$20,000,000 to \$33,000,000, that two years afterwards it had gone up to \$42,000,000, that two years after that, in 1857, to \$46,000,000, in 1859 it had gone up to \$49,000,000, in 1863 to \$55,000,000, in 1864 to \$57,000,000, in 1865 to \$71,000,000, and in 1866 it had reached the tremendous figures of \$84,000,000. There is no stop, there is no halt. The producing power of this country was tested to its utmost, and it was equal to the demand made upon it; and our fishermen, our farmers, and our lumbermen poured out their surplus products to the American market, and wealth rolled back upon them. I see opposite to me men who know the truth of what I am speaking. I would recall their attention to the time when in every creek in the Maritime Provinces the smaller vessels came there laden with the products we required from the farms and the looms of the United States, and returned again with everything that our farmers, from their surplus products, had to sell. We had not one article to sell which they were not willing to buy, and to buy at a profitable rate. Wealth rolled in upon the country, as can be seen from the figures which the total trade returns of the country shows during that time. What has been the consequence since, Sir? During that period of time the figures are large, the total interchange of traffic between the Dominion of Canada and the United States reached the immense and unparalleled figures of \$670,000,000. It is almost inconceivable—an amount which one can hardly grasp—but such are the facts as shown by the Trade and Navigation Returns, and what was it that we purchased from the United States during that time? We purchased \$150,000,000 worth of farm products, \$8,500,000 worth of timber, \$24,000,000 worth of miscellaneous goods and \$151,000,000 worth of general merchandise. We purchased it because it was for our advantage to purchase it, and we would not have purchased it unless it were so. We made money by the purchase, and we made money by the sale to the people of the United States of the millions of dollars I have mentioned, bringing back those millions in return. What is the consequence of the repeal of that treaty? It had no sooner been repealed than the traffic fell from \$84,000,000 to \$57,000,000, a falling off in one year of nearly \$30,000,000. In the year following it was \$56,000,000. In 1869, two years afterwards, it remained at \$56,000,000. It struggled up and ascended steadily from that time until in the year 1878 it reached \$89,000,000, but to-day, Sir, we find it has gone back again to \$82,000,000. We find during the period of the Reciprocity Treaty, not only by the personal experience which every gentleman who remembers can bring to bear upon it, but by the statistics contained in our blue-books as well, that it is proved beyond a doubt that the period of the Reciprocity Treaty was a period of unparalleled prosperity for Canada, whilst at the same time it was a period during which the United States reaped great gain from traffic with us. It was not a one-sided treaty. As hon. gentlemen opposite say, we are not going as beggars to the United States, we are not a poor country, we are a great country with great capabilities.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, hon. gentlemen opposite sometimes think that they possess all the loyalty and all the love of country on their side of the House. I can tell them that we are as proud of our country and have as great a knowledge of its capabilities as they have, but we want to make it a country fit for us to live in ourselves and for our sons afterwards. We want to see its capabilities developed and not dwarfed by the politicians of the country; we want to see the restrictions upon that development removed; we want to see the trade of the country untrammelled; we do not want to see the whole interests of this great and growing Dominion sacrificed to the interests of a few who have put their money in the manufactures of the country. Do you say in answer to that, as the hon. gentleman said yesterday: "I am perfectly willing that there should be a return to that old system." I dare say you may be, I dare say that you are, but the hon. gentleman knows that it is crying for the moon. He has eight or ten years' experience of his offer, and he knows it will never be granted. I have already dwelt on that question. He knows he may keep the statutory offer there for ever and it will evoke no response from the people of the United States, because it is not, and we have no hesitation in saying it is not, a fair offer of reciprocal trade. It is asking too much from them and giving too little from us. The hon. gentleman introduced the National Policy in this country. He boasts that it received the endorsement of the majority of the people of this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, "hear, hear," says my hon. friend; does he know why?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will tell him why. Does he know the ground upon which the people of the Maritime Provinces were asked, by the man who possesses as much power in the Government, if not more, than its chief, to adopt that policy?

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh!

Mr. DAVIES The hon. member laughs. I will repeat the question, and, before he laughs, he had better hear what I say. I was going to ask, does he dare to think that a people trained up in the principle of free trade, as the people of the Maritime Provinces had been, a people knowing and believing in the benefits of free trade, could have been got to listen to a proposal to reverse the system under which they had grown prosperous, and introduce a protective system simply because it was protective? No, you could not; you would not have polled a corporal's guard. But you came to them under false pretences; you said to them: We ask you to adopt the National Policy—in order that it may give benefits to you? Not at all. Did you try to prove that it would be in itself a benefit? No, but you told them it would be a means of obtaining that which they were all striving for—it would be a means of obtaining reciprocal trade with the United States. That is how you carried your National Policy in 1873. You carried it under false pretences. Sir Charles Tupper came to the city of Charlottetown, which I have now the honor to represent, and in the most emphatic terms pledged his word that what he was seeking was not an increase of taxation to build up manufactures, but it was to obtain that which was the greatest blessing the Maritime Provinces would ever have—it was to obtain reciprocity, and that was the only way they could get it. The people took him at his word, they voted for the National Policy; they were sold; and to-day they are farther off from reciprocity than ever. The less the hon. gentleman says about the election the better. We know how it was carried. Take the Province where they did not spend money, where they did not pour it out in bribery—take the Province from which I come, and what is your answer? What was the issue on

which my hon. friends and myself appealed to the people of that Province? The issue was reciprocity with the United States and the best means to obtain it; and we appealed to them to return a party to power who were in sympathy with that policy, and who were determined to do all that lay in their power to obtain it, and the people answered by sending a unanimous delegation for that purpose. It is true, Sir, in some of the other Provinces, where you poured out the Government money like water, where you bought the people with their own money, the results were not the same as with us; but you know that if you had not made the promises with regard to railways in the adjoining Province of Nova Scotia, if you had not poured out the money as you did for the construction of public works, you would hardly have had a corporal's guard to back up the hon. Finance Minister. His own personal qualities and his long public life might possibly have insured his return, but I doubt that he would have had a corporal's guard to back him in the House. Why do I believe it? Because the interests of the people of Nova Scotia are identical with those of the people of Prince Edward Island, and the untrammelled vote in the one Province shows what the untrammelled vote would have been in the other.

Sr JOHN A. MACDONALD. What a corrupt lot the people must be to be bought up in this way.

Sr RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, our Public Accounts show it. Why, they offered themselves to us, but Mr. Blake was too honest to buy them.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Now, we are not singular—it would be unnatural if we were—in feeling and predicting the great benefits which would accrue to this country from reciprocal trade with the United States. I do not know what the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government may say to-day; I do not know what his views are now; but I know, Sir, that he shares the general belief that the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty was a great calamity to this country. In 1865, when he was negotiating for a renewal of that treaty, he put into a State document which he forwarded to the English Government a declaration of his own that the repeal of that treaty was a "great calamity" to Canada; and he went further—further, I think, than was necessary. He almost warned the British Government that unless that treaty was renewed in some form or other the loyalty of the people might be undermined. The hon. gentleman said at that time in a Minute of Council:

"Under the beneficent operation of the system of self-government which the later policy of the mother country has accorded to Canada, in common with the other colonies possessing representative institutions, combined with the advantages secured by the Reciprocity Treaty, of an unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbors in the natural productions of the two countries, all agitation for organic changes has ceased, all dissatisfaction with the existing political relations of the Provinces has wholly disappeared."

There had been dissatisfaction among some of those politically associated with the right hon. gentleman until we obtained access to our natural markets in the United States; but the dissatisfaction, he says, has ceased.

"Although the commissioners would grossly misrepresent their countrymen if they were to affirm that their loyalty to their Sovereign would be diminished in the slightest degree by the withdrawal, through the unfriendly action of a foreign Government, of more commercial privileges, however valuable these might be deemed; they think they cannot err in directing the attention of the enlightened statesmen who wield the destinies of the great Empire, of which it is the proudest boast of Canadians that their country forms a part, to the connection which is usually found to exist between the material prosperity and the political contentment of a people, for in doing so they feel that they are appealing to the highest motives that can actuate patriotic statesmen—the desire to perpetuate a Dominion founded on the affectionate allegiance of a prosperous and contented people."

Statesmanlike words, those, Sir. The hon. gentleman tells the Home Government: I do not want to say that our loyalty depends altogether upon our obtaining and main-

taining free commercial relations with the people of the United States, but such is always the case, and unless the people are content, and unless the people are prosperous, you may look out for some disloyalty. Contentment and loyalty are handmaidens. Discontent is the parent of disloyalty. He warns the British Government that unless some steps are taken the loyalty of the people will be undermined. And the hon. gentleman at that time, I have no doubt, was honest in his desire to bring about a renewal of that treaty under which we have prospered so much. But, Sir, at that time, if I am not incorrect, the hon. gentleman caused propositions to be made to the States which would have horror-stricken the hon. member for Cardwell—not propositions for an exchange of natural products alone, but propositions for the assimilation of the tariffs of the two countries. If the Hon. George Brown was correct in a statement he made in a speech delivered by him in 1865, negotiations were then on foot for a renewal of reciprocity with the United States. I wonder if the hon. gentleman will leave the Government when he discovers that his leader is heterodox on that point. We have not yet heard from the hon. the First Minister, but perhaps he may yet throw over the hon. member for Cardwell. He may yet approve of the resolution introduced, because, as I have shown, it does not go any further than the right hon. gentleman was willing to go when he was seeking a renewal of these treaty relations in 1865, when he declared that the abrogation of the treaty would be a great national calamity.

Mr. SPROULE. Did he make a treaty?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) But I find that these negotiations went still further. In 1879, the hon. gentleman again opened negotiations with the people of the United States for a renewal of that treaty; and I hope the hon. member for Cardwell will not be horror-stricken when he learns that again, in 1869—I state this on the authority of the late Hon. George Brown—propositions were made a second time for the assimilation of the tariff of the two countries. I refer to the speech which the Hon. George Brown delivered in the Senate in 1875, in which he stated:

“In 1869, formal negotiations were entered into with the American Government, and the project of a treaty was presented for discussion. The negotiations continued from July, 1869, to March, 1870. The project included the cession for a term of years of our fisheries to the United States, the enlargement and enjoyment of our canals, the free enjoyment of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, the assimilation of our customs and excise duties, and some other propositions.”

Is the hon. member for Cardwell willing to resign, and leave a gentleman who has proved himself so disloyal as the First Minister did when he made those propositions? I have here the speech of the Hon. Mr. Huntington, who is now dead and gone, and whose silvery voice used to ring through this Chamber. In that speech Mr. Huntington stated he was aware from a person who could give him authoritative information, that such a *projet* of treaty had been signed by the Hon. John Rose and the Secretary of the United States Treasury. That statement will be found in Mr. Huntington's speech of March 16th, 1870. Mr. Huntington said:

“I know something about the memorandum entered into by the contracting parties in regard to the preliminary negotiations, and I have my information from sources which I believe to be reliable and trustworthy. And I say that in the preliminary negotiations between Hon. Mr. Rose and Mr. Secretary Fish, it was agreed that the manufactures of both countries should be admitted duty free, and hon. gentlemen cannot deny it.”

There is the statement, Sir, and I will go further. I will challenge the right hon. the First Minister to bring down the documents, if he dares deny the authoritative statement made by Mr. Huntington and by the Hon. Geo. Brown, who were both members of the Privy Council, and who both stated they had their information from the highest source. The hon. member for Cardwell has said that this proposition of ours involves an assimilation of the customs and excise

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

duties, and is, therefore, a disloyal proposition. But the same proposition was made by his leader. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to justify his leader or to denounce him as disloyal?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I would say that, several times in his speech, he has put words into my mouth which I never uttered. What I said was that a differential duty against England was disloyal to the mother country and inconsistent with our position.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I ask the hon. gentleman: Is not the proposition for differential duties just as much involved in the proposal of his leader, which I have just stated? If the hon. gentleman doubts what I say, let him turn his attention to the Order in Council which was adopted, and which was signed by Sir John Rose. On the 3rd September, 1868, at the very time when the right for the Dominion of Canada to discriminate in any way against the mother country was challenged, and when Sir John Rose penned a Minute of Council which was approved by the other members of the Cabinet, affirming our right to discriminate whenever we pleased against the mother land, why was that document signed? Why did the Government of that day contend that the Dominion of Canada had the right, if it chose, to discriminate against the manufactures of the mother country? Simply because the Government were then engaged in endeavoring to carry out a treaty which had that discrimination for one of its objects. I am not going to read this document at length, but I call the attention of those that wish to peruse it, to the document itself. It is to be found in No. 47 of the Sessional Papers for 1869. Sir John Rose, after devoting the first part of the minute to the assertion of the right of one Province to discriminate in favor of another Province against English goods, because Prince Edward Island was not then part of the Dominion—and the question was raised whether the Dominion had the right to discriminate in favor of Prince Edward Island as against Great Britain—after disposing of that minor question, Sir John Rose then grappled with the second objection. He said:

“The second point as stated by His Grace, viz: ‘The exclusive favor which substantially or, at all events, apparently might be conferred on the United States, if the clause providing for the admission of certain products of that country, in the event of certain contingencies, should come into operation,’ and which His Grace is pleased to say: ‘he fears could not be acceded to,’ raises a question of such deep import to the people of this Dominion, that the undersigned deems it in his duty to advert to the course which has hitherto been pursued by Her Majesty's Government with reference to it, in the conviction that further consideration will lead His Grace to withdraw the objections which by anticipation have been advanced.”

He then goes on to discuss the peculiar position in which Canada and the United States stand with regard to each other, and shows that it is for their mutual interest to exchange certain articles on reciprocal terms:

“The peculiar position in which Canada and the United States stand to each other makes it for their mutual interest to exchange certain articles on reciprocal terms.

“The truth of this proposition has never been denied by Her Majesty's Government, but, on the contrary, their influence has been invariably exercised in furtherance of such reciprocal arrangements.

“The consideration of the subject continued to be repeatedly pressed on the American Government between that day and the year 1864.

“In the latter year the treaty known as the Reciprocity Treaty was finally concluded, admitting certain natural products of each country free into the other without any qualification as to the differential or discriminating character of its provisions.”

He then goes on to say:

“In 1885, the delegates from Canada, who visited England for the purpose of conferring with Her Majesty's Government on various important matters affecting the interests of the Dominion, were again assured that Sir Frederick Bruce, Her Majesty's representative at Washington, had received instructions to negotiate for a renewal of the treaty, and to act in concert with the Government of Canada to that end.

“It thus appears that the principle of establishing special trade relations on reciprocal terms between Canada and the United States has

been formally recognised and approved by Her Majesty's Government since 1848."

And having thus successfully, as he thinks, refuted the objection taken by His Grace, we have the subsequent statement made by the gentleman to whom I have referred, that they endeavored to negotiate with the United States for the assimilation of the customs and excise duties of the two countries, which necessarily involved differential duties against the mother country. I think I have fairly proved that proposition. Then we had a new departure in 1878. We had the National Policy introduced, and there was an end of all propositions of that kind. Hon. gentlemen will see that it is not only in the statements made by leading and eloquent members of the then Opposition, which afterwards became the Government, that they were enabled to carry out that proposition of the National Policy, but that they placed upon the face of their proposition a statement which was to the effect that the National Policy ought to be adopted, not for any intrinsic value in the proposition itself, but because it would lead up to reciprocity of trade with the United States. Let me read the proposition which was made by the hon. the First Minister at that time. After reciting that it is desirable to adopt a national policy, the resolution goes on:

"That such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active inter-provincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors, so far as the various interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country—"

What?

"Eventually a reciprocity of trade."

That is what you were leading up to, or what you said you were leading up to, and what you deluded the people of the country into believing you were leading up to, and that is why you carried your National Policy. But I contend that that policy has been a failure. It has not led to reciprocity of trade. On the contrary, it has had a most unfortunate effect on our commercial connection with the United States. It can hardly be believed that four and a half millions of people in this country can convert sixty millions of people in the great country to the south of us to our views by any threat of forcing them into trade relations. The proposition was absurd from the start, and now you are further away than you were at the time the National Policy was first instituted from the end you proposed to gain. What do we find now? Bringing the matter down to the present day, we find that the fishery embroglio has brought together the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain and the United States to try and solve the disputes which had become so serious that, as Mr. Bayard expresses it, unless they were satisfactorily solved, they might result in war. No other meaning can be attached to his language. What do we find to-day? We find that the leader of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) who spoke yesterday, the Finance Minister (Sir Charles Tupper), goes to Washington, and does he, in answer to Mr. Bayard's proposition, use the language of the hon. member for Cardwell, and say offensively to the people of the United States: "You have our proposition and we can go no further than we have expressed in the statute?" Sir Charles Tupper, I hope, is too great a lover of his country to take that course; and I hope he treated this question of trade relations in a different way. We are not the suppliants in this case. We are not sacrificing any question of honor. Mr. Bayard, that great statesman, writes to Sir Charles Tupper, in May, 1877:

"I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

I think this Parliament may thank its stars that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) was not sent to Washington to answer that proposition of Mr. Bayard, and to tell him that the one and only way of settling the commercial relations of the two countries was by the United States accepting our statutory offer. Sir Charles Tupper tells Mr. Bayard that he coincides fully with him:

"I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

None of your pottifogging propositions as included in the resolution of 1878, but a broad and statesmanlike plan of settling the entire commercial relations of the two countries, or, as my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) puts it, unrestricted interchange of the natural and manufactured articles of the two countries. That is paraphrasing the language used by Secretary Bayard and re-echoed by Sir Charles Tupper, and, if my interpretation is correct, we are not going further to-day than Sir Charles Tupper has gone in his reply to the note of Secretary Bayard. Now we have that great country holding out the right hand of fellowship, and, through its Secretary of State, inviting us to declare what we believe to be the broad and liberal and comprehensive measures which should be adopted. It is known that the American commissioners refused to accept the offer Sir Charles Tupper made to treat in regard to the commercial relations of the two countries, and it is known why they refused. Those commissioners had not the power to deal with that matter, and it is known that the Congress of the United States is most jealous of interference by the representatives of the President with its supreme control over the commercial relations of that country. It is well known that they desire to maintain intact their right to regulate the tariff of the country as they see best; and so we see to-day in that great body members proposing, one a scheme known as Commercial Union, and another a proposition known as Unrestricted Reciprocity, which is as akin to ours as it can be. Thus, we have the leading men on both sides, in their respective Legislatures, taking a common-sense view of this great question which is being talked over at every fire-side on both sides of the line, and is of the utmost importance to the people of this Dominion. We have now an opportunity of declaring whether we are in earnest in desiring broad, liberal and comprehensive trade measures with the United States, or whether we are dangling this before the eyes of the people for political purposes. It has come down to that, and those who to-day vote a negative to the proposition of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will be voting against the proposition which I believe a very large majority of the people of the United States are prepared to accept, if they see a desire on this side of the line to meet them half-way. There have been a few objections raised to this proposition, and my hon. friend has answered some of them. I will not touch upon the ground he has occupied. The hon. gentleman opposite says this will discriminate against Great Britain. Necessarily it must to some extent, but we cannot help that. But this discrimination is not half as great as it is generally supposed. In fact we have a right to discriminate; the question is, is it in our interest to discriminate or not?

Mr. MITCHELL. That is the point.

Mr. DAVIES. That is the point. I say while we are loyal to England and loyal to the English flag, we are here representing the Canadian people in our Legislature. We are not now in swaddling clothes. The time has gone by when the legislation of this country is to be moulded to suit the interests of the English manufacturer. The legislation of this country must be moulded to suit the interest of the Canadian producer and the Canadian consumer. I remem-

ber well reading the other day that in 1859 objections were taken by the then Colonial Secretary to the financial scheme introduced by Sir Alexander T. Galt, then Finance Minister of Canada, on the ground that it worked injuriously to the interest of the British manufacturer, and in that far-off time, Sir Alexander Galt, with the prescience of a true statesman, recognising the importance of Canadian interests, told him he was sorry it was so, but the interests of the Canadian people must be paramount to the interests of the British manufacturer. Sir, the words of that statesman—for I think I may fairly call him a statesman, I think he is entitled to that name—may be quoted by me on this occasion. Sir Alexander Galt, in reply to the dispatch from His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, protesting against the enactment of the new Canadian tariff, moved to that protest by certain manufacturers of Sheffield, wrote :

"I must distinctly affirm the right of the Canadian Legislature to adjust the taxation of the people in the way they deem best, even if it should unfortunately happen to meet the disapproval of the Imperial Ministry. Her Majesty cannot be advised to disallow such acts unless her advisers are prepared to assume the administration of the affairs of the colony, irrespective of the views of the inhabitants."

That was the language of Sir Alexander T. Galt. We are a free people, we have control over our fiscal legislation, we know what is best for our own interests, we have power to deal with them, and if that power is to be superseded by some other persons, they must come here and take the responsibility of governing this country. But, Sir, having the power, how are we going to discriminate? As a matter of fact we have exercised that power already. Hon. gentlemen may say that they did not intend to do it, but I say that the practical effect of the incidence of the tariff, as it bears upon English goods and upon American goods, is to discriminate largely against the English. What do we find to-day? We find that there are \$25,766,273 of dutiable goods imported from Great Britain, and \$9,195,960 of free goods, making the total imports from Great Britain, \$14,962,233. Upon that sum you charge a duty of \$9,318,920, or as nearly as possible, 21 per cent. upon English imported goods. I find, Sir, that in the same year—I am now speaking of 1887—we imported \$31,570,609 of dutiable goods from the States, and \$14,536,457 of free goods from the same country, making a total of \$45,107,066 from the United States. Upon those goods you exacted a duty of \$7,263,194, or a shade over 16 per cent. So that while you are levying upon the total English importations a duty of 21 per cent., you are levying upon the total imports from the United States a duty of only 16 per cent.: you have discriminated, practically, to the extent of over 4 per cent. I am not complaining about it; it may be in the interests of Canada that you should do so, and if it is in the interests of Canada, I am prepared to defend the discrimination. But, Sir, no question has ever been raised on this side of the House, no question has ever been raised outside, that that involved the loyalty of the Administration. You are legislating in the interests of those you represent, and you would be false and recreant to the people you represent if you did not do so. Whether it bears harshly or not upon a particular class in Britain, is not the question which we ought to have in view. But I say that, practically, the effect will not amount to much. We will continue to buy largely from Great Britain of those classes of goods we now buy. I say we will do more. I say that no man who recollects the prosperity of the people of Canada under the old treaty can doubt that the prosperity of the people will, if a new treaty is made, based upon the proposition of my hon. friend from South Oxford, be duplicated. We know that the people will be in a position to purchase two dollars for one dollar they now purchase of English goods, and if that is so, I say that the result will be rather beneficial than otherwise to the English manufacturer. There is a very large class of goods you

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

buy from England that you must continue to buy, even if trade becomes free between us and the States. The United States does not enter in competition with England in those classes of goods. Why, you see the United States to-day with a tariff 10 per cent. higher than ours, and they purchase in the English market over \$150,000,000 yearly of English manufactured goods. Sir, if we had our lower tariff to-day and free trade with the States, we would still continue to import from England all those classes of goods which the Americans now find it to be their interest to import, in spite of their high tariff and others besides. I believe myself that our importation of English goods under the new era of prosperity which would be inaugurated, would be largely in excess of what it is to-day, and I believe, therefore, that, practically, the English manufacturer would be benefited instead of injured. I acknowledge that the proposition has on the face of it an element of discrimination, but I say that if it is in favor of the Canadian people, I, for one, am prepared to accept the responsibility of my vote. It may be said that there will be a loss of revenue. We know there will be a loss of revenue, and I think my hon. friend pointed out pretty clearly how he proposes to meet that loss of revenue. He proposes to meet it by following on the lines, in one respect, that have been advocated in this House for a number of years back. We say the pruning-knife must be applied to the expenditure. This matter must be dealt with vigorously, heroic measures of retrenchment must be adopted; and I think this side of the House, if entrusted with the administration of affairs, is prepared to adopt heroic measures of retrenchment. If this country could be governed as it was by my hon. friend from East York, when \$23,000,000 sufficed to carry on the affairs of the country, instead of \$36,000,000 that are now required, I think we would have no difficulty in meeting the loss of revenue. I say the first article in our creed is heroic retrenchment in the public expenditure. I say more than that: if our importations from England are, as I believe they will be, largely in excess of what they are now, your revenue will proportionately increase, and if there is a small deficiency, we will be prepared, I have no doubt, to meet it, and the people will be prepared to make it up cheerfully when the time comes. Now, Sir, there is an element in this question which affects the people of the Maritime Provinces more than it does the people of western Canada. When the treaty negotiated by the late George Brown was presented to the country, it was found that he had obtained a very great boon for the people of the Maritime Provinces—the right to register colonial built ships in the United States. That, Sir, is a very great boon, and coupled with that, I venture to express the hope that one of the conditions referred to in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford—if his proposition is ever formulated into a treaty—will be that, in addition to the right to register our vessels in the United States and the reciprocal right of the United States to register their vessels in our country, we shall also have the privilege of the coasting trade of the United States. Sir, unrestricted reciprocity will be a boon to the whole country—it will be a great boon to Ontario, a great boon to Quebec, a great boon to Manitoba, a great boon to the Maritime Provinces; but if, along with it, we can have the coasting trade and the right to register our colonial built ships in the United States, why, Sir, who will dare to fix bounds to the prosperity which will encircle those Maritime Provinces. Our shipping trade, which at one time was a very prosperous trade, has gone down; it is melancholy to look at the figures. I find away back in 1877 we built 100,000 tons of shipping in the Maritime Provinces of the Dominion; to-day we are building but 23,000. In 1877 the whole Dominion built 127,000 tons shipping. In 1887 but 27,000, or a deficiency of 100,000 tons in ten years. Give us the

right to register our ships in the United States, and in the Provinces of Quebec, and Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, we can build hundreds of ships suitable for the coasting trade which will then go into service between the Provinces and the United States. We can do it, and we can do it profitably, for we have the money, the timber, the brawny arms, and intelligence and experience gained by many years of ship building, and we have the cheap labor and the sailors to man the ships afterwards. I doubt if there is any condition you can attach to this scheme of unrestricted reciprocity which will be of greater advantage to the whole Maritime Provinces, and to the Province of Quebec in addition, than this which I have mentioned, and which I venture to hope will form one of the conditions of reciprocity, conferring upon both countries respectively the right to register their ships in the other country, the right to register Canadian vessels in the United States, and the right to register American vessels in Canada. Sir, we now have arrived, as it were, at the parting of the ways. We must make our choice between two policies. We have, on the one hand, the National Policy, with a statutory offer which we know has not been accepted, and will not be accepted; we have, on the other hand, a broad, statesmanlike proposition submitted here for throwing down the barriers of trade and opening up unrestricted reciprocity between two countries. We have offered to us the choice between stagnation in our trade, as I am sorry to say it at present exists, and that prosperity which advanced by leaps and bounds under the old treaty and which will be renewed under the new. We have a controversy here, and we have to make our choice between legislation, on the one hand, for the classes and legislation, on the other hand, for the masses—legislation which has built up, as the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) pointed out, two or three large cities, which is making the assessed value of Toronto and Montreal very much larger than it was years ago, but which is doing so at the expense of other portions of the same Provinces. You are building up the cities at the expense of the country. The totality of your wealth is not increasing. Sir, we are as loyal as you are; but we are not loyal in one quarter only, but we are loyal to the flag, loyal to the Canadian flag, loyal to the people we represent. Sir, I say it is not loyalty, but disloyalty, on the part of any member of this House if he shrinks from adopting measures which will be for our own interest and the interests of our people, for fear they would be disapproved of by a small section of manufacturers, either English or Canadian. Sir, I am not afraid our manufacturers will go to the wall. There are certain classes of manufactures which will go to the wall—those manufactures which exist only because they are bolstered up by this false system of the National Policy. Some of them may go; but when I see such men as millionaire Gibson, who owns one of the largest cotton factories in the Dominion of Canada, declaring openly that he courts unrestricted reciprocity because it will give a larger market, and that he is not afraid to compete with manufacturers to the south of us, I cannot join in the wail that free trade will destroy our manufactures. "I believe," he says, "I have money enough and brains enough, and our people are intelligent enough to enable us to compete successfully with those who are manufacturing cotton to the south. Give me the market—that is what I want." And hundreds are echoing the same cry. You cannot take up a copy of the *Mail* newspaper, which has devoted itself to this particular branch of the subject, without seeing that in all parts of the Dominion manufacturers are coming forward and declaring—what? Declaring they are going to be ruined, as the hon. member for Cardwell says? No. They are declaring they are ready to accept the situation, to join hands with the great agricultural, mining and lumbering interests of the Dominion and go in for this unres-

tricted reciprocity of trade, which will make prosperity shine over this Dominion like a sunbeam. Sir, I tell hon. gentlemen that this question has eaten too deeply into the hearts of the people to be disposed of with a single speech or a single phrase. The people have learned by experience. The hon. member for Cardwell spoke last night about time, and I tell him that time is on our side. The social forces and conditions of the country are on our side, they are working for us, and all of our debates and divisions here will not stop the onward flow of public opinion which is being created at every fireside in this Dominion on this question. Sir, we tender the people a flag of which we are not ashamed, a flag upon which is inscribed, "Unrestricted Trade with the United States." Hon. gentlemen know that this sentiment will find an echo in the heart of every man who has attained manhood's estate, and remembers what reciprocity brought us in the past; it will find an echo in the heart of every young man who to-day is in despair whether he should remain in this country or go abroad to help build up a foreign one; it will find an echo in the heart of the bread-winner who finds it hard enough to earn sufficient to buy his daily bread, much less to put by a little for a rainy day; and we throw this flag to the breeze, confident that it will be carried by the united hands of the people of the several Provinces of the Dominion to a glorious, if not to a speedy victory.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in the course of his speech last night, made use of an expression something like this: That in the discussion of this question we should approach it as statesmen and not as flunkys. I have been a little curious to know if the hon. gentleman were to undertake to put himself and his lieutenant, who has so bravely spoken just now, in one or other of these categories, in which he would place them. It would not be in harmony with his own self-respect that he should put himself or his friend in the second, and it would not be for me certainly to attempt to make the classification. It is for this House, and it is for the country after the House, from the speeches that were made and the arguments with which the proposition was attempted to be furthered, to say as to whether the proposition that was made was, in the first place, a statesmanlike proposition, and in the second place, whether it was furthered by statesmanlike arguments. I quite appreciate what has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat as to the importance of this question. I do not think the House has yet got hold of the tremendously grave nature of the issue, if it be really a serious issue, which is embodied in this proposition, and I think the House and the country may be a little excused for doubting at the present time whether it is really a serious issue or not. Hon. gentlemen opposite have had within the last ten years so many issues, they have gone from one to the other with such a surprising versatility, and such a wonderful celerity, that they have become a sort of Chinese puzzle to the community at large, and when they spring a brand new issue within a few months upon Parliament and upon the people, Parliament and the people are quite excusable if they hold their breath for a little and watch in patience as to whether those gentlemen are in earnest, and whether it is worth while taking up the fight in a real spirit or not. If this, however, be a real and serious issue, it is a tremendous one, because it involves a very great deal. It involves, in the first place, the almost complete diversion of the trade of this country, and a change of methods of transport with reference thereto; I speak particularly with regard to the import trade. Hon. gentlemen may talk as they please, but there will be a certain diversion of trade outside of the United States which comes into this country, if such a proposition as this be carried. It seems to me to be plain, and to go without

reasoning, that there will be a very large and almost complete diversion of trade if this proposition be carried. It involves, also, a commercial severance between Canada and Great Britain, as well as outside countries with which we have been carrying on trade. But, in speaking of this commercial severance, I speak of it particularly with reference to our mother country. I think it goes without saying that, if this proposition be accepted, it involves a separation—a commercial separation—at first large, and tending to become continually larger and wider, between this country and Great Britain, and it involves, in the very wake and current of that commercial severance, a political severance as well. It may be a longer time or a shorter time in coming, but I hold it as a fact, indisputable, that the warmest and the fullest current of blood to-day that flows through the country is its commercial blood, and that along the current of its commercial life will flow the social current, will flow the sympathy of feeling, will flow, eventually, the political current of the people. If we commence to-day by opening a channel which involves, at first, a commercial severance between us and the mother country, as that channel broadens and widens—and, if the rosy and imaginative pictures that have been drawn here of the great extension of commerce which would take place between us and the United States be true, it must grow and widen—I say, in proportion as it does so grow and widen there must inevitably come a wider and deeper severance, politically, between us and the mother country. More than that, it involves an almost total loss of our customs revenue. That point has been disputed, and it is a question which we may debate. I hold that no person in this House will pretend to deny that it involves a considerable disturbance of our customs duties.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not necessarily one cent.

Mr. FOSTER. On the very item of goods that we bring from the United States we drop at once seven millions of dollars, and a little better, of duty. We will buy from the United States in the main, and if the proposition of my hon. friend works itself out as it is supposed by him it will, we will buy more increasingly from the United States, and in proportion as the current of trade sets in that direction we shall buy less and less from outside countries when we have those discriminating duties between ourselves and outside countries. This, therefore, would involve a continual diminution in the customs contribution, which is now so very large a part of our revenue. It involves also the establishment of a new method of taxation, a method of taxation which is totally at variance with the wont of the people of Canada, and which, I believe, will be found to be at variance with the wishes of the people of Canada. It is totally impossible for the government of this country to be carried on without a very large annual contribution in the way of duties of some kind. As my hon. friend last night showed, it is impossible to raise excise duties beyond a certain amount, and the bulk of that which is necessary to carry on the wants of the services of this country, with their increased and continuous extension, must be got from customs duties; or if not from customs duties, it must be raised by this new method of taxation of which I have spoken—direct taxation. Again, and lastly, this proposition involves the probable destruction of a large proportion of our industries, which, in Canada, since 1878 until to-day, by the mandate of the people three times given and never revoked, it has been the sacred trust and duty of this Government and this Parliament to establish and maintain. Since the election of 1887 hon. gentlemen have sprung this new proposition upon the House and upon the country. How dare they, in the light of members responsible to the constituencies that sent them here, spring such a proposition as that, and demand for it any other weight than their own individual

Mr. FOSTER.

opinions? They, Sir, have offered to the country a proposition which would, in a great degree, disturb the existing taxation and the purposes for which that taxation largely existed, namely, to raise a revenue with a view towards the establishment and maintenance of the great industries of this country. If ever a party went to the country pledged not to make any great disturbance in this respect, it was the party opposite. If they owe any fealty to their chief of the time gone by; if they have any respect for him as their acknowledged and most applauded leader, they should remember that they went to the country pledged not to disturb this to any large extent, and, with the echoes of their own leader sounding in their ears, and with his own words echoed by themselves upon every platform, they said: "If you please, gentlemen electors, to return us to power, if you wish the manufacturing interests fairly conserved, very well, we will not disturb them, at least, to any great extent, nor will we materially disturb existing taxation." Now, Sir, when an acknowledged and idolized finance leader of a great party in this country comes before the country and before Parliament under those peculiar conditions with the mandate of the people behind him, and, against the verdict of the people which was freshly given only a few months before, puts before the country and before Parliament so bold, so revolutionary and so novel a proposition, he should have good reasons for it. And this is a proposition not only put before the country which it will most directly affect, but which exposes its whole hand without reserve to the country which must be a party to the carrying of this proposition. When a man comes with such a proposition, so bold and revolutionary, it is necessary that he should give us the closest possible reasoning, the most irrefragable proofs, and lead us irresistibly to the most irrevocable conclusions before he can demand that the people who are sent here by their constituents should give their adhesion to this change and to this proposition. Now, Sir, I leave the hon. gentleman with his speech of three or four hours in length to the calm judgment of this Parliament, and to the calmer judgment of the country behind this Parliament. I do not propose that his speech shall be judged, it cannot be judged, in the laudatory manner in which it was referred to by his lieutenant who spoke this afternoon, but in cold blood. When the people sit down with intelligence, coolness and calmness in their own homes, descended as they are from a country which they have been proud to own as their mother land, feeling between them and the old Islands beyond the sea, the invisible but strong cords of patriotism and love of ancestry and love of national glory twining about their hearts, and look at this question as citizens of a country that they have been led to believe has become great and will become greater—that they have been led to believe has a great future before it if only in the spirit of union and patriotism they set themselves to assure it;—when the people of Canada, so intelligent, and under these circumstances come to read and consider and weigh that speech, I am willing to abide by the verdict, and I think the verdict will be that the case is not proven. The hon. gentleman's speech had something in it. It was full of a plentiful assumption of personal superiority, and had running through it a constant current of sneering contempt for anyone who should be unfortunate enough to disagree with him. It was full of such expressions as this: "It is perfectly clear that," "no man who thinks twice but what knows," "any person who is not wilfully ignorant must confess," and all that; and yet at the very heels of such assertions came statements which were perfectly involved and absurd—statements which any man who thought twice would indignantly and instantly reject, and the only ground for hoping that they would be ever entertained is that they come into some person's head who never thinks twice or never thinks at all. His speech was full of a wealth of assertion which was only equalled

by the conspicuous poverty of fact that was found in it; and it had in it what I may call an immense vagueness, which offered a delightful excursion ground for the political adventurer, but which the prudent, staid and level-headed people of Canada, when they think it over, will, I venture to believe, lay aside to be taken in infinitesimally small doses along with their well-worn Gulliver's Travels and Baron Munchausen's exploits.

Mr. MITCHELL. Amen.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad that on this point my hon. friend from Northumberland piously agreed with me. But, Sir, while the speech of my hon. friend from South Oxford most inefficiently did that, it most efficiently did another thing. In that speech my hon. friend entirely eclipsed his hitherto unrivalled record as the murky-fingered painter of Canadian retrogression, hopelessness and despair. On the canvas upon which he drew he placed a picture which, honestly, if I believed to be true, would make me turn my back at once and forever upon Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. It would actually, much as my hon. friend might regret it, lead me to turn my back on Canada and to write upon its portals: "Abandon all hope, ye who enter here." The only alleviation that there is to that side of the subject is this: that my hon. friend has established so wide a notoriety as a prophet of unrealised disaster and woe, that even under the very hues of his canvas and under the very sound of his lamentations, I have no doubt Canadians will still marry and be given in marriage.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And go to the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. Will build up homes, and continue to live happily within them, and will not be turned aside in the main from laying broad and deep the foundations of future prosperity.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for South Oxford, in the introduction of his resolution, and the hon. gentleman from Queen's, P.E.I., who spoke this afternoon, both agreed that the proposition before the House is an important one. They both agreed that it proposed a very considerable disturbance of the existing relations; they agreed that it was, in fact, a heroic remedy. Now, I think, before the House or the country is justified in accepting such a proposition, so denominated by its mover and its supporters, the burden of proof is placed upon those who introduced it and support it. The burden of proof is placed upon them to show clearly that, at the present time, a heroic remedy is necessary; that, taking the condition of the country now, in 1888, as compared with its condition in 1877, or in any year previous to 1877, a set of circumstances has arisen, almost suddenly arisen, which makes it necessary now to take a step that was never deemed necessary before, and that, therefore, this heroic remedy should be applied. Now, if the burden of proof must fall upon the hon. gentleman who introduced, and the hon. gentlemen who support the resolution, let us examine for a few moments the proofs by that test, and the facts brought forward in support of the contention that a heroic remedy is at the present time necessary. The first evidence adduced by my hon. friend from South Oxford was this: He says nature is too strong for us. Now, I suppose, by that expression he meant that the different Provinces of the Dominion are so constituted, first, with relation to themselves, and, secondly, with relation to countries in their vicinity, that it is impossible to combine them into a united country having satisfactory

trade relations among the different Provinces which compose it. I understand him to mean that the geographical conditions of these different component parts of the Dominion are such that they fight continually against a unity of commerce and a unity of spirit in the Confederation, and that, in this fight, these geographical difficulties, that is nature, will prove too strong, and these component parts can, therefore, never be welded into a united whole. In the first place, I wish, in reference to that, to make this remark: I believe the hon. member for South Oxford is not a tyro in politics; I believe he is not unknown to the political history of this country; I believe he has been a more or less central figure in the party to which he has belonged for some fifteen or sixteen years. If, to-day, nature is too strong for us, as the hon. gentleman says, what must nature then have been in 1868? What must nature have been in 1873? And what must nature have been from 1873 to 1879? And what, in a less degree, must nature have been from 1879 up to the present? But we never before heard of the hon. gentleman introducing such a resolution as this, or anything akin to this; we have never heard of his proposing such a remedy as this, or anything akin to it, until this present year of grace of 1888, when the difficulties which nature has placed in our way have been, to a large extent, overcome by the energy and enterprise and wealth of the people. In 1868, the bald proposition was made to knit these different dependencies into a united country. The hon. member for South Oxford was a supporter of that idea; he was a supporter of that plan; he has continued to support it from 1868 to 1873.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). From 1864.

Mr. FOSTER. From 1864, then. He was in the Government, and a central figure in it, from 1873 to 1879. Has he just now arrived at this conclusion? What new light has been thrown that has brought him to the conclusion that nature is too strong for us? Why, Sir, it is the triumph of man to overcome the disabilities which nature throws in his way. It is the triumph of modern science, than which nothing has been more wonderful in the history of the world, to overcome geographical difficulties, to overcome the disabilities of distance, to overcome physical obstructions, and to overcome them in the interest of the unity of countries and in the interest of the spread of commerce. And it appears to me that if, in 1868, if in 1873, if in the years since then, the hon. gentleman did not feel that nature was so strong as to drive him to propose a heroic remedy, there is all the less reason to-day to adduce that as an argument, and an argument, as it seems to me, of an extraordinarily weak character. For between 1868 and this time, we have done what? We have introduced Provinces, that had no knowledge of each other, to each other; and they have become acquainted. We have completed great lines of water communication, than which no country possesses longer and better; we have built great lines of railway communication, which are channels and arteries for the commerce of this country, and which now extend from one side of the continent to the other, and in all these ways we have put nature at a minimum of disadvantage, compared to the maximum of disadvantage that she put us to in 1868. If it be true that we must never contend against nature, and that we must seek for our commerce channels that run in geographical lines, then the history of the world has been teaching us a wrong lesson. Nature was strong as between the eastern and the southern and western parts of the United States, by means of the almost illimitable distances that separated them. Man triumphed over nature, and spanned the prairies of the United States with constantly extending lines of commerce. Nature stood strong, and vast, and rugged between the two slopes of the United States, the western and the eastern slope, in the shape of a line of moun-

tains that run down between these two sections. Modern science and modern enterprise tunnelled those mountains, modern science and modern enterprise overcame those difficulties, and has introduced a direct and intimate relation of commerce between the east and middle States of the United States and the western States, and between the eastern slope and the western slope. Science and enterprise have been at work in our own Dominion of Canada, and, whereas, the Rocky Mountain range stood there as an impassable barrier for many and many a year, between our eastern and our western slope, it has been tunnelled and science has surmounted the difficulty, to the wonder of the world, and to-day the life-blood of commerce flows not only from our Atlantic to our Pacific slope, but over that line which we have built, overcoming nature, the great east and the great west speak to each other and give to each other the message of increasing commerce. Time was when the Alps formed an impassable barrier between Italy and the rest of Europe, but they have been tunnelled, and German, and Italian, and European life flow together along that line which has been constructed by engineering skill. It is no argument to say that a country shall give over its attempt to build up a nationality because geographical difficulties and geographical distances are in the way. If there is one thing more than another which brings out and shows to the full the innate energy and power of a people, it is this action which is not only the proof of their present power, but the guarantee of their future greatness. It is that they will set themselves together in a united effort to overcome and to vanquish nature, and to rise in spite of that to national greatness and prosperity. That argument, therefore, is not a sufficient one to show that we should introduce this heroic method. The next argument which the hon. gentleman introduced was this: that we had no other natural market, and my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) reiterated that idea. What do they mean by a natural market? Is it not quite possible that this phrase should be used without meaning? What is the natural market for a country? Is it a geographical market? By no means. If that were true, the natural market for Great Britain would be France, which lies closest to it, as we all know, but we also know that there is not the same traffic between Great Britain and France as there is between Great Britain and countries which lie thousands and thousands of miles away. If that statement were true, Great Britain's trade would not have extended, as it has done, to India, to China, to Japan and to every country in the wide world. A natural market, it seems to me, is a market in which you can place things which are demanded by that country and which are not produced, or are not produced in sufficient quantity by that country. That is the natural market for your country, and so it comes to pass that the West Indies are more of a natural market for Halifax or for Nova Scotia than the Province of New Brunswick, which lies close beside them; and so it happens that countries which are the diameter of the world apart are more of a natural market than those which lie contiguous to each other. So it is not a sufficient proof that we should adopt this heroic remedy because the phrase expression is given vent to that we have no natural market, and that we need the United States for a natural market. Again, the loss of population was an argument advanced by the hon. gentleman. We must revolutionise the condition of this country, we must step out on an unknown plank, we must leave the ground upon which we have stood for years, we must burn the bridges and cut the connections which are dear to us, because there has been a movement of population in this country. I do not deny that there has been a movement of population. I do not deny that there is always a movement of population from older countries to new countries, and from the older parts of new countries to

Mr. FOSTER.

the newer parts. That is a world-wide fact, especially as far as the movement of population from Europe to America is concerned, and more especially in regard to the Anglo-Saxon race. My hon. friend was mathematically precise in his assertions. He brought down an exact statement that one out of four of the Canadian people is, as he unfortunately said, exiled to a foreign country, and that three out of four of the foreign people who come to this country land themselves in the country which lies to the south and west of us. Will you think of what followed that statement which was so precise, so mathematically certain, so definite in its proportions of one to four and three to four, in the way of argument, to prove its correctness? It needs simply for me to say, and the hon. gentlemen who heard the speech, or, if they did not hear it, who will read the speech will bear me out, that the argument was totally inadequate to the assertion and that the assertion remains unproved. But the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has more than that to do. He has to prove not only that there has been this movement of population, but that the heroic remedy which he proposes will stop that movement. The larger portion of the argument of last night and of to-day was totally irrelevant, and I shall not attempt to deal with it. Let those hon. gentlemen beat upon it until the anvil is beaten out by the hammer. It has nothing to do with the question unless you establish, in addition to that, that, if we adopt this proposal, that movement of population will cease. Will hon. gentlemen think for a moment why the movement of population takes place from older countries to newer? Will my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) think a little more on that question, a little hard thinking would not hurt him, will he ask himself why people leave Prince Edward Island for the west? He says it is not on account of the soil—granted; that it is not on account of the climate—granted; it is not on account of the laws under which we live and the flag under which we live—granted. Why, then, do they leave? They leave mainly for two reasons: one, because they seek industrial employment which shall bring them in a larger amount for their labor, and the other, to get on lands broader and freer so that they may be able to try their agricultural capacities on these larger lands. Those are the principal reasons why they leave the older portions of the country. Unfortunately there was a long period when Canada had no North-West, when she had no broad prairie country to which her children could go, but the United States of America had a broad prairie country, which was opened up by lines of railways, into which the surplus population and the adventurous population of the older States of America, looking for broader and freer privileges in regard to land, went and gradually settled. Into western New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Illinois they went, further west as the lines of communication were opened up, and many of our own people went there, impelled by the same considerations and settled in the western States, and the germ always brings the accumulation, and the nucleus which was planted there drew upon those who remained. And, Sir, if Canada ever wished to keep her independent and prosperous course, it was of the first importance that she should have and open out for herself a country of broad lands, a country of prairie freedom, a country of those new conditions. Sir, it was eminently wise that the North-West should be added, and wiser still that it should be opened up, and all the wiser because of the keen competition which that country and Canada had to face in comparison with the United States of America. Now, Sir, we are in the position that when our people from the older Provinces wish broader and freer lands, they can go out into our own North-West, whither the great body of the people who go from our older sections to-day are turning their steps, and where they will make their homes

under the same flag, and will still remain citizens of Canada. My honorable and philosophical friend shakes his head as though it were not so. Is it not more so than it was twenty years ago? Is it not more so than it was five years ago? Is it not more and more so each year? Let time have its sway, let the country open up, let the prosperous years repeat themselves, let the nucleus of population go in there from different countries, each calling back to its own home for a part of its own to come and join it under new conditions, and this country's future, with reference to that part of the subject, is as assured as the United States are assured with reference to themselves. The other section of the people went away because they wished to earn ready money, they went into the industrial centres in order to earn it. They found no industrial centres in Prince Edward Island. If after the farming season had passed, and they wanted to earn something for the crowded family, the quickest way they could find to earn it was to take boat and rail and go down to the manufacturing towns of Maine, to the manufacturing towns of New England, and earn their wages during the winter, coming back in the summer to work upon their farms. Canada was at a disadvantage in that respect, and the National Policy has nothing better to commend it to these people, and nothing better to give a strong hold among these people, than the fact that it is meeting successfully that need. Here and there in the different centres of our country, industrial institutions are springing up, manufacturing establishments are opening up, into which the young people of our own country who wish to earn ready money all the year, or at odd times, find a chance for employment, and a wage for their earning hour. These are the two chief causes that take people away, and these are the two that are being gradually and surely removed in our country. Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask hon. gentlemen here: Has there been a shadow of proof to substantiate the position that the moment you have unrestricted reciprocity, all this movement of population will cease, and we will have no more people going out of Canada into the western States? Not one jot or tittle of proof to that end has been furnished. I hold that it will be opposite. To-day there are many things that restrain a man when he thinks about going from his own country and making his home in another. There are sentimental conditions that bind him, and which he must break before he goes. One of the strongest sentimental conditions is the change from flag to flag. You may call it sentiment, and you may say what you like about mock patriotism, and mock loyalty, but it is a feeling down in the heart of every man that is worthy the name of man. Sir, the very moment you weaken those ties by the current of commercial inter-communication, by that consensus of feeling and tendency which follows the channel of commercial communication, leading one to believe that there is no difference between the countries, that one flag is about the same as the other, that it is to the interests of these people that they shall so look upon it, that moment you weaken those ties and you thereby leave the drift towards the other country easier, more certain and more frequent than it otherwise would be. That, I believe, will commend itself to the sober second thought of those who look carefully into this matter. Therefore, I conclude, in the first place, that the hon. gentleman is utterly wanting in proof that if this heroic remedy is adopted it will stop the egress of population, and, in the second place, that this country is taking the best possible means to stop that egress of population, and is being successful in the means it has taken.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It has increased double.

Mr. FOSTER. That reminds me of something. When the hon. gentleman from South Oxford and the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) were in the Government of this country, from 1873 to 1879, was there no exodus of population?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There were, on the average, 22,000 a year, and since then there have been, in some years, four times that number.

Mr. FOSTER. How wonderfully and mathematically precise my hon. friend is. He will not allow the palm to be taken from him by the mathematical precision of the hon. member for South Oxford. Though the hon. member for South Oxford is well inclined to put up with small things and make his figure 1 and 4, and 3 and 4, my hon. friend from Bothwell has a broader and wider mind, and runs up into the thousands. Was there not an egress of population from 1873 to 1879? Does not the country know that there was a heavy outgo of population in those years? Do not all our records teach it? The fact is, Sir, and I challenge proof to the contrary, that in those disastrous years the population that went out from this country, that was driven from it, was far larger than has gone out in as many years since. When my hon. friend from South Oxford was in the Government, when my hon. friend from Bothwell was in the Government, was there no need of a heroic remedy when the population was leaving us more rapidly than it is to-day? But to-day a heroic remedy is trotted out when hon. gentlemen, having failed on all other cries, wanted another fad to buoy them up. Now, Sir, the next argument that is given us why this heroic remedy should be brought in is, that there is a diminution in the valuation of farm lands and farm produce. Now, you will notice that my hon. friend from South Oxford last night adduced no proof to show that farm land was decreasing in value in this country more rapidly than in the country to the south of us. He adduced not a single tittle of proof to show that farm produce was bringing less in this country than in the United States. He simply made the bald and bold assertion that farm property and farm produce in this country were decreasing in value. My hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White) flatly and explicitly contradicted that statement of the depreciation in farm land in the Province of Ontario. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) said: Well, but they have not increased much. We are not on the point now as to how much they have increased. My hon. friend from South Oxford said that they were positively decreasing in value for a series of years, although the statistical record beside him went to show that they were not decreasing, but there was an increase, though slight, in the value. Will my hon. friend maintain the proposition that there are not causes, wider and broader than any he has mentioned here, to account for the depreciation in value—or, put it in another way, for the not so rapid increase in the value of farm produce in this age of the world compared with ten years ago, fifteen years ago, or twenty years ago? Can you find me an old country in the world in which farm lands are not in more or less difficulty from various causes? The difficulty is brought about by wide and varied economic forces at work now which were not at work before. But, Sir, will my friend maintain the proposition that the countries of the United States, situated as to age, situated as to geographical latitude and longitude much the same as we are situated, have not a greater diminution in values and a greater augmentation in difficulties by the way of debts and mortgages which surround them? Why, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and Connecticut have enjoyed the whole freedom of the United States, have had the whole advantage of commercial union, of unrestricted reciprocity, and yet you have only to take the records to show that the difficulties existing there, with respect to those lands, are greater, by far, than those which exist with regard to our own lands. Suppose my hon. friend proves that there is not a rapid rise in the values of lands in this country, does that prove that they would be more rapid if unrestricted reciprocity were

the rule? Does that prove they would be more rapid if we had a wider channel of commercial intercourse—unrestricted reciprocity with the United States? That is what they must prove before they establish the proposition that the heroic remedy should be applied, founded upon this as a reason for its being applied. I desire in the next place to notice the statement which was made, that there has been a total reduction in the volume of trade, and that there is no inter-provincial trade in this country, and there cannot possibly be any. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was not ingenuous in that argument or in that statement. He did not state the whole truth, and he did not state it in the way it should be stated, in order to convey the impression that ought to be conveyed. He took the year 1873, an abnormal year, and he made the statement that the volume of trade is to-day less than it was in 1873, and he proves it by what? By simply taking the amount of foreign trade—the exports and imports. He said nothing with regard to the great decrease in the volume of that trade when he was in power from 1873 to 1879, when it went from \$127,000,000 of imports for home consumption down to \$72,000,000, when it went from \$217,000,000 of total trade down to \$153,000,000; and yet although there was this constant and fearful diminution of the volume of trade, measured as he measured it, there was no need then for the heroic remedy. There was no resolution then, embodied as a principle of government and carried out in practice, that we must have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. No, wiser counsels prevailed then. Even though these hon. gentlemen, in their position as being in the Government, had wished for anything like that the solid common sense of the Premier at that time intervened between his party and such absurd nonsense as they seem to be guilty of, when once his leadership was taken from them. He made, as the Government which preceded him made, honest, straightforward and self-respecting proposals to the United States over and over again, and when he exhausted all that honorable proposal could make, with reference to the country in this matter of trade, and when some of his followers foolishly pressed on the hon. gentleman to enter into negotiations, again and again Mr. Mackenzie rose in his place in Parliament and said: No, I have made proposals, Canada has taken the initiative again and again, our proposals have been refused; now we will wait until the power to the south of us makes some proposition to us, which we will be prepared to consider and to entertain. But let me say something in support of my proposition that the whole truth was not stated. Does not my hon. friend know that the trade of a country is not to be measured by the sum of its imports plus the sum of its exports? Does he not know that it is not a fair comparative measurement to simply give the sum total of the exports and imports without going into the quality of the imports? My hon. friend knows that the great difference between the imports in his period and the imports since 1878 has been this: that while the imports then consisted of articles, not only natural articles but articles upon which all labor had been expended to make them perfect and complete in a foreign country, the cost of which was added to the natural cost and thus went to swell the sum total of the imports, to-day the exact opposite is the case in several of the most important particulars, and to-day a large quantity is brought in in the rough, in the less costly form, and it is worked up for the consumption of this country by the labor of our own people. Sir, in the former time ships went to the country of production for raw sugar. The raw product was taken to Great Britain, and British ships took the freights upon it. That sugar was carried on British railways to British refineries, and British railways had their profits. British workmen worked up the sugar, and the wages were paid to British people. Then it was put in cars and steamships and sent to St. John, Halifax or Montreal with the maxi-

Mr. FOSTER.

mum of cost; and that, Sir, went into the figures upon which the total imports were based. That was the case with 90 per cent, if I mistake not, of the sugar consumed here. To-day of the whole sugar consumed in this country 96 per cent., if I mistake not, comes raw from the places where it is grown. It is brought into our own country, it is carried upon our own railways, worked up in our own refineries, and all the added cost put upon it goes into the pockets of our own people. That, of course, makes a vast difference. So it is with the cotton trade and the woollen trade and with a hundred and one other products, though in a less degree, but yet in some degree. The hon. member for South Oxford took care not to state this fact, but the people will take care to remember it and to ponder it well before they adopt the heroic remedy. Well, Sir, there is another question that is necessary to be put: If our trade is decreasing, how do you explain this fact? In 1875 the total registered tonnage entering into and out of the ports of this country, excluding coasting vessels always, was 9,537,000 tons, in 1876 it was 9,911,000 tons, in 1887 it was a little more than 14,000,000 tons. Did these vessels come in simply for pleasure; were they simply beating about upon the wild and yeasty waves making port now and then for the purpose of getting entered and cleared; or were they here on business and to carry on the commerce of the country? The latter evidently. From 1875 to 1879 the average tonnage of Canada, as I have explained, was 10,700,000 tons, the average tonnage from 1880 to 1887 was 13,700,000 tons, an increase of 3,000,000 a year on an average. What is all this doing? Take the railways. They are far more in number now than they were then; they have far more carrying capacity now than they had formerly, and the records as given in the railway statistics show an immense increase in the freight carried. That increase is something like this: In 1879 the tons of freight carried by railways in Canada were 8,000,000 odd, in 1886 they were nearly 16,000,000, almost double the amount of freight that was carried by our railways in 1879. What does this mean? Is this freight which is being simply carried down to one terminus, put on board some train and carried back to its starting point, to show the amount of freight carried, or is it real trade? Evidently the latter. My hon. friend's premises were wrong, and his contention was utterly futile, when he strove to make us believe that we should adopt a heroic remedy because of this alleged falling off in the volume of trade. He also says that we have no inter-provincial trade. Why, in relation to this, I can refer my Nova Scotia friends to one of their organs—I mean one of their human organs and not a newspaper organ. If there is any man who has raised a noise about himself in the Maritime Provinces, within the last three or four years, it has been Attorney General Longley, and Attorney General Longley's great fight with the Confederation, his great fight against "anti-continentalism," as he calls it is, that Nova Scotia for instance, is sending \$12,000,000 a year to Ontario to pay for goods which come down to her. What does that mean?—inter-provincial trade I think. I will allow my friend to settle that with his friend Attorney General Longley. Well, Sir, is there no other proof of inter-provincial trade than that statement, because if there were none other I should not consider it altogether satisfactory; but I think there is. I find that the Intercolonial Railway carried 175,512 tons of coal in 1887, but that is by no means all the coal which comes from Nova Scotia to Quebec and to the edges of Ontario. Every season, as my hon. friend knows, there are lines of steamers carrying heavy coal freights from Cape Breton, and Sydney, and other places, in this direction. I think there is some inter-provincial trade here. Well, Sir, look again at the sugar trade. There was no inter-provincial trade in sugar in the olden times. I find that last year the Intercolonial Railway carried 143,998 barrels of sugar from the Halifax and

Moncton refineries into those upper Provinces. I find that over three-quarters of a million of barrels of flour were carried on the Intercolonial Railway last year, a large proportion of which went to the Maritime Provinces. Why, Sir, my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island is aware of that when the Prince Edward Island Government presented a case against this Government on account of what they thought was a fair claim for compensation, because the communication with the main land had not been satisfactorily carried out, and when it was shown by a report to the Council, which has found its way into the public records, that the amount contributed in Customs by Prince Edward Island was comparatively small, that statement was met by the counter-statement that Prince Edward Island buys very largely from the other Provinces of Canada and consequently that her import figures are no criterion of the Customs upon the imports or of the amount she contributes in this way to the general revenue. To-day Prince Edward Island buys from Halifax, St. John and Montreal, and there is a large and increasing inter-provincial trade in that direction. I might carry this argument further and further, but I think I have stated enough to show that there is a volume of trade far above what was spoken of or what is shown by the simple addition of imports and exports which was relied upon by my friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Again I state he has failed to show the necessity for a heroic remedy by that argument which he has adduced. Those were mainly the arguments he placed before the House. He spoke about debts and taxes. Will he get rid of our debts if we become immersed in this unrestricted reciprocity arrangement? Shall we not have to pay our municipal debts as before? Shall we not have to pay our city debts as before, and shall we not have to pay our Provincial and Dominion debts as before? Shall we not have the costs and charges for government and improvements the same as before? It does not seem to me that there is any prospect of getting rid of them on account of bringing into operation this heroic remedy. Then, Sir, he states that there is no adequate return for public works. What does he mean by "adequate return?" Does he mean that because the great public works in Canada have not paid, in dollars and cents, a revenue, that, therefore, they have not made any adequate return to this great country in its development and extension? If he does, he means something with which I venture to think the majority of this House will not agree. I could quote to him a speech made by the Hon. G. W. Ross not more than two months ago, at a dinner in Toronto, when that gentleman most eloquently portrayed the prosperity of Canada before our illustrious visitor, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, at a banquet given in that city, and in which Mr. Ross pointed out with pride those great public works, our canals and our railways, which he declared were necessary to and a most invaluable factor in the prosperity and growth of this country, and which he was inclined to believe were a signal success. So much with reference to that. The last argument of all is that the federal constitution is about to collapse, but it is said that if you open up this channel of commerce and take commodities free across the border it will have some sort of a magic, subtle, decisive, and healthy effect, that the threatened collapse will be stayed, and the members which now appear to be disjointed will be healed and made sane and sound for all time to come. I venture to say, Sir, while reviewing all the arguments adduced by the hon. gentleman that he has not proved the necessity for his heroic remedy. On the contrary let hon. gentlemen look at the state of the country as it exists to-day. Was it ever in a sounder state in every way? If you look at its position you will see that the credit of Canada was never higher than it is to-day, when our four per cents reach the overtopping figure of 111, 111½ or 111¾.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. 113 now.

Mr. FOSTER. 113 now, my hon. friend informs me. Yes, Sir, if there was something radically wrong which needs this terrible heroic remedy, which needs this revolutionary plaster applied to it in the body politic of the Dominion of Canada, how is it that the wide awake financiers of the great money centres of the world consider the credit of Canada so good that her bonds are constantly appreciating in value and constantly sought after by them as collaterals, in stock and securities. There is another important feature in the case. The revenue of this country is improving. A few years ago when, because of certain reasons, there was a deficit for one or two years, there might have been some grounds for saying we needed a remedy. That has passed away, and to-day the revenue is more than meeting the ordinary expenditure of the country. Then again, Sir, the extraordinary public works are well provided for. Our canals and our great lines of railway, which have cost the country so many millions of dollars, are now completed. They are as good for fifty millions of people as they are for five millions, and it will not be necessary to undertake the extra expense of building those public works again. They need not be duplicated. Once built they stand for the use of the people of this country, though they be never so numerous or never so prosperous. The trade of this country has improved and is increasing daily; not only the foreign trade but the inter-provincial trade as well, and, after all, the true prosperity of the country depends more upon the variety and extent of this inter-provincial trade than it does on its foreign trade. The United States of America is one of the best examples of what I say. Again, the manufacturing interests of this country are in a better condition than they have ever been in the history of Canada. Time was, four or five years ago, when disasters were overtaking our manufacturing industries to a greater or less extent, and when there might have been some ground for claiming on that behalf the need of a heroic remedy. To-day our manufacturing industries are stable and sound, paying fair dividends to those who put money into them, as they should, and giving out their produce to the people at low prices, which, owing to the competition, it is right and natural that they should. There is nothing, then, in the state of the manufacturing industries of the country to call for heroic treatment. What about the business of the country? Have you watched the payments at the banks within the past few days? Have they not been satisfactory from Halifax to Victoria? Have you read the reports of the bank managers? Have they not given a good account of the business of the country? But appeal to your own experience: Is it not true that throughout Canada, from one end to the other, though there may be cases of difficulty here and there, as there always will be, the business of the country is on a stable, firm and sound foundation, and the people are satisfied with the prospects from a business point of view. Our soil is giving forth its good crops—abundant crops in some parts of the country—and the crop of this year has brought a fair average return. Taking all these things into consideration as the reverse of the picture which has been shown to us from the other side of the House, have we not good ground for saying that not only is the case of my hon. friend from South Oxford not proven, but that a strong case stands apparent before every hon. member for not disturbing the present relations, on the ground that under present conditions the country is fairly prosperous, and its future seems fairly well assured? Then, Sir, why this cry? I have noted the reason before: It is because hon. gentlemen opposite, having attempted to climb into power, by attaching themselves to this issue and that issue, to this sad and that sad, having made their bids to the people from unworthy motives and on unworthy grounds in many instances,

have been shaken off from the skirts of the garments of the country, and find themselves to-day without a cry; and so they ring out again the old gospel of discontent, and appeal to the widest and strongest class we have in this country, hoping to raise and rouse the farming community into ferment, thinking thereby that they may gain votes in this House, and possibly become a majority instead of a minority in this country. But I have full faith in the intelligence of the farming community, that, if this question comes to be a serious question, to be fought out before them, and both sides of it are fully ventilated, the farmers of this country will hold themselves aloof from the bait held out to them, and will keep themselves to the connections they have to-day, well assured that by so doing their future will not be prejudiced, but, on the contrary, will be prosperous. Now, Sir, the next question that comes is this: The first thing my hon. friend and his supporters had to prove was that a heroic remedy of some kind is necessary. The next thing they would have to prove, if they had been successful in that (which they have not), is that this is the remedy. Now, will hon. gentlemen follow me for a single moment while I deal with the arguments which have been adduced to show that this remedy is the proper remedy. What are they? The hon. member for South Oxford said that this was the remedy and the only remedy. How long has he been of that opinion? As a political physician, how long has he been conducting his diagnosis, and at what particular period of time did it terminate in the conclusion that the remedy was unrestricted reciprocity, and not commercial union or free trade? Well, Sir, not long; for speeches are on record, delivered not many months ago, scarcely yet cold, in which hon. gentlemen opposite, not a few, but many of them, were out full fledged and in full blast in favor of commercial union and commercial union alone as the panacea. However, the diagnosis has gone on; the different physicians have consulted; they came to a conclusion a few days ago, and they believe now that this is the sole and sovereign remedy. What are the reasons given? The first reason is that it will help everybody and hurt nobody. That would be a very good reason if it were proved; but after the assertion should come proof, and so, although my hon. friend glibly asserted that it would help the fishermen, the miners, the lumbermen and the agriculturists and the manufacturers of pluck and brains, he utterly failed to give details of any kind to show the House and the country wherein it would help them or be a special benefit to them. The hon. gentleman said the only classes hurt by it would be: first, the combines; second, the civil service; third, the promoters of elections; and fourth, those who were anxious for piers and wharves and harbors. Now, was my hon. friend really serious? It is such advocacy as that which makes me doubt still whether they intend to make this a real issue, or whether they are not only playing with it to keep themselves in practice until the next eligible thing comes up. The hon. gentleman who says this question should be approached by us as by philosophers and statesmen and not flunkeys, makes the bold assertion that everybody in Canada would be helped except these four classes by this proposition being accepted; and yet a breath or two before he stated that it was a grave question, that it would cause great disturbance, that it was a large change of policy that would be serious in its consequences. Combines! If we have a combination in this Dominion of Canada, it is a Lilliput compared with one of the combinations on the other side, for instance the Standard oil combination. Why, Sir, I can just fancy, if it was this side of the House that was asking for a measure to stop combinations and we proposed as a remedy a union in commerce with the United States, how every file of papers published in the United States would be flashed around these seats, and editorial after editorial read to show that combinations in this country bore no comparison with those in the United States. If you wish to remedy

Mr. FOSTER.

combinations, this proposition would indeed be a case of the big fish eating up the little fish, for the small combinations we have here would be swallowed *holus bolus* by the large combinations on the other side; and what would happen? We to-day have in our hands a remedy for combinations in our own country in this Parliament, if a parliamentary remedy can be got. But if we put ourselves into the hands of a combination which octopus-like stretches its arms over a country, where we have no legislative jurisdiction, where is the remedy so far as we are concerned? And yet the hon. gentleman thinks fewer combinations would be had under unrestricted reciprocity. Does he propose to blot out the Civil Service if we have unrestricted reciprocity? Will we not need the public service of the country to be carried on, and so have a civil service? I say it seems to me the hon. gentleman is not yet really serious in his advocacy of this question. But if he were serious when he introduced it, something intervened between the time of the introduction of the measure and the time when, towards the end of his speech, he made that trivial assertion which took the seriousness out of him and out of his subject. Well, he says, as an additional reason in favor of his proposition, that the poor man in this country pays the highest taxation and that when we get reciprocity he will pay less taxation. Now the hon. gentleman attacks as monstrously unjust, and the hon. member for Queen's (P.E.I.) reiterated the same argument, and challenged proof to the contrary, the statement that the poor man does not pay the heavy weight of taxation in this country. But when the hon. gentleman was asked on this side to point out the articles on which the poor man paid his heavy tax, he let off an extra edition of the fireworks he always keeps on hand, but took great care to aim no straight bullet at the mark which was put before him. I challenge him now or any hon. gentleman on that side to go into particulars, and to prove, in the first place, that the poor man pays the weight of taxation; and to prove, in the second place, that if he does, unrestricted reciprocity will remove that weight in any measure. Look at the question as it stands. What does the poor man buy on which he pays this heavy taxation? Take, first, the fairly well-to-do class. Take, for instance, the farmer. On what does he pay taxes? Most articles that go into the food of his family, so far as their daily wants are concerned, is raised on his own farm, and on these articles he does not pay a cent of taxation. Then the large proportion of the clothing he and his family wear is made out of the products of his own farm or of this country, and no taxes paid. With him the luxuries he buys are the minimum whilst with the wealthy man the luxuries rise to the maximum, and in this country the practice is followed of putting the weight of taxation on the luxuries and taking it off the necessities. Oh, but my hon. friend says, there is the tariff on coarse woollens, and consequently the man who wears these woollens pays a heavy tax on every yard he uses. Does he? The farmer has sheep on his own farm, which he often shears himself, and whose wool he has often made up in the mill of his own locality, and his family wear the clothes thus manufactured. Where is the tax that is paid on these? The statement that the tax is paid in this case can only be affirmed on two grounds: First, that all the woollen clothing worn in this country is manufactured in large establishments, or else is imported; and second, that that which is manufactured in the large manufactories, notwithstanding the competition induced, pays the tariff that is put on the imported articles. But will that be remedied by unrestricted reciprocity, which is to open up a channel of trade between this country and the United States? How will the tax be taken off the woollens worn by the farmers, or the other materials he uses for his wear, since in the United States a heavier tax is imposed on these articles than is imposed here? We are asked to enter into commercial relations with a country

which has a higher tariff than we have, and in the name of common sense I would ask how then are the taxes here to be lowered? The proposition falls to the ground of its own weight: first that the poor man pays the tax; and second, that the tax will be taken off if unrestricted reciprocity be the rule. But the hon. gentleman says it will suit Great Britain and the United States, and my hon. friend was not content with drawing a picture of this country in hues of the very blackness of despair, but he must needs have his fling at the mother country as well. And in these troublous times, when forces are at work which at any moment may create a great conflagration, the outcome of which no man can foresee, and when even the utterances of men in a Parliament of this kind, have their effect more or less in the wide world in which they are read, the hon. gentleman must go out of his way to taunt Great Britain with having no ally on the continent of Europe among the first-class powers. Sir, the position of Great Britain has been well-taken and well-maintained in the past. The institutions of Britain are, to-day, stronger than ever they were before; the power of the Anglo-Saxon race the wide world over, is as great as ever, while the spirit of their enterprise displayed around this whole globe of ours, and which strengthens and enobles the British power, taken collectively as a whole, has never been manifested to greater perfection than it is to-day. Great Britain will take good care to hold her proud position, and it was not manly or statesmanlike in the hon. gentleman, occupying the position he does, to question in this House her ability to retain the great influence she has always exercised in European affairs. But supposing Great Britain has no ally among the first-class powers in Europe, does the hon. gentleman propose to make for her an ally of the United States, and to embroil the United States in the European entanglements which affect Great Britain alone? Does he think that the United States, which have kept themselves religiously aloof from European entanglements, will make an alliance with Great Britain, and thus run the risk of involving themselves with Great Britain, in all the European complications that are liable to rise at any moment? What influence the great powers of reasoning of the hon. gentleman may have on the government of the United States in this respect, I cannot say, but judging from the specimens of his logic we have heard here within the last twenty-four hours, I am inclined to think his arguments will not stir the United States from the position they have hitherto maintained. What a fine method that would be of making an ally for the mother country, by putting ourselves in commercial union with the United States and raising a discriminating tariff wall against our mother land. The proposal does seem odd, though there may be some abstruse meaning in it that we cannot seize, but of which the hon. member for South Oxford is fully aware. But he says, we will not discriminate largely against Great Britain, and this afternoon, I think I heard him say that our trade with Great Britain would be actually improved. Just analyse that for a moment. Here are 5,000,000 of Canadians, here is an open channel of trade between Canada and the United States, and here is an hon. gentleman asserting that the trade between the two countries will grow to \$300,000,000 a year. Now what will happen? Between the United States and this country, there will be no tariff, while between this country and Great Britain there is a tariff of fairly good proportions, say 22 or 25 per cent. We enter this commercial alliance. We create a trade between the two countries that will reach \$300,000,000 a year; and then, when we grow rich and wax fat and sleek, the hon. gentleman says he will turn to our own mother country and import goods from her, on which we will pay the extra Customs duty, just for the sake of showing that in the long run our trade with Great Britain will not suffer. That is a most unreasonable proposition. The

currents of trade, if they be free and advantageous to ourselves, will be kept for the sake of the advantages they offer, and it would be proved by the experiment, if the experiment should be ever unfortunately made, that our trade with Great Britain would dwindle to almost nothing, because the odds are against our trading with the country on whose goods we put a tariff of 25 per cent, as compared with a country between which and ourselves there is no tariff. But the hon. gentleman says, if we consider advisable to discriminate against Great Britain, we have the right to do so. We have our own interests and they are paramount, and that assertion was made still stronger to-day by the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) Now, I have two or three links in a chain of reasoning that I would like the hon. gentlemen to follow, if I can clearly express it. The hon. member for South Oxford says: If it does discriminate against Great Britain, we have a right to do it, our own interests are paramount, which is equivalent to saying, on a fair interpretation, that, whenever the time comes that it is better for us to do thus, and so in commercial matters, we have a right to do so, and it is our duty to do so in our own interests; and he then makes the second assertion that we owe nothing to Great Britain but charity for the atrocious blundering she has been guilty of in regard to our interests. There is first the statement that we have nothing but our own interests to regard because they are paramount and secondly, there is the assertion that the paramount idea of our own interests has been overridden by Great Britain. And then the hon. gentleman goes on to clench all that by saying that there never was a time in her own history when Canada could not have bettered her condition by linking her interests with the United States of America. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I ask hon. gentlemen around these boards to tell me which is the most honorable position, that occupied by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) or that occupied by my hon. friend from the City of St. John, N.B. (Mr. Ellis). I can imagine a colloquy in the corridors between my friend from St. John and my friend from South Oxford. My friend from St. John says: Sir Knight, you tell me that our own interests should be paramount? Yes. You tell me that we owe Great Britain nothing but charity, and very little of that? Yes. You tell me that there never was any time when Canada's interests would not have been better served by linking them with the United States of America? Yes. Then, why do you not say at once: Let us link our fortunes with the United States of America, and why do you not be as brave and honest about it as I am? The only difference between these two hon. gentlemen is—and it is to the credit of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis)—that he believes thus and so, and has the courage to express it, even though it may be unpalatable to the gentlemen around him and to the people among whom he lives, while my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) contends and works in the same line, but he is afraid of outside opinion and gilds it over by saying Oh, no, I am not an annexationist, I do not believe in annexation. That is the only difference between them, and I think it is in favor of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis) and I willingly give him the credit due. Then we are told as a reason why this is the peculiar and only remedy, that it will give the United States a great home market in Canada. The hon. gentleman believes in the doctrine of equivalents. He is superlatively honest, and he would not take anything without giving something in return, and he is perforce driven by his own innate spirit of right to maintain the argument that there will be equivalents, and one of those is that the United States will get a large home market in Canada. Let us reason that out. There are five millions of people in Canada. They buy all they are able to now. They buy that from certain persons now. My hon. friend from South Oxford says to the people of the United States.

Adopt this scheme, and you will get a largely extended home market in Canada. What will happen? If they get that home market, the people of Canada cannot buy more than they are able to. It will be simply a displacement, and the people of the United States, the merchants of the United States, will get what our merchants and our industrial centres now get. In what will they find a home market in this country? For their coal, in Nova Scotia? If they do, I ask my hon. friend whether he can find a market for American coal in Nova Scotia, without displacing an equal quantity of coal brought up from the mines in Nova Scotia, and, if he displaces Nova Scotia coal by American coal, I ask him what becomes of the men who, with drill, pick and lamp, earn that which supports their families and builds up their villages by mining the coal in the depths under the sea in the Province of Nova Scotia. They will only be able to obtain a market by displacing what is now provided by our own people, and, if they get a market in regard to manufactures, in regard to agricultural produce, in regard to sugar, they can only do it by displacing those who are now carrying on these trades as Canadians, who are improving Canadian industries, with profits to the Canadian people. The hon. gentleman adopts the *dictum* of Attorney General Longley, who says that, instead of getting ten or twelve million dollars' worth from Upper Canada, they will get it from the United States. The exporters in Boston and New York will gain, but what about the merchants and manufacturers of Halifax and the Lower Provinces, and what about the millers and wheat growers in the other Provinces? I have not the time to carry out this reasoning, but hon. gentlemen can carry it out for themselves, and they will come to the conclusion that in nearly every case every dollar's worth of goods obtained from the United States in the way of an increased home market in Canada will displace an equal amount which has come generally through Canadian channels. That is what the apostle of commercial union declares. Mr. Wiman lets out a great deal of the truth, and sometimes this truth gets to our ears. Speaking in Newark, N. J., he says:

"If new markets for relief of over-production, created by the stimulant of protection, can be made accessible" —

What does that mean? It means simply that the producing power of the United States is over and above what is necessary to furnish its own market, and can easily have a surplus to send into other countries and other markets. Where would it be sent? Into Canada, says he. To do what? To displace an equal amount now furnished by the woollen and cotton manufacturers of Canada —

—"without disturbing in the slightest the perfect equilibrium of existing taxation, clearly it is the duty of the protectionist to secure these markets, not only because of the immediate outlet which they afford, but as an illustration of the benefits of his favorite policy. Further, if these new markets, secured by the protectionist without sacrifice, are got at the expense of a free trade nation, so much the better. This would be one of the results of commercial union. The total trade of Canada, a portion of the British Empire, is about \$200,000,000. Two-thirds of it, it is supposed, can be secured by the United States, by simply lifting up the Customs line that now runs through the middle of the continent, and stretching it right around the continent. This would not only admit to more than half the continent all American manufacturers, but it would create in their favor, in one part of the British Empire, a discrimination against the manufacturers of another part of the British Empire. Can anything be more attractive to the average American protectionist than this advantage over the pauper labor of Europe?"

And Mr. Hitt, who has been glorified as one of the joint laborers in this heroic remedy which is to be applied by the hon. gentleman, states this a little more fully. In speaking to eastern men—and he is a western man—at a great banquet, he declared:

"We in the west would like you manufacturers of New England to have access to that great market of Canada. With a Reciprocity Treaty or, better still, Commercial Union, you will have the preference over English, French and German goods, and in two years' time after its
Mr. FOSTER.

adoption, goods from Yankee manufacturers will be in every retail store from Montreal to Victoria."

Well, that is perfectly right as a matter to be striven after by our friends in the United States. But it remains for us seriously to consider whether it is for our interest, as a country, that we should lay our industries at this particular time, open to that competition. But again he says that it would give us the United States market. Now, that was pretty well ventilated by my colleague last night, and I shall not traverse the ground made by him. I simply draw your attention to one of the sportively imaginative statements of the hon. member for South Oxford. He talked about our railways. He said we had long lines but they were not carrying much, but just let unrestricted reciprocity come into force, and our railways might carry more to the borders and less to the seaboard, and they would speedily quadruple freights and quadruple their earnings. Well, that is a rosy statement. Did he give one iota of proof which would lead us to believe that this would be the case? Has he not stated to this House as one of the attractive points of his programme that there are large American cities along the border, that our Provinces lie contiguous to these cities. But remark that if this project were carried out, you would only have a constant stream of traffic along our lines of railway from one of these countries into another. To-day, Sir, the great traffic of our railway consists in what it carries from points distant far in the west to points distant far in the east conversely from one Province to another Province; by this proposition you would cut off to, a large extent, that great long line of traffic, and you would substitute a cross traffic in which the lines of intercommunication would be changed out of their present course by running between this country and the United States in order to get to these great cities. So much for the rosy idea of quadrupling freights and earnings of the railways of this country. With these remarks I leave that branch of my subject, hoping that I have fairly well proved that this remedy which has been proposed is not the best thing for the people of Canada. There remains one question which I shall state briefly, and that is this: Is this a favorable time in which to make a proposition for closer relations between us and the United States? My hon. friend says yes, it is the happy, happy now? And he goes on to give his reasons why it is the happy now by saying that at present tariff reductions are imminent. How far are tariff reductions imminent, so far as we can see? They are imminent only so far as the Tariff Bill brought down by Mr. Mills of Texas is concerned. That, Sir, is the extreme limit to which the people of the United States who are most favorable to the reduction in the tariff, dare to go, thinking to carry with them the support of Congress and the Senate which is necessary for the measure. If you scan that measure carefully you will find that, though on some few things the tariff is reduced, on the whole it is left far above the present average tariff of the Dominion of Canada, so that the reduction of the tariff, imminent as he says, is not a very great reduction of the tariff at the best. But he says the President, in his message, invited trade negotiations. Now, that is not a sufficient statement to go to the country. It is a sufficient statement to go to Parliament, because this Parliament is well conversant with the difference in powers between the Executive in the United States and the Executive in this country. If the Cabinet of this country, through any one of its members, or through the Governor General, made a proposition, it would be bound to carry that proposition through, and the people would consider that the country was pledged because the Government staked its life upon it. But in the United States it is very different. The President and his executive officers are, in large measure, totally distinct from and outside of the Congress and Senate of the United States. They may make suggestions, they may send down messages,

as they do from time to time, to be entirely ignored by the Congress and Senate, unless the feeling in those bodies is in their favor. Why, we had a President's message with reference to the fishery question, asking the United States' Senate to appoint a commission. It was sent down to that body, and the Senate rejected it by a vote of 35 to 10. So it is not indubitable proof that the United States is ready to meet trade propositions, because an invitation happens to be put in the President's message. Again, it was stated that Mr. Bayard's invitation to Sir Charles Tupper showed that they were ready for it. Mr. Bayard's invitation to Sir Charles Tupper was previous to the conference. When the conference came together then they were treating in a closer capacity, and the proposition was made by Sir Charles Tupper on behalf of the British Commissioners that they should approach this matter on the basis of a general commercial adjustment between the two countries, and to that Mr. Bayard and his co-plenipotentiaries gave a decisive and categorical answer in the negative, and did it, why? Because, they said, in the present condition of affairs, it would be impossible to carry it through Congress and the Senate, whose support is necessary to give it life. Could anything more clearly show that the public opinion of the United States is not ripe for a proposition of this kind? The hon. gentleman again says that another indication is Mr. Butterworth's Bill, and Mr. Hitt's Bill. I have not time to lay before you the documents that I have, to show you the fact that, for years, Bills and resolutions like Mr. Hitt's and Mr. Butterworth's, in all essential particulars, have been introduced over and over again in the Congress and in the Senate, and have never got further than a committee, or an adverse report from a committee. So these indications are not strong ones. He blames the Government, however, for having delayed to adjust the fishery question on Mr. Bayard's proposition until the presidential year. The Government of Canada delayed nothing. In 1865 they made a proposition, and the British Government made a proposition in their behalf, looking to a speedy conference between the two countries to undertake negotiations and settle this matter. That was pressed over and over again by Great Britain, and just so soon as the United States accepted the proposition, just so soon that proposition was taken advantage of by the British Government. But it was not delayed a single moment so far as Canada and Great Britain were concerned. It did happen to come off in the presidential year, and for that, my hon. friend finds fault with the Government. Yet he brings down a proposition asking Parliament to affirm a resolution in favor of a certain course, and instructing the Government, in this presidential year, here and now, to undertake negotiations with the United States in reference to that proposition. If a presidential year is bad in respect of the negotiation of one treaty, why it is not bad for another? Now, I would rather liken my hon. friend to Jove than to do him the discourtesy of likening him, as one of his supporters did this afternoon, to Goliath.

An hon. MEMBER. Not Goliath, but Jove.

Mr. FOSTER. The Jove of his party. But, likening him to Jove, we may well say that for once he has been found nodding. Now, Sir, having gone over these points, I beg simply to conclude by making one or two remarks with reference to a point which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) brought up this afternoon. I am sorry he is not in his place in the House to hear my criticism. My hon. friend thought that the Minister of the Interior was somewhat confused last night in his speech, and that he forgot he was talking about unrestricted reciprocity, and broke off into saying something about commercial union. I think there was great excuse for some such confusion, if any such confusion existed. My hon. friend, no doubt, had two or three hon. gentlemen in his eye, and

among them he had probably the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and he was thinking about an utterance delivered by the hon. gentleman. Speaking at Charlotte-town before the Board of Trade, not many weeks ago, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) made this statement:

"Under commercial union trade would flow freely between this country and the United States, as it now flows between the several States; while, as against the rest of the world there would be a uniform tariff, to be mutually agreed upon by the two countries comprised in the union. 'Unrestricted reciprocity' would differ from commercial union in this respect: that while under it there would be perfectly free trade between the two countries, each country would retain the right to frame its own tariff as against the rest of the world. Canada, for instance, might have a 25 per cent. tariff, while that of the United States might be one of 35 per cent. The immediate consequence would be that imports to the United States, instead of being carried to the great ports of the United States, would be taken to the States by way of Montreal. To this the States, whose people are not arrant fools, would never consent. An unrestricted reciprocity, although it would suit us as well as commercial union, was, therefore, impracticable."

Now, in what position does the hon. gentleman place himself? Is he an honest man, is he putting this question for honest purposes before this Parliament, or is he doing as he accuses us of doing, dangling a spangle before the eyes of the people? I will believe, in the first place, that he is an honest man, and that, when he took up the two lines of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity, he believed what he said, and he had good grounds for the belief, that the people of the United States, unless they were arrant fools, would never accept unrestricted reciprocity. Well, Sir, in what position, if he was an honest man at that time, is he placing himself now? He comes here and argues before this Parliament and asks this Parliament to adopt a measure, to show its whole hand, to go, as it were, the whole figure, to keep nothing back, to state out and out to the people of the United States: We will give you everything in exchange, if you will let us take everything into your country as an exchange; and yet, in the face of that, he says—to himself, of course—the United States will not accept such a proposition as that, they are not such arrant fools, and unless they were arrant fools, they would never take unrestricted reciprocity. Now, Sir, do you find any fault with any hon. gentleman on this side being slightly confused when he was looking into the eye of the hon. member who, not many weeks ago, made that statement, and has not disclaimed that statement to this day? Or, if it is true that he believes what he said here, is it not a reprehensible proceeding for a public man to attempt to put before Parliament and the country, and press to a solution a proposition, all the time believing that the neighboring power will never accept the proposition, but will certainly reject it unless they are arrant fools, which we know the people of the United States are not? There were one or two other statements made by the hon. member for Queen's to which I desire to refer, especially to one of those strong generalisations in which he is apt to indulge respecting the poverty of the people of Prince Edward Island. He goes on, turn by turn, till he reaches the climax, and the climax is this: That the people of Prince Edward Island, the farmers there especially, are living without hope—not only in Prince Edward Island, but in the Maritime Provinces—they are becoming poorer and poorer, losing hope and falling into despair. And yet I turn up the blue-books of the Dominion and look at the list which shows the earnings put into the Savings Bank of Prince Edward Island and what do I find? In 1874 they had a balance of \$336,000 to their credit there, in 1879 it had climbed up to \$420,000, to-day it is \$2,200,000. There is a paltry increase of \$34,000, in that halcyon period measured by the time when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power in this country, and there is a massive saving of \$1,750,000 which had been placed there by the poor people of Prince Edward Island in the time covered from

1880 to 1887; and yet they are living without hope, ready to plunge over into the fatal gulf of despair, they are entirely without aspiration and entirely without prospects for the future. Looking at these things it seems to me that the position which this Parliament may well take is something like this: The measure which has been proposed is a heroic measure according to the statement of the hon. gentleman who introduced it into this House. He has already failed to prove, in the first place, that a necessity for a heroic measure exists; in the second place, he has failed to prove that this is a measure which would be beneficial to Canada; and yet he asks this Government to leave the old and beaten policy and take this bantling of his own. On the other side you have the policy of the Government which from the first has been stable and has been proved. It has been this: To cultivate the most friendly relations between this country and the kindred people who live to the south of us, to seek in every way to have as fair and as free commercial relations as it is possible for the two peoples honorably to agree upon. There has not been a time since 1848 till to-day when the proposition has not stood out freely and fairly before the people of the United States something like this: Come and let us reason together and place our commercial and reciprocal relations on a fair and honorable basis for both of us. If ever those relations once established for a period have been broken, it has never been at the instance and wish of the Government or this Parliament, but always at the instance and wish of our cousins on the south of the border. Hon. gentlemen tell us that it is nothing, that an Act of Parliament stands on the Statute-book offering reciprocal trade between this country and the United States the moment the United States is willing to accept it. I take that statement and I say to hon. gentlemen opposite: Suppose the United States had put a clause in their Tariff Act saying, the very moment Canada makes natural products free the United States will make them free, would we not have a pressure which it would be totally impossible for us to resist? What can be a stronger expression of opinion than an Act of Parliament voicing the opinion of the people, which has stood before the people of the United States for some time? This stood before the people of the United States, and in all our relations there has been dominant in this Parliament and with this Government since it has been in power, the desire to have as free and extended and cordial relations as are possible in the interests of both countries. On the other hand we have felt, and the Government has introduced the policy which they carry out, that failing that, and if we cannot have extended reciprocal relations with the United States, the thing for us to do is to carve out a policy of our own which will stimulate industries in our own country, which will build up inter-provincial trade, which will give us a national standard of independence of our own, and which will put us on our feet in the future as it has contributed to our self-respect in the past. That policy is dear to the heart of the country. The fireworks let off about corruption and the way in which elections are carried on are very good for a slight blaze, but they go out soon, and a perfume remains which is not of the sweetest or most pleasant kind. The real facts of the case about the elections are that the people after the most thorough discussion were roused to look into this question, and after giving to the Government a mandate in 1878 to foster the industries of this country by means of a protective tariff, they enjoyed the benefits for four years, and when this Government went back to the people, the people renewed that mandate and enjoyed the benefits for another four years. The same people who in 1873 returned us into power, in 1887 sent this Government and the party which is with the Government back, with a strong stable majority, asking them and pledging them to preserve the interests which they had confided to their charge and the trust with which they

Mr. FOSTER.

had commissioned them in 1878 and in 1882. The Government feels, and the party feels, and the country in the main feels that this is the policy which is stable, fair, and honest. While at the same time we look after our own industries we are willing to meet every fair proposition that is made for extended trade relations with the people to the south of us. In this regard then and with those remarks I beg leave to move the following amendment:—

That Canada in the future as in the past is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various industries and interests of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and which has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of the people.

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron). Mr. Speaker, this I consider to be the most important question that has come before the people of the Dominion of Canada for many a day; and, Sir, as I belong to the agricultural community, and as I have always been opposed to the policy that has been adopted by the Government of this country, as a policy that has borne harder on the laboring classes, which I represent, than on any other class in the Dominion, I would not be performing my duty to my constituents were I to listen to this debate without lifting my voice in favor of the resolution which has been offered in this House by the Hon. Sir Richard John Cartwright, member of Parliament for the south riding of Oxford. I believe, Sir, that this resolution if carried into effect will do more to quiet the discontent that exists in Canada to-day than all the National Policies in existence. We have been asked, Sir, to show on this side of the House that the remedy we offer will put an end to the large amount of emigration going out of the country into the United States. I would ask the hon. gentleman opposite if the hon. leader of the Government in his famous speech at Parkhill did not attempt to prove that this would be the remedy when he stated as one of the reasons why the policy should be enforced, that he wanted to bring back to Canada the 500,000 of our own people in the workshops of the United States, and that by adopting a policy that would re-adjust the tariff and foster the industries that object would be attained, and the agricultural industry would be benefited, as we would be able to keep our own people at home to consume our own products. The hon. gentleman referred to a great many other blessings which would ensue from a reform of the tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite must see before this time that the National Policy has entirely failed to confer the blessings which were promised to the people of this country. I would just say this in relation to what the First Minister has said, that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Since one policy has failed, since it has taken out of this country a great many more people than the policy that was followed by the Government of which the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie was the head, I hold that it is time we ought to have some change. We have been asked the reason why we bring up such a proposition as this, and why we ask for this redress under the present circumstances? My answer to this would be that the agricultural industry in this country is now in a very languishing condition, that the prices of our products are very low indeed, and that we are not receiving prices equal to what we had before the National Policy was adopted, compared with the prices received by the people on the other side of the line. We are paying a greater amount for the goods we consume than we would pay if it were not for this policy, and the agricultural community one might say is cut at both ends. The price of their produce is reduced and whatever they have to purchase they have to pay a larger price for. I will pass on very rapidly over a few of the statements made by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He tried to show that there was no danger of nature being too strong, and he went on to show how nature had been overcome

between this Province and our Pacific Provinces, how it had been overcome between the United States and her Pacific provinces, and he argued that trade was not a geographical matter. But, Sir, in that trade between the United States and her Pacific Provinces there was no iron wall of protection between the Eastern and Western States, neither was there between the Eastern Provinces of the Dominion of Canada and her Pacific Provinces. I venture the statement that if Great Britain enforced such a policy towards the East Indies as the Government of Canada has adopted here, the trade of Great Britain in that country would never have attained to the position it has attained to at the present day. It was by such a course as we now ask for in the proposition laid before this House that the trade of that country has been promoted. I would just say that the very fact that Ontario sends \$5,000,000 annually into the British market to-day, while it sends \$22,800,000 into the markets of the United States, although there is a tariff of over 16 per cent. against us in the one case and a free market in the other, is proof positive that natural channels will be followed in spite of all the tariffs that can be framed. Another argument, which I was sorry to see the hon. Minister of Marine pass over as he did, was that relating to inter-provincial trade. I think the hon. member for South Oxford stated yesterday that \$340,000 more had been spent on the Intercolonial Railway within the last seven months than the earnings of the railway amounted to, and I think I saw about a year ago the statement that the Intercolonial Railway cost in 12 months \$160,000 more than it had earned, showing that the inter-provincial trade is not growing, but has decreased; and I was astonished that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not apply himself to this argument. He dealt a great deal more in what I may term blustering statements than in arguing the question. Now, Sir, we were told that there was as great a diminution in the population of some of the United States as there has been in this country. I do not believe any hon. gentleman opposite can rise and mention any State in the Union, similarly situated to Ontario, in which there has been as small a gain in population, as there has been in that Province. I have a statement here showing that in 1880 the population of Ontario was 1,683,883, and in 1884 1,754,044, a gain of 70,161, while the State of Michigan, situated similarly to Ontario, but not having as many natural advantages, during the same period gained 219,163. That State and the Province of Ontario are nearly equal in population, while in area and fertility the Province of Ontario far surpasses the State of Michigan. Then, Sir, we were told that the volume of trade was less in 1883 than it was in 1887. I have here a statement of the volume of trade between the United States and Canada during the years of the Reciprocity Treaty. I find that in 1873 the total volume of trade between the United States and Canada amounted to \$93,915,716, while in 1886 it only amounted to \$84,027,223. But going back to the year 1866, the year in which the Reciprocity Treaty ended, I find that the volume of trade between Canada and the United States in that year amounted to \$84,685,361, or \$600,000 more than it did in 1886, showing clearly that the trade of this country with the United States is not growing as it ought to. The farmers of this country can look back to the time of that Reciprocity Treaty from 1854 to 1866, and we can remember the great strides the country made at that time, and the prosperity that was enjoyed by every household in Canada, especially among the agricultural population; and we believe, Sir, that unless there is a remedy found for the present state of affairs in Canada there will be a severe strain put upon Confederation. To show what the feeling is in the County of Huron, to which I belong, I will just read a letter which I received yesterday from a friend in that county:

"I am pleased to learn that the Opposition are making unrestricted reciprocity with the United States one of the planks in their platform. I think it will be very popular. I also think that if we do not get something in that line before many years there will be a strong annexation party in this country, and I fear your correspondent will be added to that number."

Such is the feeling that pervades not merely the eastern and western Provinces of this country, but that is spreading rapidly among the agricultural population of the Province of Ontario. We are told that we pay no taxes on our own wool from which we make our own cloth. I can remember the statement by the hon. First Minister in his famous Parkhill speech, that if we had the National Policy all our own cloth would be made out of wool of our own raising. But I can tell him his prophesy has not been fulfilled, for whereas we imported in 1878 \$8,000,000 worth of woollen goods, we imported in 1886 \$11,000,000 worth. The effect of this on the agricultural population is, that we have to pay the whole duty even on the goods manufactured in Canada. In conversation a few days before I came to Ottawa with a large importer of dry goods from the British market, I put the question to him: "What is the effect of the tariff on goods manufactured in this country, and at what percentage can goods manufactured in Canada be purchased below goods manufactured in the English market?" His reply was that on goods purchased in Canada similar to the goods purchased in Scotland he had to pay the whole duty, that is, an average of 27 per cent. on a round lot of dry goods, which amounted to 33 per cent. to the consumer, and that the only margin left over the cost of the Canadian manufactured goods compared with the cost of the goods manufactured in Britain was something like 2 per cent., that is the cost of freight and insurance; so that the statement cannot be contradicted that we have to pay an amount equal to the duty, and that goes into the pockets of the Canadian manufacturers. Yet I do not believe that even the manufacturers have benefited to the extent that they might, because I believe very large amounts of money have been sunk in manufacturing industries for which there is not sufficient demand in this country. I will venture the statement that no large capitalist will ever come into this country and invest any large sum of money unless we have a larger market. Then the question comes, where are we to find this larger market? Because we find that our export of manufactured goods was some \$1,300,000 less last year than it was in 1878. This shows that our manufactures are not keeping pace with the improvements which are going on in manufacturing in other countries, and that the National Policy has had the effect of destroying the market in other countries for Canadian manufactured goods. There has been a good deal said with respect to the decreased value of land in the Province of Ontario. I will say, as a farmer, that this is, perhaps, a subject with which I am better acquainted than many others, as I have had an opportunity of testing the value of lands in the County of Huron and in the County of Perth which very few farmers have had. I had the honor to be appointed twelve months ago to value the whole County of Perth for equalisation purposes. I went over it along with another gentleman and put a value on every lot of land there, and I can assure you, Sir, that the reduction in the value of land in that county amounts to 10 and 15 per cent., and in some cases more. I am certain that the same reduction has taken place in the County of Huron, to which I have the honor to belong. In that county we had in 1886, according to the latest reports, 2,600 people less than in 1878, showing plainly that the country is not prosperous. There are eight counties in Ontario which have 2,000 less population than they had in 1878; yet we are told that the country is in a healthy, prosperous and thriving condition. I would ask what is the cause of the hard times we have in Canada? I need not go further back than 1882, to show the decrease in the value of crops in the Province of Ontario. In Ontario, in 1882, the

value of the crops of wheat, barley, oats, rye and peas was \$89,682,065, but when we come to 1886 we find the value is shrunk to \$58,000,683. Now, this is a very large reduction indeed, and a reduction for which we cannot entirely blame the Government, because there is no government in the world, in my opinion, that can remedy this, although we have been told by the First Minister in one of his famous speeches that the clerk of the weather was a good Conservative. In 1878 the right hon. gentleman said the clerk of the weather was on their side, and would give a good crop, because he knew the Conservatives were going into power. But if he was a good Conservative, he must, like all Conservatives, have overdone the matter, and has not since given us the fine sunshine and the great crops which it was predicted he would supply. If the right hon. gentleman had the power of obtaining all those blessings for us, what is the reason he has forgotten at this time to give the good crops, the clear skies, the good prices, the abundance of employment and the high wages, which, in 1878, he predicted would follow the advent of his party to power? Why has he allowed hundreds of thousands of the most promising youths of our native-born population to go and settle across the lines? There is another statement which the hon. gentleman made in that famous speech to which I have alluded, and that is, that it would not pay at that time to build mills in Canada, and the reason he gave was that they had a very small number of customers on this side, but that on the other side of the line they would have 40,000,000 consumers. If that argument held good then, it must hold doubly good to-day. Not only that, but we find that under the influence of the National Policy flour which has fallen, since 1881, only 90 cents per barrel in the United States, has fallen in the Dominion over \$2 a barrel, so that no miller would be wise in building a mill in this country as long as the present condition of things, under which the value of produce and of labor has fallen so considerably, continues. Now, I will address myself a little further to the question of the crops. In 1886, the value of the crops was \$31,361,982 less than it was in 1882. But I will go further and state that the value of the crop of 1887 is less still. According to the quarterly report of the Bureau of Industries issued in the month of August, we had 10,000,000 bushels of wheat less in 1887 than in 1886. We had 5,000,000 bushels less oats, 2,136,000 bushels less barley and 3,000,000 bushels less peas, and if you take these at the market prices, you will find a loss of \$3,000,000 on the grain crop of 1887 as compared with that of 1882. That taken from the sum of \$58,000,000, which was the value of the crop of 1882, reduces the crop of 1887 to a little over \$45,000,000, or very little more than one-half the crop of 1882. Yet we are told we are prosperous; yet we are told that the most prosperous people in the world to-day are the farmers of Ontario. The hon. the Minister of the Interior told us that, but I can well remember that this gentleman's sympathies are not to any great extent with the farmers of the Dominion. I think he made a speech in Montreal at a banquet, and I was a little astonished at the statements he then made. He said he had always considered that the prosperity of the Dominion lay with the merchants of Canada, and the commercial travellers, the future merchants. Hon. gentlemen opposite ignore the great wealth producers of the Dominion, the agriculturists and the laborers. They ignore them entirely, and it appears this class is only here for the purpose of having a large amount of taxation imposed on it, without receiving in any shape whatever any corresponding benefit. But our loss does not stop there. We were told by the hon. the Minister of the Interior that horses and cattle in Ontario were on the increase. But in the report I received last August, we have 70,000 fewer cattle than in 1886, 214,700 fewer sheep, 25,305 fewer hogs, and yet we are the most prosperous people in the

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron.)

Dominion. But the effects of the National Policy do not stop here. I do not hold it responsible in every case, but I say it has reduced the prices of produce. The price of flour in the United States in 1881 was \$5.60 per barrel, but in 1886 it had fallen to \$4.60, a reduction of 97 cents, whereas the price in Montreal in 1881 was \$5.64, against \$3.56 in 1886, a reduction of \$2.08. Take wheat, and you find that the price in the United States in 1881 was \$1.11, against 87 cents in 1886, a reduction of 24 cents, whereas in Canada the price of wheat in 1881 was \$1.33, against 85 cents in 1886, a reduction of 48 cents. Corn in the United States was 55 cents in 1881 and 49 cents in 1886, a reduction of 6 cents, whereas in Canada it was 46 cents in 1881 and 49 cents in 1886, a reduction of 17 cents. Thus we find that in Canada flour had fallen \$2.08 against 97 cents in the United States, while wheat had fallen 48 cents in Canada against 24 cents in the United States, and corn had fallen 17 cents in Canada against 6 cents in the United States. If hon. gentlemen ask where I got this information, I can tell them that it was not from any wicked Grit or falsifying Reformer, but that the information is contained in a record which the hon. the Minister of Agriculture has put into the hands of every member of this House, and from that statement hon. gentlemen can see that we, the farmers of Ontario, have been robbed to a great extent by the National Policy. I was very happy to hear the Minister of the Interior state yesterday that in 1886 we raised 27,500,000 bushels of wheat in the Province of Ontario. It was a statement I had intended to make myself, and I now corroborate it. For what reason do I corroborate it? I corroborate it for the purpose of showing that half of that wheat would be consumed by the farmer and the other half would be put on the market, and that, as the price of the home market is regulated by the price we get for what we export, and as it was reduced 24 cents per bushel more than the price of wheat was reduced in the United States, if we take the half of that wheat at 13,500,000 bushels, we find that the Province of Ontario lost \$3,310,763 on the price of that wheat during that season. Taking all this into consideration, is it to be wondered at that the farmers of Ontario are in a languishing condition? What is it that gives value to farming property? What is it that gives value to land? Is it not the value of what we raise? and, as the value of our grain has shrunk 50 per cent. since 1882, is it not reasonable to say that the value of land has shrunk also? I was surprised to hear the hon. Minister say that the value of farm property in Ontario had increased by \$13,000,000 in 1886 over the value in 1885. His statement was in reality correct, but the hon. gentleman did not treat the subject fairly. He ought to have taken an average of a few years, and, if he had gone back to 1883 he would have found that in that year the land in the Province of Ontario was worth \$654,693,035, and when he came to 1886 he would have found that the land was worth \$643,009,828, or a reduction of \$6,783,197 in the value of the land during that time. He would also have found that since 1883, 300,000 acres of land had been brought under the assessment rolls in the older counties of Ontario and 400,000 acres of land had been cleared. If you take the 300,000 acres at \$29 an acre, you have \$8,700,000, and if you take the 100,000 acres besides, which were cleared, at \$20 an acre, which would not be an extravagant price, that would be \$2,000,000, making a total of \$10,700,000. This brings the reduction in the value of the land from the year 1883 to the year 1886 to \$17,483,197, and that is exclusive of all the improvements that have gone on in all the other parts of the Province except upon these 400,000 acres cleared since 1883, and the 300,000 acres which have been placed upon the assessment roll. I hold, therefore, that we have suffered to a very large extent. Although it may be shown that in buildings we have increased the value to the amount of \$20,717,637, I think I can show that those buildings and the implements for which we have paid to the extent of

\$7,000,000, are not really, though they may be nominally, the property of the farmer, as he is indebted for them, and is getting rapidly further in debt. Even now, I have not told the whole tale in regard to the farmers of Ontario and the burdens to which they are subjected, though some of them are of their own imposing. We have heard a good deal in respect to mortgages, and we had a very glowing account from the hon. Minister of the Interior, who told us what a great many companies had reported; but anyone who knows anything about borrowed money and mortgages in Ontario knows that there is a great deal of private funds lent among the farmers on first class mortgages, the farmers preferring to take private moneys to borrowing from the companies; and these are amounts of which the Government cannot know anything. I know that this practice exists to a great extent in the County of Huron and all over the Province of Ontario. *The Insurance and Finance Chronicle* of Montreal, in its January issue, values the land very much as the Bureau of Industries values it, at \$300,000,000, but says that the land is mortgaged to the extent of \$275,000,000, that 80 per cent. of the farms in Ontario are encumbered, and are encumbered to the extent of 43 per cent. of their value; count the loans at 6 per cent. on that amount, and you have \$16,500,000 that the farmers of Ontario had to pay on mortgages this last year. We are told that money has been getting cheaper. I know nothing about that. I know that I act as a valuator for a number of individuals who are lending money and for one company that lends money in the locality from which I come, and I know that, while last fall I could get money easily for 5½ per cent., to-day I cannot get it for less than 7 per cent. Money is going up rapidly in price, and I have never known such a large amount of money placed on farms during the last 44 years of my residence in Ontario as was placed during the last fall and winter, which shows that the farmers are not in the same condition to-day as they have been since I came to the Province of Ontario, and that is a long time indeed. I would just state this with respect to the reduction in the number of cattle, that it simply shows that the farmers had not crops enough to pay their debts, and so had to sell some of their stock which should have been kept on their farms. In 1885 they sold an enormous number of cattle, more than they had been accustomed to sell—they sold 143,000 cattle during that year. Now, Sir, in 1887 there were 70,000 head of cattle in Ontario less than in 1886. The farmers are in a very bad condition indeed. I think the farmers are in the worst condition of any class of the population in the Province of Ontario. Now, let us examine the cost of running a farm of 100 acres in the Province of Ontario, and the revenue that can be got out of it. Sir, I have a statement by me which shows that the condition of the farmer is but little better, if any, than that of the day laborer who works for his daily bread. The total value of crops in 1886 was: grains, \$58,000,683; corn, buckwheat, beans, hay, clover, potatoes and carrots, \$52,763,943,—in all, \$110,764,626. Then I estimate at \$33,878,483 the products of animals and all other sources of revenue to the farmer—a sum almost equal to the value of the grain crops. It includes the value of root crops, grain crops, and everything except straw; so that the total revenue derived from farms in the Province of Ontario is \$164,643,109. Now, how many farms are there in the Province of Ontario of 100 acres each, which is the average number of acres? We find there are 208,615. What is the revenue derived from one of those farms? I find that it will amount on the average to about \$790, and no practical farmer who knows anything about the business will venture to say that an average farm in Ontario will produce any more revenue than that. Now, this average farm has about 50 acres of wood land and 50 acres cleared. In estimating the expense of carrying on this farm, we

must have two men to do the work the year round. These have to board themselves, and they each receive about \$250. Then there must be a team kept, with hay and grain at the market price. I put that at the low rate of 33 cents a day, or \$120 a year. Then for seed, threshing, taxes, and all the other incidental expenses in connection with the farm, I have reckoned the low sum of \$100. These sums together amount to \$720, leaving a balance of only \$70 to come into the hands of the farmer. This sum gives him an interest on his capital of less than 1½ per cent. He has nothing except that very small amount to keep up buildings and fences, to meet the wear and tear of his machinery, harnesses and implements. Now, that is a bad condition for the farmers of Ontario to be in. The hon. gentleman has taken his report from the Bureau of Industries, and I challenge him to go over the whole report and show that my statement is not correct. I have no fear that any hon. gentleman will be able to show anything of the kind. Now, Sir, what is the position of the manufacturers when compared with the farmers in the Province of Ontario? I have taken the figures from the census of 1881. I was happy to hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries this afternoon say that the manufacturers of Canada were never in a better condition than they are in to-day. If that is true, the statement I am about to make is one that is more than favorable for them. I find that in the Dominion of Canada the capital invested in manufacturing industries in 1881 was \$165,302,623; I find that the raw material amounted to \$179,918,593, and the total produce from all these establishments amounted to \$309,676,068. That sum had been increased in value by labor to the amount of \$129,757,475. The sum that is to be deducted from this as having been paid for labor is \$59,429,002. Now, the question comes: How many workmen were engaged in all the different industries of Canada in 1881? I find, first, that the number of manufacturers was 2,229, and the number of workmen was 254,935. I find that the average salary paid to men, women, boys and girls, was \$233 a year. Next: How much did the manufacturer draw from each individual workman? The nice little sum of \$276. In reality the manufacturers of Canada, after counting 10 per cent. for insurance and management, and 6 per cent. on capital invested, have left 38¼ per cent. of the total cost of product over materials. And yet the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stands up in this House and declares that the farmers of the Province of Ontario are the most prosperous class in the Dominion. I state that there is no other class in this country which puts forth the same amount of energy, industry and perseverance, and exercises the same amount of economy and receives such a small remuneration for their labor. And I warn the hon. gentleman opposite that the farmers of the Dominion have found that the promises made to them in 1878 have not been fulfilled, that we have no home market created, that we have not had better prices, that we have not had our population kept at home and that we have not had our produce consumed at home. There are certain things, however, that their policy has succeeded in doing. It has succeeded in driving the very best of our young men from the Dominion to seek homes across the line, it has succeeded in building up "rings" and "trusts" to an extent never known before, it has succeeded in compelling us to pay higher prices than in any country I know of for our manufactured goods; and although we are told that goods are cheaper to-day than they ever were in the history of the world, this same National Policy has deprived the farmers of the benefit of lower prices which should be secured to them by improved machinery and improved methods of manufacture. The National Policy has also succeeded in taking a very large amount of money out of the pockets of the farmers in the shape of taxation, much more than was promised

before the Government went into power. They, in fact, promised that there would not be an increase of taxation, only a readjustment of taxation. Let us see what this readjustment of taxation, which the Government promised the farmers, together with all other classes of the community, has amounted to, and what effect it has had on the agricultural class. We were told by the hon. Finance Minister before hon. gentlemen opposite assumed the reins of power, that they would not require those large amounts of taxation needed by the Government of Mr. Mackenzie. His language was: "Inasmuch as we have ruled the country with smaller taxation in the past, we are prepared to rule it with smaller taxation in the future." The hon. First Minister said time and again there would not be an increase of taxation, only a readjustment of the tariff. What effect has that readjustment had? During the five years Mr. Mackenzie's Government was in power there was collected \$93,565,768 in taxation, or \$18,713,153 a year. During the last five years the present Government have collected \$134,030,883, or an average of \$26,810,176. This amounts to \$8,097,023 per annum more than was collected by the Mackenzie Government, that is to say, in the last five years an additional sum of \$40,485,115 was taken out of the pockets of the ratepayers. I hold that \$30,000,000 of that should never have been collected, and if the Government had increased the annual expenditure by only \$2,500,000 there would not have been a great deal of cause for complaint. But the evil has not ended there. In addition to that amount taken for taxation there has been a large amount taken out of the pockets of the people and placed in the hands of the manufacturers. Is it a wonder, under these circumstances, that there are stringent times in the Dominion, when there is such increase of taxation and burdens upon the people, because probably from twenty to thirty millions annually taken out of the taxpayers do not find their way into the public treasury. These are all causes of grave complaint against the present Government, and if the present condition of affairs continues for any length of time, such a sentiment will spring up that hon. gentlemen opposite will find it very difficult indeed to rule the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the speeches of hon. members on this side of the House have driven the best of our population to a foreign country; but I tell them that if the advice given by hon. gentlemen on this side had been followed we would have had thousands of our own population at home more than we have to-day. We would have had the North-West more fully settled. What folly it is for the Government to spend \$500,000 a year to bring immigrants into the country, and when they get them in the North-West impose 35 per cent taxes on the agricultural implements they use. That is a detriment to every farmer who goes there with means to get a fair start, for it means that he has to pay nearly \$200 of duty on his implements. Let me repeat briefly a conversation I had during the summer with an implement agent at Brandon. He said he could go to the other side and purchase Deering binders for \$100 each, but when he brought them to the Custom house they were valued at \$130, the officer stating that he had received order from Ottawa to value them at that sum. This brought their cost up to \$200 to the actual settler. When a farmer is compelled to pay \$200 for an implement which he can purchase for \$120 on the other side of the line, and when he has to pay 10 cents per bushel extra for the carriage of his wheat to market, he comes to think that loyalty should begin at home. When a man has to move, what difference does it make to him whether he goes across the line or not, whether he goes to the United States and lives among people of our own flesh and blood whose traditions are our traditions and whose ancestors were our ancestors, so long as he is going to place himself and his family in a better condition, which I hold they have

Mr. McMILLAN (Huron.)

done in most cases. It is not the speeches of hon. gentlemen on this side, but the actions of one of the most extravagant Governments ever known that have caused this emigration. It is also owing to the Government establishing a railway monopoly in the North-West, and granting Government lands in such a manner that every alternate section is owned by a wealthy company. I was one of the first settlers in the County of Huron, and I know the hardships we endured in making roads and building schools, and I can, therefore, judge of the great hardships people must endure in the North-West when every alternate block is held by speculators, and especially when such land is not subject to taxation. These are the causes that have led to the depopulation of Canada. These are the causes that have sent our young men across the lines. Within a week of my leaving home to attend Parliament, a young man residing in the North-West came to my place and remained all night. He has been long enough there to perform his settlement duties, and he told me that unless the Government removed the restrictions on implements and allowed competition in railways he would never go back to that country to settle, because he was not going to spend his life and energy to put money in the pockets of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Such, Sir, has been the experience of almost every individual who went to our North-West. I could name individual after individual, and family after family from my iowntownship and county who went to the North-West to settle, but when they found the conditions under which they were to be placed they stepped across the line. Hence the State of Dakota has gained in population over 300,000 people, while the Province of Manitoba has only gained some 43,000. I hold that the Province of Manitoba has superior land and is superior in every shape to any of the States adjoining, but if the people had the same advantages under the Government of getting goods into the country they would be more prosperous and successful. I hold, Sir, that the Province of Ontario to-day is one of the fairest spots upon the face of the earth, and I do not see what is the reason that Province cannot succeed better and why her population has not increased more rapidly than it has. Let me read a statement from a gentleman who is well known to any person who has paid much attention to the public men on the other side. The statement is made by David A. Wells, and he says:

"North of Lakes Erie and Ontario, and the River St. Lawrence, east of Lake Huron, south of the 45th parallel, and included mainly within the present Province of Ontario there is as fair a country as exists on the North American continent; nearly as large in area as New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio combined, and equal if not superior to those States as a whole in its agricultural capacity. It is the natural habitation of the combing-wool sheep without a full, cheap and reliable supply of the wool, of which species the great worsted manufacturing industries of the country cannot prosper, or, we should rather say, exist. It is the land where grows the finest barley, which the brewing interests of the United States must have if it ever expects to rival Great Britain in its present annual export of over eleven millions of dollars worth of malt products. It raises and grazes the finest of cattle, with qualities especially desirable to make good the deterioration of stock in other sections; and its climatic conditions created by an almost encirclement of the great lakes, especially fit to grow men. Such a country is one of the greatest gifts of Providence to the human race; better than the bonanzas of silver or rivers whose sands contain gold."

I would ask, Sir, why the Province of Ontario, when it is the most fertile of all the Provinces, nay, when it is more fertile than any State in the Union, has not progressed more than it has? I have a statement which shows the average produce for five years of some of the best grain-growing States in the United States of America, and compares it with the produce of the Province of Ontario for the same period. I would just say, Sir, that this comparison has been made from the United States' records. Of fall wheat per acre, in nine of the best wheat growing States in the Union, the highest produce is in the State of Kansas, which yields 15½ bushels per acre; in

the Province of Ontario the produce was 21 bushels per acre, $5\frac{1}{2}$ bushels more than in the best State of the Union. In spring wheat, out of five of the best producing States in the Union, the highest was Dakota, and it produced 14 bushels per acre; the produce of spring wheat in Ontario was 16 bushels per acre, or 2 bushels of spring wheat in advance of the best State on the other side. In barley, out of six States in the Union, the highest is $24\frac{1}{2}$ bushels per acre in Wisconsin, and in Ontario the produce was $26\frac{2}{10}$ bushels, or $2\frac{7}{10}$ bushels more than in the best State of the Union. In oats, out of twelve States Minnesota was the highest. The produce was $34\frac{3}{8}$ bushels per acre; while in Ontario the produce was $37\frac{1}{10}$ bushels, or $2\frac{3}{8}$ more than in any State of the Union. Now, Sir, we have a more fertile soil, we have a better agricultural and grazing country, and we are situated on the line of commerce to the seaboard; we have all the natural advantages that a Province could boast of, and there must be some cause why the Province of Ontario is not growing more rapidly than it does grow. I think the causes have been plainly pointed out to the Government of the day. It has been pointed out to them, that it is impossible for a country to prosper when we are taking such large sums of money out of the pockets of the people and placing them in the hands of a few favorites. Unless the Government adopt a different policy from that which they have pursued with reference to the Province of Ontario there will be developed such a sentiment of discontent that I cannot see where it will end. I believe myself that if a plebiscite were taken by ballot to-day in the Province of Ontario, as to whether we should remain a part and parcel of Confederation, or whether we should become independent or throw in our lot with the United States, the result might be different from what some people may think. I would not like to throw in my lot with the United States if I could help it. I left the land of my birth, and I look back to that country with feelings of respect. Canada is the land of my adoption. I spent my youth and manhood here, and I would not like to leave this country; but if the Government continue to treat the country as they have done, they will create such a spirit among the people that they will come to the conclusion that if we cannot get the markets of the United States opened to our produce, we will either have to go to the United States ourselves or ask admission to the Union. That is the sentiment I believe which prevails to-day. Hon. gentlemen may clap their hands or laugh, but they will find later on perhaps that that sentiment will be too strong for them, as the sentiment is too strong that has been developed in Manitoba. I was just thinking, Sir, when I saw two gentlemen sitting in this Chamber—a deputation from Manitoba to the Government to see if they could arrange terms of peace in that Province with the Government at Ottawa—that the impression prevails that the Government has imposed on that Province and upon the North-West such conditions that it has become a question whether or not the Province of Manitoba is about to rise in its might and assert its right to manage its own business in its own way, and that perhaps Manitoba is not the only Province that will have to do that. Thanking the House very cordially for their kind and courteous attention to me while speaking, I now beg leave to resume my seat.

Mr. PORTER. The question now before the House, and embraced in the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), is certainly one of the greatest consequence and of the utmost importance. It is a subject, Sir, large as our national life and wide as our future in all the ages to come. And, Sir, when we consider that question, and when we approach that question, we ought certainly to approach it as the hon. gentleman has recommended us to do, in the spirit of statesmen

and philosophers. Sir, this question has been argued before this House in very many different ways, and all the different speeches bearing on this question have been presented to this House in eloquent and strenuous terms. For me, Sir, to go over the nature of the argument of the gentlemen who have preceded me, would certainly be futile and useless. However, I would crave the attention of this House while I address a few remarks in reference, more particularly, to the special subject of the last gentleman's discourse. It is claimed, Sir, that in this country the National Policy, which was indeed the great object of his attack, has been a detriment and injury to the farmers of this country. The hon. gentleman has presented that subject in every variety of view, and every form and every manner of way, in which it could be placed before this House, and the conclusion of all his arguments, and the summing up of all his speaking, was that the National Policy introduced in 1879, was detrimental to the farmers of this country. Sir, what does he propose to do in order to relieve the farmers of this country from the burdens they are bearing under this National Policy? He proposes the heroic remedy contained in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. He proposes that we should be relieved from the sufferings we experience from the National Policy by transferring us to a country where a higher National Policy prevails. Sir, that is a most extraordinary remedy; it is scarcely such a remedy as any reasonable man would think for a moment of prescribing. We are also reminded by hon. gentlemen opposite how very necessary it is in any discussion of this kind that we should know precisely the meaning of the terms we are using, so that there will be no danger of confounding or misunderstanding them. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., took to task members on this side of the House because, as he said, they were opposed to reciprocity. Sir, we are not opposed to reciprocity; we never have been; but unrestricted reciprocity and reciprocity are entirely different things. Reciprocity may mean a certain exchange of goods to such an extent as may be agreed upon, while unrestricted reciprocity means nothing more nor less than absolute free trade, without any restrictions of any sort, with the country with which we propose to enter into relations. It is just as well that that distinction should be borne in mind. We have been reminded by the hon. member for Queen's, and by the hon. gentleman who last spoke of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854; and it is very strange that when hon. gentlemen opposite speak of the period from 1854 to 1866 they forget some important events which occurred during that period, and which undoubtedly had great influence on the prosperity enjoyed in this country at that time. They forget that, in 1854, when the treaty was about to come into operation, a great European war was going on; and I am old enough to remember, and I think the hon. gentleman who preceded me is also old enough to remember, that at that time the prices of the products of Canada were raised to a higher pitch than they have ever been since, and why? Because of reciprocity with the United States? No, Sir, it was simply because a great war was raging in a foreign land, and that that land required that we should raise the products necessary for its sustenance. More than that, to prove conclusively the truth of my statement, let me remind hon. gentlemen that at the conclusion of that great war there was such a tumble in prices, such wreck of fortunes, such a loss of gains in Canada, as is remembered to the present hour; and did the reciprocity of which we have heard so much prevent that dire evil falling on the people of Canada? No, Sir, it did not. There were other laws and other economic forces governing us besides the Reciprocity Treaty. Then, Sir, let me also call the attention of this House to another fact in reference to this question, that at that time Canada was awakening like a giant from slumber, and was beginning

to put forth her natural energies and to realise the great possessions God had given her to develop and to transmit to posterity. She was beginning to construct long lines of railway; the Grand Trunk Railway was undertaken; and we know that millions of dollars were spent in the settled portions of the country. All that was an element in the prosperity of which we hear so much during reciprocity times. There was still another element in that prosperity which hon. gentlemen opposite leave out of consideration. We remember that in the year 1860, there were ominous sounds of conflict in the land to the south of us, and during the four years ensuing there waged in that great republic a war, fierce, lasting and desolating, and during that period the people, instead of being employed in the pursuits of peace and in the arts of industry and agriculture, were grasping each other's throat, and thrusting their bayonets through each other's hearts. What was the effect of that strife upon Canada? It was that we who were at peace with all the world, whose industries and trade were not disturbed or interrupted, were able to supply them with all the necessaries they required. So that when these gentlemen speak of the Reciprocity Treaty, I think in all fairness to the people of this country they should have stated these facts; because they are not at present on public platforms attempting to get votes. As men in council, desiring to arrive at the truth, they should neither express a false thing nor suppress a true thing, but they should give all the facts and all the reasons they know of bearing on the subject under discussion. I say these hon. gentlemen should bear in mind all these facts when they come to speak of the period from 1854 to 1866. Now, I have no doubt I have wearied the House with these remarks, because the facts I mention have no doubt often been heard before, but I think it is very necessary that they should be heard again in a discussion of this kind. Sir, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, made the National Policy the principal point of attack, and, I must confess, the figures he brought before us were so numerous and so conflicting that it was almost impossible to follow him. I will, therefore, take a few points only. If the hon. gentleman had listened to the arguments of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries this afternoon, he would have omitted one point at least which he brought before the House. He says we pay the whole duty on every article we consume. Now, the hon. gentleman is a farmer like myself. He knows that the greater part of the woolen goods he and his children wear are shorn from the sheep's backs, are taken to the mill and spun, and brought home and made up into clothing for himself and his family; and he knows that not one cent of taxation is paid on those goods. It was, therefore, not ingenuous in him to make the farmers believe that they had to pay duty on every article they wear. The hon. gentleman also said that goods manufactured in Canada are affected in their price by the price of the goods imported from foreign countries, and that the manufacturers charge more than they ought to do, and that the difference goes into their pockets. It is well known, Sir, that competition in trade undoubtedly reduces the prices of all articles, and it is only a short time ago, indeed, that the manufacturers in this country complained that over-production was causing them to sell at a great loss, so that articles could be bought for actually less than real cost price. But without dwelling on that subject at any length, I will simply touch on another point to which the hon. gentleman referred. In the course of his remarks he read a letter from a farmer in the county of Huron. The farmer congratulated the Liberal party, which has introduced this resolution, upon their policy, and declared that if such a policy as that was not embraced by this House, he would very probably become a citizen of the United States. Let me say this much: We have been asked to discuss this

Mr. PORTER.

question without sentiment, and I am willing also to discuss it without sentiment. I believe it is a question of material progress to a very large extent; I believe it to be a question of material wealth to a very large extent; still, I am not ashamed to own that sentiment has a certain influence over my heart and thoughts. I believe in the fibre of every man, who is a manly man, sentiment certainly has a place, and we know from the world's history, we know from the history of the countries around us that sentiment has made nations brave and men successful. If we were to discuss this subject without sentiment, I believe we would discuss it without considering a most important element in the nation's welfare. I believe that we ought not to make sentiment the most prominent question, yet, after all, in the background of discussion there will remain always a something that will influence our decisions in a most important direction. However, I am willing to discuss this question without sentiment, and if the hon. member for South Huron is altogether devoid of sentiment, and for the sake of a few dollars would sell his allegiance to the United States, I believe that Canada is better without him. The hon. member who has just taken his seat has spoken of depreciation in the value of land. He has told us he was a valuator for a company, and that he had an opportunity of examining lands in the county of Perth and some other adjacent counties, and that values had decreased lately owing to the National Policy. In answer to that statement, I have here statistics taken from Mr. Blue's report and from the report of the Agricultural Commission of 1880, of which I believe the hon. gentleman was a member. From Mr. Blue's statistics, we learn that the average value of land per acre in the county of Huron, which I select as being the hon. gentleman's own county, and it is better to particularise—from Mr. Blue's report, we learn that the average value of land per acre in the county of Huron was in 1886, \$51.49, with buildings thereon, the land being worth \$41.28, and the buildings \$10.21. From the report of the Agricultural Commission of 1880, I find the value of 100 acres of farm land in the county of Huron, taking the three classes, the first, second and third into which the Commission divide the land, and making an average price—I find from the report that for the whole county of Huron, the value of the farming land was in 1880 estimated to be worth \$36.16 per acre, so that from 1880 to 1886 the land in question had increased \$15.32 per acre in value. These facts and figures are taken from the statistics of hon. gentlemen's friends in Ontario, and I ask you, Sir, if they show any sign of depreciation in the value of landed property. Suppose we admit for the sake of argument that the land has depreciated, or rather that it has not risen in value, what do we find Mr. Blue saying? In his report of 1885, he says that the value of the land depends upon the value of the crops, and that when prices are low land is low. That is but a reasonable statement of facts in the mind of all impartial men. There is another test of the value of land, and that is the increase in the assessment values, as they appear from year to year in the reports of the municipalities. The assessment values of land in the county of Huron was:—

In 1875.....	\$37 91
1876.....	38 76
1877.....	29 43
1878.....	29 54
1879.....	30 01
1880.....	30 01
1881.....	30 22
1882.....	31 07
1883.....	30 94
1884.....	31 42
1885.....	32 71

During the series of years, from 1875 to 1885, eleven years, the land was rising steadily in value, and it was rising

steadily in value under the care and supervision of men who were interested in not going beyond its true value, lest the township would have to pay a little more taxes than it did before. These two facts show conclusively that the statement of the hon. gentleman and his friends as to the depreciation of land in the county of Huron, is not substantiated by the facts. It has been said to us repeatedly that the farmers are on the verge of starvation, that some of them are bereft of all hope in this world, whatever they will have in the world beyond. Other gentlemen may think that, although their condition is not so deplorable as this, their earnings are very trifling, indeed, compared with what they should be. Hon. gentlemen sometimes should remember that it is always well, in discussing a great question, to state exactly the facts, because when they do that there is no fear that any man can trip their statement. I find that an hon. gentleman on the Opposition benches last year, discussing the condition of the farmer, and who, in his blind fury was anxious to make a point against the Government in regard to the National Policy, adduced certain facts and statements to show how much the farmers had lost under the National Policy. In that statement I find a very healthy state of affairs indeed, and I think it shows that there is no necessity for the lamentations which the hon. gentlemen are making in regard to the terrible state of the farmers. I find that, in that discussion, the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) said that the average farmer in the county of Huron sold 200 bushels of wheat at 99 cents, \$198; 150 bushels of barley at 68 cents, \$102; 150 bushels of oats at 40 cents, \$60; 75 bushels of peas at 67 cents, \$50.75; 10 cwt. of dressed hogs at \$7, \$70; 10 dressed turkeys at \$1.50, \$15; 200 lbs. of butter at 19 cents, \$38; 15 barrels of apples at \$2.30 a barrel, \$34.50; 50 dozen of eggs at 19 cents, \$9.50; five tons of hay at \$11, \$55; 5 tons of straw at \$8, \$40; 50 lbs. of wool at 22 cents, \$11; so that the whole of the articles which the average farmer sold, according to this hon. gentleman, on an average year from 1879 to 1887, was over \$620 worth. I ask you to consider whether that is not a fair showing for the profits of a farm on an average number of years from 1879 to 1887. But the hon. gentleman did not complete his statement. If he undertook to state all the products from the farm, he should have gone further, and many hon. gentlemen are aware that the farmers in that county sell excellent horses, excellent cattle and excellent sheep, but the hon. gentleman never enumerated a single horse, or a single sheep, or a single fat beast. If we add those products to the others which he has given, we will then find that the average farmer in the county of Huron derives an income of nearly \$900 per annum. I ask this House, or any hon. gentleman, if that is not a very fair showing indeed for an average farmer in the county of Huron to make. Perhaps I have not paid as much attention to the statements of the hon. gentleman opposite as they might deserve. I remember that in the county of Renfrew, when I was assisting in the election of an hon. gentleman who is now in this House, I quoted these statistics to show that the state of the country and the condition of the farmers in my own county was not as desperate as it might be. The hon. gentleman who replied to me said: "Why, it is absurd." I said: "My dear sir, the gentleman who uttered these words is the member for East Huron, a Reformer." He said: "I do not care what he is; the Reformers of East Huron have chosen a fool, and I think the people of West Huron have chosen another." Not only have I quoted this to show the condition of the farmers, but I may quote the words of Professor Brown in reference to the condition of the farmer. It is well known that that gentleman is in a position to understand the condition of the farmers of this country as well as any other man. His profession brings him into contact with them, his studies and his pur-

suits bring him in touch with them, and no doubt anything that affects their condition is known to him by a sort of magnetic or sympathetic influence, and this gentleman, drawing his facts and figures from Mr. Blue's report, sums up a letter, a long and able dissertation upon the condition of the farmer in these words, that he has no hesitation, after giving all the facts and combining them and showing the relation in which they stand to one another, in repeating: "That you, the farmers of Ontario, are not only doing well and making money, whether placed in the bank or in improvements or in mortgage, but you are all actually wealthy." That letter was attempted to be contradicted by men whose views it did not suit, and the professor again, on 3rd January, 1888, answered the statements, and in concluding he says: "If debiting and crediting can be stated on an average, I am of opinion that no class of farmers is so well off as those of Ontario." That is independent and professional evidence, and it is evidence given by a man who is thoroughly competent to understand what he speaks of. Another point to which I shall also direct the attention of hon. gentlemen for a short time is that of the mortgages on farm property. We heard a very doleful statement from the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) as to the burdens the farmers bear and the large amounts they pay to mortgage companies, and we are told that almost every farm in this country was burdened with a mortgage; but, before the hon. gentleman sat down, almost before he completed his sentence, he told us that the loan companies did not exactly show the amount of mortgages, because many farmers took first-class mortgages as good security. Is it not extraordinary that ruined farmers are able to lend money on mortgages? Where do they get the money? If they are ruined in order to keep up the pomp and splendor of manufacturers, where do they get the money? I think the farmers of Huron are well able to hold their own, and if there is a shiftless, or thriftless, or intemperate, or lazy man among them who cannot hold his own, they are quite willing to put their money upon his land. I may give a few moments also to a further consideration of some of the remarks the hon. gentleman has made. Amongst other things, he claims that unrestricted reciprocity would be of great benefit to the farmers of Canada—as all the others claim—by opening up a larger market, by placing within their reach the privilege of supplying the larger cities and populous communities along our southern border, and that thereby they might make a readier sale and receive a larger price. But, Sir, we know that Canada and many of the States south of us, produce agricultural products of the same class, and these latter to such an extent as to more than supply their own market. Therefore our products must seek the markets of the world where they may be disposed of at the best advantage. To assert that New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, or any other State to the south of us, require for their own use our wheat, our oats, our peas, corn, beef or pork, is to mock the intelligence of our farmers. Now, let me call attention to a statement which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries also made in answer to the hon. gentleman, about our natural market. The hon. gentleman says that the United States is the natural market for the agricultural products of Canada. A natural market, as I take it may be defined as one that is either contiguous, co-terminus or adjacent. But it is one in which nature supplies either not at all, or to a very limited extent, the goods therein offered, and which are demanded and required by the people. Now, in which of these categories shall we place the United States? Shall we say that they do not produce breadstuffs, meats, and such like products at all; or shall we say that they do not produce them in such a rich abundance as to supply their own people? Sir, to make either assertion, in the face of the evidence that we only send to that country

fifteen million dollars of agricultural products, and in face of the evidence of the commercial records of the United States, I say an assertion of that sort would be as absurd as it is false. We learn from the returns of the United States that the agricultural exports for the year ending 30th June, 1887, amounted to \$484,500,000. Of this sum about \$161,000,000 were breadstuff, \$92,000,000 beef, pork, butter and cheese, and \$9,000,000 were cattle and other products. Sir, I ask you is it possible that a country that produces these large quantities of agricultural products, really requires the products of Canada. Let me ask you to reflect on the innumerable bushels of grain and barrels of flour that leave the Atlantic ports of the United States for the hungry nations of Europe. Think also of the mountains of beef and pork which accompany this bread, and then how can any intelligent man say that the United States is a natural market for our surplus agricultural produce? No Sir, if we wish to dispose of these things we must go where they are required, and we shall find a market among these people who have outgrown the limits of their own food supply. To those countries must we look for the best customers of Canada. When the time comes, which is undoubtedly remote when the United States shall no longer export agricultural produce, or but to a very limited extent, then I acknowledge that we who live upon their borders may supply their wants with benefit to themselves and with profit to us. Until that time comes we must look to the populous nations of Europe, to them we must send our products, and from them receive the money or its equivalent, and in any case we must regard them as by nature destined to consume the fruits of our soil. The hon. gentleman also spoke of the movement of population, and this seems to be not only a stock argument, but a never failing source of melancholy regret on their part. The hon. member for South Oxford last night quoted the Scriptures, apparently for the sake of making a joke, but I thought he was very unfortunately placed, because the copy of the sacred book he possesses must be a mutilated copy; it begins with Exodus and ends with the lamentations of Jeremiah. Sir, in that book of his there is no gospel for Canada, there are no beatitudes for Canada, and it would seem that he was born, like the prophet of old, not to bless, but to curse. Sir, the exodus of Canada has been very well explained, and I think if men will lay aside party spirit and political bias, which sway their judgments oft-times, unintentionally, they must acknowledge that a movement of population is going on the world over. Some of these hon. gentlemen know well that in the old settled townships of the county I represent, there is a movement, not on account of the poverty of the people, not on account of the want of enterprise of the people, not on account of the sterility of the soil, but on account of the ambition of the younger men to go where they can find homes for themselves, free and untrammelled, where they can find an opportunity to commence the world in a life of adventure, like their fathers before them. It is nothing to be regretted as has been well remarked, heretofore we have not been able to utilise that spirit of adventure in our young men, because we had not in our possession the territory we required, and they drifted off, unfortunately for us, to the land of the Stars and Stripes. But while we regret the exodus of our young men, it is certainly a source of pride to every Canadian to know that though they have gone across the border, they have maintained the reputation of Canada for intelligence and trustworthiness. If we cannot keep them at home, we need not be ashamed of our export. If we raise the best wheat and the best horses in the world, we can also raise as good men, at least, as the United States. Sir, a remedy has been proposed for all the evils that afflict our country, more especially that afflict agriculture. It is a very drastic remedy, it is heroic treatment indeed. We were told, for example, the remedy would have the result of diminishing our revenue, and that by

Mr. PORTER.

some possibility, although not admitted, direct taxation might be the consequence. The physician examined the patient, he made a diagnosis and found she was very ill, and in order to save her he bled her to death and then killed her by starvation. That is certainly most heroic treatment. If our revenues are to be taken from us, and then the little we have remaining is to go in the form of taxation that is heroic treatment unquestionably. I need not dwell on the question of manufacturing industries. I think it will be admitted by every hon. member, as it will be by every intelligent man in the Dominion, that no country can ever be a great country that is purely an agricultural one, but that every country to attain to the highest civilisation must possess a great variety of all the elements which occupy and employ the mind and intellect of man, every art, science and industrial pursuit. The finest, the most complete, the most artistic industries must be carried on before a country can attain to the eminence of a highly civilised country. I think, therefore, the importance and the necessity will be admitted of establishing industrial pursuits in this Canada of ours. Years ago we were nothing more than the clearers of the forest, then we were the pioneers who were clearing away the obstructions of nature; but now that these results have been accomplished and we have overcome the first difficulties in our way and we are about to lay the foundations of a great and, as I hope, a mighty empire, we should consider well and consider wisely by what possible means we can introduce all the varied branches of art, science and literature into the country, because by these means and these means alone shall we ever become a great nation. Wealth alone will not make us great, but wealth, arts, science and industry, and all the mechanical skill and enterprise which characterise the most advanced nations of men, they and they alone will make us great. I say, therefore, that these statesmen, especially the venerable leader of this House who nine years ago introduced a policy which had for its object that view and purpose, deserve the gratitude of the country not only now but for all time to come. If one could suppose that his wise scheme could miscarry, and the people of Canada declined to follow the plan which he had laid down for them, and the lines on which he desired them to go, yet I believe the time would come, if in a moment of excitement they were led away by the seductions of hon. gentlemen opposite, when they would recoil to the position they had already taken and reaffirm the verdict already made. If they were to do away with all those protections to the industries of the country and starve out our young industries, then I believe not many years would pass before they would be sorry they had so far forgotten themselves, and would recall the memories of those days of 1879, and wish again for one hour with the venerable statesman who now leads this House. We are told that the introduction of the National Policy has been the means of establishing large institutions in this country which derive vast sums of money from the people. If it be unwise and unjust, if it be dangerous to the state to form an establishment in this country, which by its command of an enormous capital is able to exercise its power to crush out its feebler rivals, I contend it is ten times more dangerous to the state to build up an institution of that kind in a foreign land over which we can have no control. No good can the people of Canada by any possibility derive, no compensation for the sense of injustice which our people will feel can be obtained, for the insuperable obstacles which must be placed in the way of men equally as enterprising and energetic, but not as wealthy, under an arrangement such as is proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite. When we contemplate what the present policy has done for us we have every reason to be assured that we are working upon the right lines, we have every reason to be confirmed in our opinion that the time is not far distant when we certainly

shall reap the benefits of all our labors, and planning, and scheming for the welfare of Canada. But suppose we admit that we are led aside by the seductive tones of the gloomy knight from Oxford, that the darkness of the shadows overcloud the intellect, and we are led to vote for the resolution before the House, what then will take place? I contend that the passage of this resolution would retard Canada in mid-career, would have a tendency to destroy her industries, would reduce her capital, and would make us, although we aim to be something better, only producers of those raw materials which would be used in the manufactories and workshops of a foreign country, and Canada like ancient Bœotia would be famed for her fertile soil and the stupidity of her men. What true-hearted, patriotic Canadian can contemplate the melancholy picture of his country, under the auspices of the scheme which those gentlemen propose? He must hang his head in deep humiliation, he must feel the glow of shame burning in his face at the result which must inevitably happen. But to that keen and shrewd nation over the border into whose hands this resolution would certainly deliver us bound in brazen fetters, to those men I say our abject whining and cringing must be loathsome and disgusting. They themselves formulated a treaty of commerce between us which existed for twelve years, and which we were anxious to renew, and for twenty-two years they have refused to listen to the repeated requests of the Canadian people and Canadian Government. Canada wishes to trade upon fair terms and on a satisfactory basis with all the world, and when the people of the United States intimate their willingness to meet with us and discuss these matters, then we will meet them and discuss the whole question; but until that time comes, Canada must refuse to stand like a beggar, cap in hand, at the door of the cold and haughty republic. For these reasons, which I have imperfectly recounted, and because I believe that Canada's future depends upon her own efforts and her own wisdom and not on another's favor, I shall vote against the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. DESSAINT. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I regret having to speak at this late hour of the evening. I beg my hon. colleagues to forgive me if I take the floor at the beginning of a debate as important as that which is now holding the attention of this House. I do not act thus through ostentation but because, having to absent myself to-morrow on urgent business, I shall not enjoy the privilege of voting on the question at present submitted to us. Hence I seize this opportunity of expressing my views on the subject. As the representative of a wholly farming county, I think it urgent to express my opinion—an opinion which I believe to be shared by a large majority of the electors of my constituency on the question which is now stirring public opinion. I shall endeavor, Mr. Speaker, to do it as briefly as possible. The question set before us by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is of capital importance, involving the highest interests of the country. It has attracted widespread attention throughout the provinces and may entail the most momentous consequences. The proposition, which is not new in itself, and has already been admitted in principle in this country, tends to demand thorough reciprocity of our manufactured products and our natural produce with the United States. On the one hand, reciprocity is commended as calculated to give Canada great advantages in respect of her commercial relations with the United States. On the other hand, two objections are urged against it. In the first place, it is stated that a reciprocity treaty is impossible because the United States will have none of it, and, in proof, we are referred to the request made by Sir Charles Tupper, as plenipotentiary, during the late fisheries conferences at Washington. Secondly, I have heard it declared

in this House, and the papers repeat, that reciprocity is not in the best interests of the country. Well, Mr. Speaker, I see here a contradiction in terms. If reciprocity is of no advantage to our country, why did Sir Charles Tupper plead for it? If, on the contrary, this reciprocity treaty is beneficial to Canada, why should gentlemen speaking with authority, Ministers of the Crown, in speeches learnedly prepared, and inspired with more or less good faith, come before us and say that we live in the best country of the world, that we are enjoying prosperity, and that, with the actual system of protection, there is nothing that we need further seek? I say, Sir, that this is a contradiction and that there is a lack of sequence in these means of defence. I believe that all those who have followed a little the course of events in this country, and who understand the relations which have existed and still exist between Canada and the United States, are blind in saying that a people like ours of 5,000,000 of inhabitants are not interested in having commercial relations with a nation like the United States, and its 60,000,000 of souls. The geography of the two countries demonstrates, on the contrary, that we are destined to have continual relations. And naturally, too, Canada has more interest in these relations to the United States than the United States have in relations with us. We are neighbors; it is only an imaginary line that separates us from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans. Shall it then be said that, because we are not the same nation, although having the same interests, we must keep up a barrier between us and transact no business together? I am of opinion that such would not be to the interest of the Canadian people, certainly not to the interest of the greater number—consisting of the farmers. My further opinion is that those who tell us we have no interest in cultivating business relations with the United States, are not sincere, but simply making political capital. The business relations are there to demonstrate the advantages which Canada would derive from a reciprocity treaty with our neighbors. Take the fluctuations of commerce in the first few years. I shall do this briefly, during three periods. The first period will be from 1821 to 1846. At that time we were under the yoke of England in regard to Commerce, under the complete tutelage of Great Britain, and had not the right, as a colony, to conclude treaties or even to make a tariff. Where was our commerce during that term? We had then no relations at all, or almost none, with the United States. True, the Canadian people were not as numerous as they are at present, but taking the number into consideration, let us see what commercial relations existed then:—From 1821 to 1846 the total of imports from the United States into the Provinces of British North America, including Newfoundland, were \$90,124,195, and the exports \$31,040,831. Thus for twenty-five years, we exported, on an average, the yearly worth of one million and a quarter dollars and, as I said, we had no reciprocity at that epoch, and were under the commercial wing of the mother country. In 1846, the ties binding us to the mother country were slackened a little, and we were enabled to have business dealings with the United States of a more direct character. Then there was a question between the statesmen of both countries to weave still closer business relations, and thence sprang the scheme of the first reciprocity treaty concluded in 1854. So early as 1847, public men on both sides of the line were busied with these commercial relations of which the importance was felt, while the reciprocal benefits which would accrue therefrom were well understood. The proposition remained in abeyance, however, till 1854. We may examine now the next period between 1854 and 1866, during which the reciprocity treaty was in force between the two countries. Take, first, since 1850—the imports and exports. The former stood at \$6,594,860, and the latter at \$1,951,159. In 1866, when the reciprocity treaty expired, the imports were \$20,424,692 and

the exports \$34,770,261. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the conclusion that one would naturally draw from such figures? We are taught thereby that during this period of reciprocity we prospered at an astonishing rate, and the conclusion to be drawn is that if we had reciprocity still with the United States, the increase in our commerce would be proportionate to that which we enjoyed during the term just mentioned. The reciprocity treaty terminated on the 17th March, 1866. We may now enquire whether the progress of our commerce was in the same ratio in 1867? The imports of that year were \$20,271,907 and the exports \$25,583,800. In 1866, twenty years later, the imports were \$35,770,150 and the exports \$26,997,914. Indeed, Sir, the exports of 1866 were less considerably than those of 1866. In other words, twenty years previous, when we were under the terms of a reciprocity treaty, we exported upwards of \$34,000,000, and twenty years later, in spite of the great prosperity of the country, about which we hear so much praise, we exported only the worth of \$26,000,000, or \$8,000,000 less than under the reciprocity system. Now, Sir, they who applaud the present state of things, who affirm that we are as well off as possible and who say that it is almost impossible to have more prosperity than that which we now enjoy, speak rather from the standpoint of the great capitalists who seem to work, not for the greater number, but for the lesser number, the manufacturers. We, as representatives of the people, it is not the smaller number that we must protect, but the mass of the population, and for my part, I say that if we had a reciprocity treaty as general as possible with the United States, the former class would find it to their great advantage. There are disadvantages, Mr. Speaker, which our farmers cannot overcome. Thus, in virtue of the tariff actually in force in the United States—a tariff of reprisals—our farmers cannot sell their produce without paying considerable duties, which all hon. members know as well as I. I shall cite a few points to show that our farmers require the disappearance of this barrier between Canada and the United States, in order that we may have easier relations with the United States. I speak more particularly for the farmer class, and the county which I have the honor of representing. It is almost exclusively agricultural. Kamouraska county produces in particular, annually, a large quantity of hay, potatoes, and grain of all kinds, and there is also a large trade in horses, cattle, sheep and other animals. I say nothing but what is known, and there is no use of concealing the facts, when I state that we are obliged to pay, at the American frontier, a duty of 20 per cent. on the horses which we sell; thus, when a farmer sells a horse to a trader for \$100, the trader who takes it to the United States is obliged to give 20 per cent. duty. If he had not this duty of 20 per cent. to pay, instead of giving the farmer only \$100 for his horse, he would pay him \$120, that would make \$20 to the good for our farmers if we had a reciprocity treaty with the Americans. It is the same, Mr. Speaker, for all the products of the farm, and in my county chiefly for hay and potatoes. A duty of 15 per cent. a bushel is put on potatoes, or a percentage of 39·58 per cent. It is the same for cheese on which we pay four cents per pound, that is, 30·14 per cent. So we pay also \$2 on the ton of hay, or \$2 for 100 bundles, which is 18·98 per cent. If tradesmen had not such duties to pay on passing the American border they might pay more to our Canadian farmers, and these farmers would profit thereby. I hold, then, that we should, first and foremost, protect the agricultural class. Even, it seems to me, the manufacturers would find their own advantage therein. Much protection has been demanded for the manufacturers; and, Mr. Speaker, after these several years in which they have worked their industries, these gentlemen ought to be in a position to cope with foreign manufacturers. We boast of the prosperity of our country; it is said that we are progressing in every respect. Yet I hold that, if there is any

Mr. DESSAINT.

advance, it is only in the large cities, for unfortunately in our rural districts there has been hardly any growth. Look at the population of Kamouraska county. In 1871 it stood at 21,254 inhabitants, and in 1881 it had risen only to 22,181—an increment in a whole decade of no more than 927 souls. Take next the whole population of the Province of Quebec. In 1871 it figured at 1,191,116 inhabitants, and in 1881 it stood at 1,359,027, or an increase of only 167,511. Will it be said that this is a natural augmentation giving full and entire satisfaction? Certainly not. And what is the cause of this lack of increase? It is because our country places are losing their people every day. Every year, you may see one-quarter, or perhaps one-third of our population going into exile, in the direction of the United States. And why? Because they do not find protection enough in their own land; because they do not find sufficient manufactures to provide them with subsistence. This is a fact which is patent to everybody. We may boast of the wealth of our country as much as we like, but the proof of the contrary lies in the fact that, at this day, there are in the United States over a million of Canadians. I firmly believe that if we had the advantage of renewing commercial relations with the United States, we should see our friends from beyond the border return to their homes, to find work and earn the livelihood of their families. During the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) I overheard an observation from an hon. member on the other side of House, or, I should say, an insult launched in the face of every Canadian on the other side of line 45°. It was said that they who had migrated to the United States were no better than hewers of wood and drawers of water. This is a gratuitous injury, doing no credit to the person who uttered it, and showing the feeling which exists—I shall not say among all the members opposite—but among some of them, in regard to Canadians who have removed to the United States. Such expressions prove that the parties using them are not prepared to encourage the return of these exiles to their native land, and that they prefer to hurl insults at them. This is to be regretted. But in the name of those who dwell beyond the line, I affirm that it was wrong to speak so, inasmuch as those of our people who are in the United States are there through necessity, and that, if they have been forced to leave the country, it is because we have an Administration which does not allow them to make their living honorably therein. I hold, Mr. Speaker, that not only would reciprocity be advantageous to the farmer class, but that it would furthermore be beneficial to the development of almost all the resources which we possess. We say with reason that our country is blessed with great and manifold advantages. We have indeed very rich mines of all ores. But it must be confessed, Mr. Speaker, that capital is scanty in the Dominion of Canada, and if we had more extended commercial relations with the United States, I believe that the capital abounding there would flow into this country to co-operate in the working of our forests, our mines and all our other sources of latent wealth. One fact which happened in my county shows that it is owing to the lack of money if we do not always succeed, and that it is only through constant communication with a people as well-to-do as our neighbors that we shall arrive at the thrift which we all sigh for. We have in Kamouraska silex mountains, adapted for glass works, and we have also considerable strata of sand which could be employed in the manufacture of glass. A few years ago, a company was raised to work out this industry. But, as so often happens with enterprises of that class in this country, we were unable to succeed for want of means. Well, I repeat my belief that if we had a reciprocity treaty; if the American markets were thrown open to us; if we had the advantage of seeing

Americans working our industries, it were a source of wealth for the country, and for the county which I represent. The chief objections made to reciprocity was that the programme should have been submitted to the electors, instead of the House. I do not regard the objection as a serious one, because there is question only of the manifestation of an opinion. Furthermore, the hon. gentlemen sitting on the other wing of the House have not always been so squeamish in their political career. When they established Confederation, they did not consult the people and they carried out their scheme in spite of the protests of the hon. members of the Left, in those days. And later, what did they do with their protection programme? When the hon. leader of the Government began setting his National Policy before the House, was it after consulting the people? No, Sir. It was during the first or second Session after the general elections that his project was adopted. Hence this objection is not serious, and even if it were, these hon. gentlemen should go back on themselves and remember that they were wrong in the past and that we are right at present. The second objection adduced is that it were a want of allegiance, nay, a case of treason, to make a reciprocity treaty with the United States, to the strong detriment of Great Britain. I deem that this objection is not serious either. When the hon. gentlemen on the other side put forth their protective tariff, they took no heed of the interests of Great Britain. They proclaimed in the press, in the House, and everywhere that their watchword was "Canada for Canadians." In other words, they gave out that they were making a tariff to protect Canadians, and not Britons. We are in the same predicament to-day. The question is to draft a reciprocity treaty, not to protect Great Britain, but to protect ourselves, and to foster commercial relations with our neighbors. The third objection urged is the only serious one specially handled by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and by the other members of this side of the House who followed him. Verily, after the lesson of political economy given by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I hold it would be imprudent to venture on the difficult ground. The hon. gentleman's speech will remain as a monument in the parliamentary annals of this House, and I believe that the reasons he gave in answer to this objection are altogether triumphant. I shall take leave to add only a few words. We are asked where we shall find the revenue to replace the customs duties which are proposed to be abolished between Canada and the United States? In the first place, as it has been said in this House, the expenses which are now actually incurred ought to be lessened, because they are excessive. We spend \$37,000,000 to \$38,000,000 yearly, when with an outlay of \$26,000,000 I think we could meet all the wants of the Administration. I remember that in 1878 the Hon. Mr. Tilley, then a member of this House, made a special charge against the Mackenzie Government for spending beyond \$23,000,000; adding, that with such a sum he could manage the affairs of the country, and meet all necessary calls with an income of \$23,000,000. What are the reasons of the increase since then? My opinion is that if the business of the country was well administered, instead of sinking millions to encourage companies ambitious to control the country, the whole wants of the Administration of the country could be supplied with \$26,000,000. Now, with a reciprocity treaty, we should certainly have considerable increase in commerce, excise duties would be increased by the same token, and our customs duties with Great Britain and all other countries would remain the same as they are now. But let us suppose, for a moment, that the customs revenue could be insufficient to meet necessary and indispensable expenses. I am of opinion—although my experience does not go far in the matter—that means could be found

to make good the outlay, not by levying an indirect tax on the Province, but by imposing duties which the wealthy would support. Thus, we have railway, telegraph, navigation and other companies doing the business of the country. Who would be the first to profit by reciprocity and our increments in business? Evidently, these railways, telegraph and navigation companies. I really believe that it would be proper, if there should be need, to impose a duty or tax on these corporations, as is now done in the Province of Quebec. There would probably be outcries. But who is responsible for the notion? It is due to the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec who passed a law levying a tax on all commercial corporations of the Province. And if I have been rightly informed, the plan had its origin here, in Ottawa. I believe it would prove a means of balancing our finances, and, at the same time, protecting the agricultural class, if those who draw the largest revenues were made to pay. But it is urged that the immediate introduction of a reciprocity treaty would produce a complete disturbance in business. Well, let the change be made gradual, as was done with the treaty of 1854 and as would have been the case in 1874, when negotiations were carried on between the late George Brown and the Government of the United States, for a renewal of the treaty. A treaty of that kind is not enforced at once, but a certain delay is allotted, one, two or three years, in order to prevent anything like a financial derangement. Finally we are told that the United States do not want a reciprocity treaty. Then, it is our business to take the first step forward. It will not do to cloak ourselves up in our dignity and exclaim: "We, a people of 5,000,000, have no business to hold out the hand to the United States, numbering 60,000,000. We are too proud for that." We must take the initiative, for the good reason that we have the most interest in the conclusion of such an instrument. Indeed, who drew the greatest profits out of the commercial relations during the existence of the treaty of 1854? Doubtless, Canadians. And the proof that the United States made nothing by it is that they demanded its abrogation. This is proof sufficient that we have more need of the reciprocity treaty than the United States. It follows that, if it is more to an advantage for us than for them, it is ours to make the start in that direction. It strikes me that those who pretend that we should not make the first advances are neither serious nor sincere. We have been told in this House that there is no more advantage to Canadians from a treaty of reciprocity than from the present system. If you find that a reciprocity treaty with the United States is not of sufficient advantage, say so honestly and frankly, and then we shall know where we stand. In my view, the interests of the country should be discussed with more loyalty and open-mindedness. We should thus learn from one another and reach some sort of an understanding. Mr. Speaker, I have lengthened my remarks rather more than I had proposed. I had no mind to debate the question, my meaning being simply to give an expression of my views. As I said at the beginning, as representing an agricultural county, I deem it to be in the general interest of the vast bulk of the population that we should bend all our efforts towards reaching an understanding with the United States. And if we attain the object of thorough business interchange with the United States, I am convinced that we shall see the dawn of universal thrift in the country, and more especially among the farming class. As I said before, I shall not have the opportunity of voting on this question, being called away by absolutely urgent business, but I thought it was only my duty to unfold my views on this subject, which will receive from me and from that portion of my constituents whom I have the honor of representing, the warmest approbation.

Mr. CHARLTON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Before the adjournment of the debate I would wish to ask the leader of the Opposition whether there is any likelihood that the debate will be brought to an end to-morrow.

Mr. LAURIER. No, Mr. Speaker; as far as I can see there is no likelihood for the debate to be concluded to-morrow.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Can we come to some agreement on both sides about closing the debate say on Tuesday if that would be convenient for members on both sides.

Mr. LAURIER. I think we can agree that there will be no division on Monday.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 16th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Pontiac and Renfrew Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 43) to amend the Act incorporating the Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 44) respecting bonds of branch lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

THE EMPEROR OF GERMANY.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to take the opportunity of enquiring of the First Minister if there is truth in the report which is circulated that the Crown Prince, the present Emperor of Germany, is deceased?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have no information on that point. I am happy to believe that it is an error.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought probably it was.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report arose, I fancy, from the flags being hoisted half-mast high. They were so hoisted on the reception of a communication from the Home Government, to honor the obsequies of the late Emperor.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other, (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

Mr. DESSAINT.

And amendment of Mr. Foster:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending Trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, the consideration of the question now before the House is a matter of great importance to this country, and it may truly be said that no question has been debated in this Chamber since the date of Confederation of as great importance as that now under consideration. It is a question, Sir, which has recently attracted a very large amount of attention in the country; it is a question which to-day occupies in the public mind a more prominent place than any other public question. It is also a question which has been discussed and considered for some months past not as a party question; it has been a political question indeed, but it was not a party question. Either of the great parties in this country were at liberty at any time to make this proposition a plank in their platform, or both of the great parties were at liberty to act in concert on this matter for the purpose of procuring what we believe would prove a very great boon to Canada. It is a question, Sir, that can only be said to have assumed the position of a party question, yesterday. It only assumed that position, Sir, when the Minister of Marine introduced his amendment to the motion made by my hon. friend at my right, declaring that in the opinion of this House reciprocity with the United States ought only be sought for upon conditions which would permit us to retain unimpaired the features of the National Policy, or, in other words, that it should only be sought for upon conditions that we are certain would be refused. That, Sir, makes a plain, square issue and makes the question a party question. My hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has introduced his motion, declaring that unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States would prove to be a boon that we are warranted in seeking to obtain; and the Government meets that proposal by a counter-proposition, declaring that we will not seek for it—that we will not accept reciprocity with the United States, except upon conditions which the Government and the people of that country have distinctly informed us, time and time again and for years past, were inadmissible, and conditions upon which they would not grant it. It now, Sir, becomes a party question, and it is the party question of the day. It will be a party question, in all probability, for some years in the future, and, Sir, in my belief it is a principle that is bound to triumph in this country. In my belief, the hope of this country is intimately connected with the triumph of this principle.

In considering this question it is well at all times to bear in mind our peculiar position, our peculiar environments and our surroundings upon this continent at the same time. No less than 65,000,000 of people speak the English tongue on this continent to-day, and that, at this moment, North America is the great seat of Anglo-Saxon power. Some weeks ago I stood upon the plains of Abraham and looked upon the inscription on that simple shaft erected to the memory of General Wolfe:

"Here died Wolfe victorious, September 17, 1759."

Well, Sir, 129 years have passed away since then, and the two and a half millions of English-speaking people that then dwelt upon this continent have increased to 65,000,000. When we come to make computations as to the probable increase in numbers and wealth of English speaking people on this continent, and are guided in these computations by the experience of the past, the result of such computations would lead one to doubt whether he were waking or dreaming. It is certain, Sir, that, in the near future, there will be 100,000,000 of English-speaking people on the continent of North America, and in

all human probability that number will be living on this continent when we reach the year 1910. It is morally certain that there will be 65,000,000 people in the United States at the next census in 1890, as certain almost is it that there will be 80,000,000 people there in 1900, and that there will be 100,000,000 in 1910. Now, Sir, this being the case, and the fact being apparent that this continent is to be the grandest theatre of Anglo-Saxon achievements and development of Anglo-Saxon power, it becomes us to consider our position as Anglo Saxons living upon the continent of North America. We should approach the consideration of this question not in a partisan spirit; we should approach the consideration of this question with a view to the promotion of the best interests of this country. It is a question which, above all other questions, requires in its treatment and in its consideration the exercise of patriotic impulses and motives.

Mr. LANDRY. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend says "hear, hear." I hope, Sir, he will never lose sight of this sentiment when treating this question. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have forty-five Anglo-Saxon commonwealths and fifteen territorial organisations, besides the commonwealths upon this continent. Part of these are under one flag and part of them are under another, but they are to-day, and they will be in all the days of the future, intimately bound together. The fate of one will influence the fate of the other, and it is inevitable such will be the case. Their geographical situation is such that they must necessarily have commercial and social relations of the most intimate character, the one with the other.

Now, Sir, in dealing with the question of a proposed commercial treaty with the United States, we have to take into consideration—and we shall find that at every turn of the argument that view of the case will crop up—the relative public burdens resting on the two countries, the amount of the necessary taxation in one and in the other, the burden of debt resting on one and on the other, and the expenditure of one and of the other. We shall have to enter into a process of self-examination to ascertain exactly what our position relatively to that of the United States is. To state the case briefly, we commenced in 1867 with a net debt of \$75,728,400; on the 1st of March last our debt amounted to \$229,000,000, an increase of \$153,600,000 in round numbers, or 203 per cent., while our population did not increase more than 40 per cent. The increase of our debt in that time has been five times more rapid than the increase of our population. We commenced in 1868 with an expenditure of \$13,486,000, and last year our expenditure was \$35,658,000—that of the preceding year was much higher. That was an increase of \$22,000,000, or 164 per cent., an increase of expenditure four times more rapid than the increase of population. Our taxation from customs in 1868 was \$8,578,000, and in 1887 it was \$22,378,000, an increase of \$13,800,000 or 160 per cent., an increase four times more rapid than the increase of population. Now, you will see that the increase in debt has outstripped the increase of population in a five-fold ratio, the increase of expenditure has outstripped the increase of population in a four-fold ratio, and the increase of taxation has outstripped the increase of population in a four-fold ratio; and the only period in the history of Canada when this course of things has not marked the administration of the affairs of this country, was during the administration of my hon. and most highly honored friend at my right (Mr. Mackenzie). Under his administration, though he was compelled, in order to carry out obligations incurred by his predecessors, to increase the debt of this country from 1874-5 to 1878-9, so that the burden of interest was increased \$604,000, he diminished the taxation from customs from \$15,351,000 in 1874-5 to \$12-

900,000 in 1878-9, a decrease in taxation of \$3,451,000. Although the expenditure chargeable to consolidated fund increased in the same period, by a careful computation, almost exactly \$352,000, the controllable expenditure was diminished by \$1,782,000. I say, Sir, that period furnished the only instance in the history of Canada, since 1867, when the affairs of this country have been administered in other than a reckless manner, and a manner contrary to the dictates of economy and prudence.

Now, Sir, one result of this extravagance, and of other circumstances to which I shall shortly allude, is to be seen in the exodus of the population of this country. I am aware, Sir, that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House seek to belittle this loss. I am aware that the accuracy of the statistics furnished by the United States is impugned by them. I am aware that they deny that any unusual movement in that direction has taken place in late years. The hon. Minister of Marine stated, yesterday, that no unusual movement of late had taken place. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Porter) stated that there was a movement to a certain extent, and that the movement from his section was of young men who went to find homes free and untrammelled and cheaper than they could find them in Ontario. While they do go for that purpose, the fact is capable of demonstration that the exodus from this country has been of an alarming character. No person can visit the United States and travel with his eyes open without becoming aware that in the northern States a great percentage of the population is native Canadian. The statistics furnished at Washington show that the immigration from British America to the United States amounted in 1870 to 490,000 souls. The census of 1880 returned 700,000 souls, and 930,000 odd children born in the United States of Canadian parents as then living in the United States; so that it is demonstrable that, at the present moment, not less than 2,000,000 people are living in the United States who would have had their homes in Canada but for the exodus which has taken place from this country to theirs. This exodus is intimately connected with the administration of affairs of this country. It is caused, to a large extent, by the serious burdens imposed on the people of the country. It is caused to a still larger extent by the delusive promises made on behalf of the National Policy, which the people of this country are aware have not been and cannot be fulfilled. That National Policy, which was adopted in 1879, promised to the farmers of Canada a market for all their productions. They have not secured it; but, on the contrary, instead of receiving higher prices, prices have continued steadily, and year by year, to decline. It promised to the farmers of Canada that American productions should be prevented from coming into competition with Canadian productions, by the duties imposed on the former. That also was a delusion and a snare. It promised that competition between manufacturers in Canada would lower the price of goods, and the truth is that to-day there is no civilised country in the world where the producer buys dearer and sells cheaper than he does in Canada.

Mr. HICKEY. It is not so; you cannot prove it either.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is so. In some cases goods may be absolutely somewhat lower in price than they were ten years ago; but there is no case in which goods are not relatively higher in consequence of the National Policy than they were then. There is no class of goods that it will not pay to smuggle into this country. There are no goods that are not sold in this country almost up to the limit at which similar goods could be imported with the duty paid; and I repeat that Canada, is of all civilised countries, the one where the great producing classes buy dear and sell cheap. That is the result of the National Policy, and one of the fruits of that policy

is to drive from this country hundreds of thousands of its citizens. The hon. Minister of the Interior assured us the other night that the farmers of Ontario were in a happy condition. Well, Sir, I leave the farmers of Ontario to judge, and to say whether that is not entirely destitute of every element of truth, and whether it is not a cruel insult to that class of people. He proceeded to make a comparison between the prices obtainable for certain productions of the soil in Buffalo and in Toronto, and he succeeded in making a comparison in some articles that was favorable to Canada. Now, since the year 1879, when the National Policy went into operation, there never has been a time, in my opinion, which is based upon the market reports, when agricultural productions of all kinds were not rated higher in price in the United States markets than in the corresponding Canadian markets, until the past summer, autumn and winter, when, for the first time since the National Policy was adopted, it has been possible to make a comparison that would be favorable to Canada in a few lines of agricultural productions. And what was the cause of this? It was because last year we had an unprecedented drought in Ontario, which dried up our pastures and caused the country to have a deficient crop; and, as a result of that disaster, potatoes were imported from Manitoba, and Ontario became, instead of a producing country with a surplus to sell, a consuming country which had to purchase supplies of various kinds in order to meet its wants. Under these conditions, for a short time in the history of Ontario, prices were higher in some lines there than in the corresponding markets of the United States, and the hon. gentleman paraded before this House certain facts which were due solely to a great agricultural disaster, and upon these facts he felicitated himself on the unduly prosperous condition of the country.

Although, perhaps, it is not exactly germane to the case, I will allude to the statement made by the hon. the Minister of the Interior, with regard to the burdens resting upon the farmers in the western States. The hon. gentleman seems to have conceived that the *Chicago Times* is an authority of greater value than any statistical report in the country, and he quoted an extract from that paper stating that mortgages in the western States were placed at from 1 to 3 per cent. per month, and that the land in that country was rapidly being swallowed up by capitalists through the foreclosure of mortgages. Now, whether the hon. gentleman was aware of it or not, no statement could have been wider of the truth, and so far as it may have any bearing upon the question under discussion now, I pronounce it to be entirely unfounded. I know, from personal experience and observation, that 6 and 7 per cent. per annum on good mortgage security, is considered a satisfactory rate in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Missouri, and that only do high rates prevail in some of the newer Territories, where the security to be considered is of a less solid character. The fact is, there is a plethora of capital in the United States which is seeking investment, at low rates, in any portion of the country where satisfactory security can be obtained, and the statement of the hon. gentleman that 3 per cent. a month is charged on good mortgage security is utterly unfounded, even if it does emanate from that paper, which has been called the Satanic press of Chicago, the *Chicago Times*.

Another result of the policy of this Government is found at the present moment in the condition of our North-West. My hon. friend told us the other night that many Canadians had been entrapped into going to Dakota. Well, I do not know of any individual in this Dominion who has more effectually aided in entrapping Canadians into Dakota than the Minister of the Interior. I do not know of any cause that has operated more effectually to produce immigration to Dakota than the regulations of the Department of the Interior. True, they have

been modified somewhat, and for the better, under the administration of my hon. friend. True, they were very much worse under his predecessor, but still those regulations to-day—and I wish that I may be able to impress this fact on the mind of my hon. friend—are of a character to aid most efficiently in entrapping Canadians into Dakota, because they are less liberal than the land regulations of the United States. They are less liberal with reference to homestead grants; they are less liberal as regards the prices of land. They charge as much again for land south of the Canadian Pacific Railway as is charged in the United States for land similarly situated. They charge 75 cents per acre more for land north of the Canadian Pacific Railway than is charged for similar lands in the United States; and these charges have operated most powerfully in diverting emigration from the Canadian North-West to the new Territories of the American Union. Another influence that has operated to entrap Canadians into Dakota is the National Policy, which bears with unjust severity upon the people of our North-West. It is a policy which imposes upon them heavy taxation on the implements they introduce into that country, it is a policy which, while on the one hand taxing them mercilessly, denies them on the other hand the means for securing the transmission of the grain that lies piled up in millions of bushels along the Canadian Pacific Railway at the present moment. I visited Manitoba lately, and was informed there that the duty on agricultural implements often amounted to over 50 per cent. of their actual cost, under the regulations of the department. Steam threshers and mowing machines introduced at the boundary line at their actual cost, are revalued; their value is increased, and the purchaser obliged to pay a duty of 50 per cent. or more on their cost. These things—these regulations with regard to land, and the operation of the National Policy in the North-West, are what have driven Canadians into Dakota and Minnesota, and have led to there being more Canadians to-day in the single Territory of Dakota than there are in Manitoba and all the Territories in the North-West.

So much for this diagnosis of the Canadian case. Now, to come to a direct consideration of the question under discussion, I wish to draw the attention of my hon. friends opposite to one most significant fact. The question of commercial or unrestricted reciprocity has been under consideration in the country for some time, and a great number of the farmers' institutes of Ontario, forty out of sixty, have pronounced unequivocally and by overwhelming majorities in favor of this principle embodied in the resolution now before the House. I hold a list in my hand of these institutes, but it is hardly necessary for me to take up the time of the House by reading it at the present moment. I have attended the meetings of some of those institutes, and have found that, in all cases, the sentiment in favor of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity was of a most pronounced character, and I have found that this sentiment is by no means confined within party lines. The president of one of the institutes, a meeting of which I attended, was a Reformer. He took the platform in opposition to the principle of unrestricted reciprocity, in reply to the arguments I made in its behalf. I had the privilege of the closing reply, and the vote that was taken showed there were only three present, in the whole meeting, who were opposed to the principle of unrestricted reciprocity. The people feel instinctively that a change is required. They feel that our interests require us to obtain closer trade relations with the United States, and that every impediment placed in the way of trade with that country is an impediment that reacts upon all the great producing classes of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said a few moments ago, our relative position in the matter of taxation, our relative position in the matter of expenditure and in the

matter of debt, to that of the United States is a practical question of the utmost importance to the people of this country. It is a question that will become more and more important to us. It is a question which has a most important bearing upon the welfare of this country, because we have an intelligent people in this Dominion from whom it is impossible to conceal the true condition of affairs, a people who can come to a conclusion themselves as to the meaning of our debt burden, which is two and a-half times greater than that of the United States, *per capita*, a people who can calculate for themselves what the increase of expenditure four times more rapidly than the increase of population means, a people who know, in fact, that the course the country is pursuing is one which threatens the gravest disaster; and when they compare the condition of this country with that of the United States, they are induced in thousands of cases to abandon Canada and go to that country. In view of that condition of affairs, I want to point out what the disparity in the burdens of the two countries is, and I do that in order to enforce the argument which I wish to impress upon the House, that the time has come for retrenchment and economy. On the 1st March, this present month, the gross debt of the United States amounted to \$1,202,454,714; the net debt amounted to \$1,092,927,581, deducting from the gross debt the principal and interest due from the Pacific roads, less their sinking funds. The gross *per capita* charge in the United States was \$20.04, and the net *per capita* charge \$18.22. But the argument which will probably be advanced is that this is not a fair comparison, and that it is necessary, in order to make the comparison a fair one, to add to the debt of the United States the debt of the various States, because, while we grant subsidies to our Provinces, the general Government of the United States does not. If we accept that as a correct statement, and include the debts of the States, funded and unfunded, which amounted in 1887 to \$228,347,462, less \$50,753,312 sinking funds and assets convertible into cash, or net debt amounting to \$177,589,150, we find that the net debt, federal and state all included, on the 1st March last, was \$1,270,516,446, or a *per capita* charge of \$21.18. Now, what is ours? On the basis of four and three-quarter millions of inhabitants, which, I presume, are as many as will be claimed, we find that our net debt of \$229,409,430 is equal to a *per capita* charge of \$48.29, or two and one-third times as much as the total indebtedness of the United States, federal and state. That is a grave state of affairs. It involves taxing this people two and one-third times as much as the people of the United States are taxed. No, it is even heavier, because, while the 3 per cents. in that country are at a premium, in this country the 3 per cents. are at a discount. Our credit is not as good, and the relative ability to meet the indebtedness is in the ratio of about two and one-half in Canada to one in the United States. Last year, the Government of the United States reduced the national debt by \$103,471,097, and the State debts were reduced by \$15,260,986, while we increased our indebtedness and made our position worse than it had been at the opening of the year. If we come to the question of customs, we find that last year we raised by customs duties the amount of \$22,469,705, which is a *per capita* charge of \$4.73. In the United States they raised the amount of \$217,286,893, or \$3.62 *per capita*. But of that \$217,000,000 they applied \$103,471,097 towards the extinguishment of their national debt, leaving a net taxation from customs applicable to expenditure of \$113,815,796, or a *per capita* charge of \$1.90 against a charge of \$4.73 a head in Canada. Under that condition of things, with an actual taxation from customs nearly three times as great as that in the neighboring country, what is likely to be the inevitable result? Is it not time to call a halt in this country and to cease this reckless course of extravagance, this piling up of our

debt mountains high, this rushing the country at railroad speed into expenditure, which must lead to financial destruction. The expenditure of the United States did not reach the present expenditure of Canada till that country had more than 20,000,000 inhabitants. The United States never owed more than half of our present debt until it had 32,000,000 inhabitants, except during two years, 1816 and 1817, just after the conclusion of the war with England, when its debt was a trifle more than half our present debt. The practical difficulty between any commissioners appointed between this country and the United States to arrange for reciprocal trade would be this very question, that to arrange an assimilation of our tariffs it would be necessary to do away with the disparity which exists between the two countries as to the revenue required from taxation to meet the expenditure of the two countries. We need to-day to raise almost as much again per head as they to meet our current expenses, and the disparity in this respect is growing every year as we drift wider and wider apart in the matter of debt burden which is resting upon the people. It is undeniable that our progress for the last twenty years has been slow. It is undeniable that it has been slow as compared with the progress of the United States during that period of their national existence which corresponds with ours during the last twenty years. In 1790, that country had a population of 3,900,000. In 1810, twenty years later, its population had increased to 7,250,000. During all that time, it is estimated that the accession to the population from immigration did not reach 140,000 souls. Now, have we as satisfactory an exhibit to present as that? We would have had, if we had not lost two million people—one million who left us and their progeny who would have been with us if we had not lost that population. We do not present so favorable a record as that by two or three million souls. Is this progress, this unsatisfactory rate of progress that we have made, due to inferiority of race? No, it is not. The hon. member from Huron (Mr. Porter) very truthfully said last night that our emigrants to the United States maintained the reputation of Canada wherever they went. So they do. There is not an element in the population of the United States more progressive, more highly esteemed, more successful than the native Canadians who are in that country. We are losing the life-blood of this young country, we are losing the most energetic of our population, who are going to swell the resources, to swell the wealth and increase the might of that great power which has already some 60,000,000 of population. We can only regret that we have not those men here. We can only deplore the circumstances which have led them away from our soil, but we can seek to arrest the course which has led to this. Is it due to lack of natural resources? There is scarcely a country in the world which is more abundantly blessed by Providence and nature than ours. Its fisheries, its timber, its minerals, its agricultural lands, the boundless prairies of the west, show that this country was designed by Providence to be the home of millions of men and to become a great and wealthy power, and it is failing to reach the destiny which Providence and nature designed to give it, not because of a lack of natural resources, but through the lack of men to develop those resources, who have been driven from the country, to a great extent, by the stupidity of the Government of the day. What is the remedy for this state of things? We require various things—honesty in the administration of the country, economy, retrenchment, and we require access to our natural markets; we require continental free trade, and without continental free trade, without access to the markets of 60,000,000 of people to the south of us, we cannot progress satisfactorily. Our geographical affinities are not with the nations across the Atlantic, but with the kindred commonwealth to the south of us. The Maritime Provinces have followed the dictates of nature and geo-

graphy; they export their potatoes, their fish, their lumber, their coal and their various other productions to the seaboard cities of the Atlantic, and they bring back from those cities such articles as they may be able to buy at advantage in that country. It is their natural trade. Geographical affinities say they shall trade in that direction, and it is only artificial barriers that prevent their carrying on a lucrative trade with those seaboard cities. Ontario and Quebec, that lie right alongside the great markets of the American Union, the great centres of population and wealth; alongside the State of New York, with nearly 6,000,000 of inhabitants within its borders, and the great metropolis of this continent, possessing three times the wealth of the whole Dominion of Canada—there is our natural market. Geographical affinities say we should trade there. Our railway lines lead to that country, everything invites us to trade there except tariffs, which prevent our availing ourselves of the advantage that nature designed we should reap. Manitoba is naturally a portion of the Mississippi valley, and would naturally trade with St. Paul, and Minneapolis, and Chicago, and St. Louis, and to debar Manitoba and the North-West from access to those great markets, and the shortest routes to the great markets of the east, is burdening them with restrictions not calculated to promote their interests. British Columbia, with its timber, its fish and its coal, finds her natural markets down on the Pacific coast, in Oregon, in California; are the most natural markets that Province can seek or obtain; but the hostile tariffs between the two countries forbid British Columbia to enjoy the advantages that nature designs she should reap from commercial transactions with those Pacific States.

What is the character, Mr. Speaker, of the United States domestic commerce? It is a commerce enormous in its magnitude and varied in its character. The country possesses almost every kind of climate, almost every kind of soil, almost every production of nature, and the commercial transactions between the several States of that nation are so enormous that they would be scarcely credited, if they were stated in detail. Now, we are shut out from that commerce, we are debarred from participating in that trade which has contributed to the so rapid advancement of that country. In order to participate in that trade, we must have access to those markets, and when we do have access to those markets, then we will move along side by side in the steps of progress, abreast of these American States, progressing as rapidly as they do, and unless we do obtain that access to our natural markets, we shall be cribbed, cabined and confined by the restrictions placed upon us here. Now, as I stated a few moments ago, we have 5,000,000 of people, in round numbers, in the Dominion; there are, speaking within limits, 60,000,000 in the United States. There will be 65,000,000 in a few years hence, and 80,000,000 before the end of this century. Now, this people, who will amount to 100,000,000 in 1910, this nation is to-day the richest nation in the world. The actual value of its property is \$58,000,000,000; that of Great Britain, \$48,000,000,000. The wealth of the United States is \$10,000,000,000 greater than that of the United Kingdom. The earnings of the people of the United States last year were \$1,050,000,000; the earnings of the people of the United Kingdom were \$280,000,000 less; the earnings of the people of France \$350,000,000 less, and the earnings of the people of the German Empire over \$400,000,000 less than the people of the United States. Well, if this great nation, right at our doors, with more wealth than any other nation, with nearly twice the population of the United Kingdom, and with its prospective growth—if there is anything that can compensate us for the loss of access to the markets of that nation, I would like to be informed what that thing is. I do not believe anything can compensate this country for the loss of access to the markets of that country. The

Mr. CHARLTON.

hon. member for Haron (Mr. Porter) told us, last night that we should be sorry if we proceeded to starve our infant industries. I suppose the hon. gentleman proceeded upon the assertion that we are creating those infant industries in order to furnish a home market for the produce of the soil in this country. Well, if that is his object, I can explain to him how he can obtain a short road to that result. The United States have been engaged for twenty-five years in developing a home market. They have now a greater manufacturing interest than any other nation in the world. The United States is the great manufacturing nation of the world; it exceeds England. According to the census of 1880, the productions of the manufactures of the United States were \$5,369,000,000; in 1882, the productions of the manufactures of England were \$4,092,000,000. The United States, in 1880, produced \$1,279,000,000 more manufactures than Great Britain did in 1882. Now, if it is desirable to have a market, if it is desirable to foster our infant industries at a great cost for the time being in order to create a market for the future, is it not more desirable to take a short cut to a market already created, created at a great cost, and created through the operation, if my hon. friend's theory is correct, of a protective tariff during twenty-five years, a market which produces more goods in a year than the manufactures of England do. I say is it not desirable to obtain access to that market by a short cut, rather than to spend years in a futile endeavor to create a market here which never can equal in importance the market already created and opened to us there? Now, Sir, the practical question is: how shall we reach this market? The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us last night that we had given the United States the strongest invitation to reciprocity that could be given. He asks: what can be a stronger invitation to reciprocity than our standing offer of 1879? Now, the hon. gentleman is Minister of Fisheries, and I wonder, Sir, if he is not sufficiently astute as a fisherman to change his bait when he is fishing for nine years without getting a nibble. This offer has been standing since 1879—an inducement so strong, he says, that we could not make it stronger; and yet, time and again, the Americans have spurned the offer, they have told us they would not consider it, that they would not 'bite,' and we may keep the offer standing until doomsday without their ever considering it. Sir, the hon. gentleman is attempting to mislead the country when he asserts that we have made an offer as strong as can be made, inviting the American people to reciprocal trade relations. They know that our offer is not a desirable one; we have made an offer that we know they will not accept; and the hon. gentleman is not—well, I won't use the word I was going to use—the hon. gentleman is taking a course in this matter that is not calculated to give the country a proper impression as to the course this Government is pursuing. This Government is not seeking reciprocity, this Government does not want reciprocity, except on inadmissible terms; it will not take reciprocity on such terms as it can be obtained, and that is made perfectly apparent by the motion made by the hon. gentleman, pitting the National Policy against unrestricted reciprocity. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the gauntlet thrown down we have taken up, the challenge given we accept, and we will fight the issue out before the people of this country upon that line alone.

Mr. HESSON. You will have a good time of it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, we will have a good time of it, and the hon. gentleman from Perth may have a little participation in that good time. Now, Sir, this is a matter that requires careful consideration. If this celebrated standing offer that we have had on our Statute-book for nine years is not acceptable to the United States, it is our duty to ascertain what the Americans demand. Will they grant reciprocity on any terms whatever? It is our duty to

ascertain how that case is, how we are to meet them? What probability is there of achieving success under any circumstances whatever? We have indications which point most unmistakably to the conclusion that reciprocal trade with the United States can be obtained. We have the letter of Mr. Bayard, we have the declarations of many public men in the United States. We have the introduction of two Bills, one by Mr. Butterworth and one by Mr. Hitt, the one corresponding in its essential features with the proposal we have under discussion now; the other, that by Mr. Hitt, proposing an arrangement equal to commercial union. We have the fact that the last named Bill was reported yesterday unanimously. I am led to believe that the great mass of American public men will look favorably upon the consideration of any proposal that involves the granting of reciprocal trade arrangements with Canada upon a basis which will not be, like the old Reciprocity Treaty, chiefly advantageous to one side. They simply ask in this arrangement that their own interests should be considered as well as ours, that the arrangements should not be exclusively advantageous to one side but mutually advantageous to both, and as honest men I do not think we would feel disposed to ask more.

In his speech the other night the Minister of Interior was good enough to quote a certain statement made by myself in Haldimand in definition of what constitutes commercial union. I do not know that I would have alluded to the subject but for that reference made by the Minister of Interior. He told us that commercial union meant—and the hon. gentleman will correct me if I do injustice to him in the statement—the same duties to be collected against the outside world in Canada as were now collected in the United States. That was the distinct statement made by the Minister of Interior—that commercial union simply meant the adoption by Canada of the present tariff of the United States. If the hon. gentleman made that statement deliberately understanding what he did mean, he either did not understand what commercial union meant or he made a statement calculated to mislead the country. No advocate of commercial union, either in Canada or the United States, assumes or proposes that the present tariff of the United States is to be adopted by either one country or the other. No advocate of commercial union assumes that an arrangement will be made that does not involve a re-arrangement of the tariff, an arrangement satisfactory to both powers and consented to by both powers, and neither one power or the other is obliged to enter into an arrangement for commercial union unless the arrangement is satisfactory—it must be made satisfactory, and it does not imply that the present tariff of the United States will be adopted as the tariff to be levied under commercial union.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Will the hon. gentleman allow me. I understand him to say that I implied that the proposition was that the present tariff of the United States was to be adopted as commercial union. I did not so state and did not so imply. What I did state was this: I inferred from the statement of the hon. gentleman that whatever was the tariff of the United States, that would be the tariff of Canada; that is to say, we would have the same tariff, whatever that tariff might be, against all other countries, with free trade as between these two countries. Is that the proposition now before the House by hon. gentlemen?

Mr. CHARLTON. No, it is not. I was led to discuss that question from the fact that the hon. Minister had alluded to it; and if he would add that the tariff would be one consented to by Canada and acceptable to Canada, then he would have made a fair statement of the case.

Mr. BOWELL. It would be against the rest of the world, would it not?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. By mutual agreement.

Mr. CHARLTON. I might as well define what I understand commercial union to mean. The definition read by the Minister of Interior, quoted from the speech made by me in Haldimand, is exactly what I do understand commercial union to mean. I understand commercial union to mean an arrangement between two or more powers or as many more as choose to join—for in the commercial union of Germany embraced all the German States—an arrangement made between two or more countries whereby they adopt a common tariff and common excise laws, abolish all commercial restrictions between themselves, abolish all customs lines between themselves, collect a revenue at any point where the goods may be entered from any country not a member of the union; throw that whole revenue into one common fund and divide that fund, after taking out the cost of collection, either upon the basis of a *per capita* division or upon such other division or upon such other basis as may be mutually agreed upon by the contracting parties.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not desire to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but perhaps he will go further and state whether that is the proposition now before the House by the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has been told most distinctly, and it has been stated a dozen times on this side of the House, that it is not the proposition. I can add that the hon. gentleman and his followers must have been even more stupid, if that is possible, than is usually the case.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not so uncharitable as my hon. friend. I do not accuse the hon. gentleman of stupidity, but he evidently believes that the country is stupid and that he can mislead the people upon this question by dragging a red herring across the trail. So much for the question of commercial union arising indirectly on this question, owing to the remarks made by the Minister of Interior.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. CHARLTON. Some hon. gentlemen say "Oh, oh," as if this was a question we would not dare to discuss. I am ready to discuss this question, I am not afraid of it. It is not, however, the question under discussion. The resolution under the consideration of the House is a resolution with regard to unrestricted reciprocity; but that is only a means of arriving at commercial relations between two countries that may be arrived at in some other way. We have adopted that because we consider it preferable to the others simply for that and for no other reason. With respect to unrestricted reciprocity, let us define what we understand that to mean. We understand—at least I understand by unrestricted reciprocity—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not profess to speak for the world and for all men, I speak for myself. I understand by unrestricted reciprocity an arrangement that would admit into the United States all the natural productions of Canada, all the manufactured productions of Canada, all the productions of Canada of any nature, character or name whatever, free of duty; an arrangement which would reciprocally admit into Canada all the productions of the United States of the same character; that we leave the United States free to impose such duties as they choose upon the productions of other countries imported into that country; that we leave Canada free to do the same thing, and raise its revenue from import duties in such a way as it may choose, on

such scale of duties as it may choose to impose, leaving both countries perfectly free to carry out its own arrangements except in so far as reciprocal trade between the two countries is concerned in the productions of the two countries. I do not know whether that is sufficiently definite for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Is that your proposition?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, as I understand it.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you include articles produced in the United States and not produced in Canada *vice versa*.

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly. The United States produces a good many articles that we do not, and we produce some that they do not. The arrangement contemplates a perfect reciprocal trade, a reciprocal trade that admits all the products of one country into the other. Now, I would ask, Mr. Speaker, can reciprocity, the question which we are discussing, be considered a mere theoretical question? Do we know anything about the operation of this system? We know that in 1787 thirteen States comprising then the American Union entered into an arrangement which was practically equivalent to reciprocal trade between those States. Those States, it is true, existed under a Federal Union, but each one of those States, and all the States subsequently admitted to the American Union, retained their distinct autonomy. Each State retained control over its criminal code and its civil code, and, in fact, the jurisdiction of their Legislatures is much wider than the jurisdiction of the Legislatures of the Provinces of this Dominion. They were thirteen nations then—they are thirty-eight nations now, banded together for certain common purposes; and those thirty-eight nations, commencing with thirteen, have existed and progressed since 1787 with unrestricted trade existing between all these States. What is the result of that unrestricted reciprocity? In 1884, as my hon. friend at my right informed the House, the internal commerce of that country, according to Mr. Nimmo, amounted to \$10,000,000,000. Last year the internal commerce, it is estimated, amounted to \$11,500,000,000, based upon the increase of tonnage transported upon the railways of that country. Now, Sir, how does that compare with the total commerce carried by the total shipping of the world, exclusive of the United States? Do you suppose it equals the sea-going commercial transactions of England, France, Germany and all the Maritime States of Christendom, excluding the United States? Sir, the commerce of all those countries last year amounted to \$4,213,000,000 as against \$11,500,000,000 in the United States. The internal commerce of the United States in reality had two and a-half times the volume of the entire commerce by shipping of all the nations of the world, leaving out the United States. That is an astounding statement. Including England, including every country except the United States, this latter country last year had a vastly greater volume of commerce than all the others. 149,000 miles of railway have moved last year 482,245,000 tons of freight. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance informed us last night we had moved the same year in Canada 16,000,000 tons, or one-thirtieth part of the freight moved upon the railways of the United States. The amount of freight moved by the shipping by all the nations of the world, exclusive of the United States, was 92,432,000 tons, which is less than one-quarter the freight moved on American railways. The earnings of the United States railways were \$82,000,000 last year; the earnings of all the shipping of the world, leaving out the shipping of the United States, amounted to \$535,000,000; the railways of the United States earned on freight \$287,000,000 more last year than all the shipping of the world, excepting the shipping of the United States. Those facts enable us to form some dim conception of the vast volume of that commerce created by one hundred

Mr. CHARLTON.

years' experience of the system of reciprocity between the commonwealths composing that great confederation. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that a tariff would be tolerated between the eastern groups of those States and any of the other groups, or between the middle group or any of the other groups, or between the southern or Pacific groups? Do you think that a tariff would be permitted by the States of the Union to exist between any one of those groups? No, Sir, it would be detrimental to their interests, and never would be permitted. I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, in what does this great northern group, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific oceans, and embracing all the Provinces and Territories of the Dominion—in what respect, geographical or natural, this northern group differs from either the southern, the middle, the western, the eastern or the Pacific group of the great American confederation? Geographically we are the same, our interests are exactly the same as theirs, and to debar us from that continental trade enjoyed by all those States is to inflict upon us the same injuries that would be inflicted upon any one of those groups of States, if they had not their internal commercial relations with their sister States. I repeat, Sir, that our interests in this great continental group of Anglo-Saxon commonwealths are identical with the interests of every group of commonwealths in this great constellation, and that to debar the States which comprise this Dominion from free access to the markets of the country south of us is just as detrimental to our interests as would be the attempt, which would be resisted by every State in the Union, to place any particular State under similar disabilities to those which are forced upon us. Reciprocity, Sir, is not a mere theory; it has worked the most beneficent results in that great country, it has been chiefly instrumental in increasing the population from 3,900,000 to 61,000,000, and it has produced those astounding results in trade and commerce which I have laid before the House. It has made that country the wealthiest and most powerful nation in the world, a nation which in 1862 contained but a little more than one-half the population and considerably less than one-half the wealth it does to-day. It enabled that country to place in the field two and a-half millions of armed men and to incur an expenditure of \$6,000,000,000, which is nearly wiped out to-day. Now, notwithstanding natural laws, and notwithstanding artificial restrictions, I say that natural laws do assert themselves. When those artificial restrictions were temporarily removed, to a partial extent, in the period extending between 1854 and 1865, the increase in the commerce of this country with the United States, as explained by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) yesterday, was prodigious. The total trade of Canada with the United States ran up from \$20,000,000 in 1854 to \$84,000,000 in 1865. Since the restrictions have been reimposed that trade has fallen back, and after a lapse of twenty-four years the total trade between Canada and the United States is some \$2,000,000 less than it was in 1865, showing the beneficent results produced by reciprocity and the opposite result by restricted trade measures. Mr. Speaker, if we were to adopt unrestricted reciprocity we would probably have the same ratio of increase in our trade with the United States, and if unrestricted reciprocity went into operation this year, by the year 1900 our trade with the United States would be \$325,000,000 with the same ratio of increase. You must bear in mind, Sir, that the proposition before this House contemplates the throwing off of all shackles which existed during the Reciprocity Treaty. That was only a partial reciprocity treaty, a reciprocity treaty merely in natural products; but now the proposition we are discussing contemplates the admission of all the products of both countries, and there is no reason, Sir, for supposing that, under the operation of such a treaty, commerce between the United States and Canada would not equal \$500,000,000 in the year of our

Lord 1900. Notwithstanding the restrictions imposed upon trade, there is still a great amount of trade transacted between those two countries. Last year, of the total amount of imports into Canada, 42 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. came from the United States, of the total amount of exports from this country 42 per cent. of all went to the United States. We are importing from the United States \$45,000,000, in round numbers, and exporting \$37,000,000, with the result that the volume of trade inward is 42 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the whole, and outward 42 per cent. of all our trade, as I have said.

Now, I shall come to the consideration, Mr. Speaker, of the most practical part of this question, the one that interests the great producing classes of Canada, and I would proceed to the consideration of this branch of the question by asking, what do we sell to the people of the United States? We sell them horses, cattle, sheep, peas, and on those articles a duty of 20 per cent. is levied. We sell them fish, and by the United States returns, the duty on fish last year was 21 $\frac{7}{2}$ per cent. We sell them barley, rye, oats, and buckwheat, and the duty on each of these articles is 10 cents a bushel. We sell them potatoes, on which the duty is 15 cents per bushel. We sell them hops, on which the duty is eight cents a pound. We sell them wool, on which the duty is 10 cents a pound; hay, on which the duty is \$2 a ton; lumber, on which the duty is \$2 per 1,000; butter, on which the duty is four cents a pound; iron ore, on which the duty is 75 cents per ton; coal, on which the duty is 75 cents per ton; and salt, on which the duty is 12 cents per cwt. in bags, and six cents per cwt. in bulk. We sell them all these articles and many more. The American statistics are not kept as well as ours—I am sure my hon. friend the Minister of Customs will be glad to hear that—and it is impossible to ascertain from them with exactness the amount of duties collected on Canadian imports last year or any preceding year. They give the amount in mass, but do not distinguish countries as we do in our statistics, and there has been no change in their practice in that respect since 1820. But we can arrive with a fair degree of accuracy at the amount of duty paid to the American Government on Canadian imports, and that amount was, last year, in all about \$5,500,000. Now, the practical question that interests the people of this country above all others is, who pays this duty? If it can be shown that the American consumer pays the duty—that for these articles which we export to the United States we get just as much as we would if no duty was imposed, I think one reason we urge for adopting unrestricted reciprocity would cease to exist; but if it can be shown that in the majority of cases the prices we received for these various articles is just so much less than it would be by the amount of the duty, then we have a very practical interest in the question. Now, we will consider this question first, in the light of the farmer's case, next in that of the fisherman's, next in that of the lumberman's, and then in that of the miner's. I will trouble you with a few figures, showing the quantities of articles imported from Canada into the United States last year, because this is a very important point, and I wish to attempt to demonstrate the position I take. I give the quantities of certain articles imported, and I compare the volume of those imports with the production of the same articles in the United States, as shown in the census of 1880, except that in the case of barley I take the production of 1886, as I was able to obtain that:

Article.	Quantity.	Rate of duty.	Duty paid.	United States production.
Barley.....	9,437,717 bush.	10 cts.	\$943,771	63,000,000 bush.
Beans.....	197,764 "	10 "	20,860
Pease.....	405,358 "	20 "	86,268
Wheat.....	341,508 "	20 "	68,300	459,483,137 "
Malt.....	182,176 "	20 "	34,435	18,273,102 "
Potatoes.....	1,276,809 "	15 "	191,520	169,458,589 "
Hay.....	69,450 tons	\$2	138,900	35,205,712 tons

Article.	Quantity.	Rate of duty.	Duty paid.	United States production.
Horses.....	18,225	20 p. c.	\$442,867	10,357,498
Cattle.....	45,765	20 "	177,551	35,925,461
Sheep.....	363,046	20 "	191,896	85,192,074
Wool.....	1,297,867 lbs.	10 "	129,798	155,681,751 lbs.

These figures show that we sold them one bushel of barley to every seven they produced; one bushel of wheat to every 1,200 bushels they produced; one bushel of malt to every 100 bushels they produced; one bushel of potatoes to every 130 bushels they produced; one ton of hay to every 500 tons they produced; one horse to every 600 they raised, one head of cattle to every 700 head they raised, one sheep to every 100 they raised, and one pound of wool to every 130 they produced. I do not think any one will say that the removal of the duties charged by the United States on these articles which we sold to them, would have the effect of reducing the price of their own productions. I do not think you can convince the common-sense yeomanry of this country that it would, because they know that the volume of our exports to the United States is so small, compared with the volume of the United States productions, that the imposition of the duty has little or no effect on the price in that country. Upon these articles which I have enumerated there was collected, last year, \$2,500,000 of duties; and in addition to the articles I have named, we sold them buckwheat, rye, oats, turnips, vegetables, hops, flaxseed, seeds, poultry, butter, cheese, mutton, meats, &c., &c. The duties paid on all the articles sold by the farmers of Canada in the United States last year amounted to no less than \$3,000,000, and the proportion these articles bear to the total quantity in the United States is infinitely small. It is preposterous to suppose that the removal of the duty from these articles, the quantity of which is so small compared with the total raised in that country, would seriously affect the prices of the bulk of these goods produced in the United States. Then with regard to the fishermen's case. Last year we exported to the United States fish to the amount of \$2,717,509, the duty on which, estimating it at an average of 20 per cent., which is 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. less than the rate given in the United States returns, was \$543,500. Now, the United States production of fish in the same year amounted to \$13,041,053. We sold them therefore one-sixteenth of the quantity of fish they consumed, and they themselves produced fifteen sixteenths. It will hardly be maintained that the removal of the 20 per cent. duty on one-sixteenth of the entire product would affect to any appreciable extent the value of the remaining fifteen-sixteenths. With regard to the lumbermen's case: we sold to the United States last year 508,304,000 feet of plank boards and joists, the duty on which amounted to \$1,016,608. In addition we sold to the United States lath, hardwood, lumber, deals, spruce lumber, deal ends, pickets, staves, shingles, &c., and I have no doubt that the total amount of duty collected in that country on the product of our forests reached \$1,200,000. While we sold to the United States that quantity of lumber, they produced themselves, according to the census of 1880, 18,000,000,000, and the production last year was undoubtedly much greater. Our exports to them, therefore, averaged but one thirty sixth part of their total produce of lumber. I do not think that the removal of the duty on our small percentage of one thirty-sixth would greatly affect the price of the balance, and the result is that we pay a good part of the duty on the lumber we export. Let us look at the miners' case. Last year we sold to the United States 404,042 tons of coal, on which the duty collected amounted to \$303,032, and the production in 1880 in the United States—a production which has since largely increased—was 7,480,426 tons of coal. Last year it must have reached 10,000,000 tons. I doubt very much whether the removal of the duty of 400,000 tons would seriously affect the price of 10,000,-

000 tons. Of iron ore we sold last year to the United States, 23,385 tons, and the United States produce, in 1880, was 7,064,829. Last year no doubt the production in that country reached 10,000,000 tons. The trade in iron ore last year from the Lake Superior ports was of vast volume, reaching a value of over \$30,000,000. It employed over one-third of the total tonnage on the lakes. You could go to Erie, Cleveland, Ashtabula or Buffalo, and in each port you would find vast fleets of ore-carrying vessels. The business was one of enormous magnitude, and one which conferred great advantages on the commercial community of all the States bordering on the upper lakes; and while the volume of that trade amounted to several million tons in these ports, we have to show on this side this paltry figure of 23,000 tons as the total export of our ore to the United States. And this in face of the fact that there is lying at Coes Mine, at the head of the Ontario and Central Road, over 30,000 tons of iron ore, which have been lying there for the last two years. We have on the Canadian side an enormous quantity of ore of the best quality, and but for the restriction placed on the trade, our export would amount to millions of tons annually; it would give employment to thousands of men and millions of capital and furnish traffic to new railway lines. Instead of that, we have, owing to the restriction imposed on our export trade, but the beggarly show to make of 23,385 tons shipped to the United States. We pay the duty on what little we do send. If we did not, we would send to the United States vastly more, because there would be an enormous demand for it, and the quality of our ore being superior to what is obtained in the States for certain purposes. Let the restriction imposed on our exports of ore be removed, and an enormous demand for it will spring up. Turning to the article of copper ore, I find that last year we sold 5,267 tons to our neighbors. We have an enormous quantity of this ore on our shores, but the duty of 2½ cents per lb. on the yield of copper effectually bars the trade. Of salt, last year we sold to the United States 106,385 cwt., while the United States production in 1880 was 29,805,293 cwt. Our salt obtained the small sale it did in spite of the duty, and solely on its merits, because it is of a superior quality, and if the duty were removed it would force its way into American consumption. But for the duty an enormous trade would spring up in the salt districts of Lake Huron. One of the best demonstrations of an increase in trade, which will be sure to follow the removal of the duties, is furnished by the trade in eggs. In 1870, our export to the United States amounted to \$14,000, in 1878 it reached \$631,204, and in 1887, \$1,821,364. That little item has grown to be one of the most important articles of export in Canada, simply because the duty was removed on the importation of eggs into the United States. So much for the question of who pays the duty upon what we export to the United States. I repeat that, in my opinion, the volume of our exports to that country is so insignificant in comparison with the vast bulk of the production of that country, that the duty imposed is simply extracted from the prices received by the producer in this country.

Our import trade with the Americans last year amounted to \$45,107,066 of their productions. What did we buy? We bought cotton goods, coal, furniture, tools, implements, machinery, hardware, books, coal oil, manufactured brass, cotton, tobacco, hides, &c., and the duty on these imports amounted to \$7,299,591. To what extent did the duty on these articles enhance the cost to the consumer? Did he get them for the additional cost of \$7,290,000, being the amount of the duty? What would they have cost, in other words, had the duties not being imposed? This brings out one of the objectionable features of indirect taxation that I am about to demonstrate. Every dollar imposed by this Gov-

Mr. CHARLTON.

ernment in the shape of duty means an enhanced cost to the consumer of \$1.50. The \$1 of duty is added to the cost of the article by the wholesale dealer when he receives the article in his store. Then he proceeds to figure up his profit on the cost of that article, and assesses his profit, not on the cost in the invoice, but on the cost with the duty added, which is part of what he pays for the goods. If, therefore, his profit be 20 per cent., that article goes to the retail merchant, costing him \$1.20 more than it would have cost him had there been no duty. The retail merchant, when he places the article upon his shelf, figures his profit of 25 per cent. on the total cost of the article, so that he adds 25 per cent. on \$1.20—not on a dollar—and the consumer has to pay the profit in each case on the duty, as well as on the invoice price of the goods. I maintain, therefore, that every dollar of duty levied by the Government implies a loss to the consumer of \$1.50, unless the wholesale dealer's profit is less than 20 per cent., and the retail dealer's less than 25 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. Except in the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. In all countries. I am demonstrating that the duty of \$7,299,000 levied upon our importations from the United States last year, meant more than an enhanced cost to the consumer to the extent of the duty alone. It meant an additional tax of 50 per cent. on the duty imposed. Our imports from the United States last year of goods not manufactured—perhaps the hon. the Minister of Customs will correct if I am wrong—amounted, in round figures, to \$21,000,000; our imports of coal, corn, hides, tobacco, settlers' effects, alone being \$15,200,000. The imports of manufactured goods, if that statement be correct, would amount to \$24,000,000, on which this duty of \$7,299,591 was imposed. Now, the question is, who paid the duty? It may be said that if we claim that the duty on exports from Canada is paid by the producer in Canada, we must admit that on imports from the United States into Canada the American producer must pay the duty. But the cases are not analogous. While we export to the United States an amount of our productions which is scarcely felt in their market, we buy from the United States an amount which is equal to \$1 in every \$223 produced in that country, because the production in the United States, in 1880, was \$5,369,579,191, and our imports amounted to about \$24,000,000. So, if that trade was destroyed, if we bought nothing from them, it would make very little difference in the volume of their business or in the prices asked in the country. If this theory is correct, and I contend it is, and I believe that the thinking, practical classes of people in this country will see that it is, then the loss to Canada from duties which are imposed on the exports from this country, and on the imports into this country, amounts, in regard to the producing classes of this country, to at least \$15,000,000 a year. In addition to that, there is another feature to which I wish to draw the attention of the House. For every shipment from Canada to the United States, no matter how insignificant the amount may be, the shipper must obtain a consular certificate, and that involves trouble and cost. In every entry made at custom houses in the United States, the shipper must run the risk of seizure and trouble with the custom house authorities, and that feature of the trade deters a great number of men who would be buyers and operators in the market from engaging in the business at all, and it deprives this country of the advantage of competition to a marked extent, it deprives us of a class of men who would be our most valuable dealers and would pay the best prices for our productions, but on this account they will not come to this market at all. If either of these bought a drove of horses or a herd of cattle and entered them at a custom house in the United States, and it was claimed that the entry was under the amount of the proper value, and the animals were

detained there, and the dealer had to summon witnesses to prove that his entry was correct, it is clear that vexation, detention and cost would prove a serious matter, and my practical knowledge of this matter warrants me in saying that in consequence of the tariff we lose half as much from the lack of competition in regard to our commodities as we do on the duties which have to be paid on those commodities. If we lose \$5,500,000 in duties, we probably lose \$3,000,000 a year by the lack of competition, by the repelling of these competitors who would otherwise engage in the trade, by the custom house restrictions. We lose something else besides this. We not only lose the benefit of the competition we would have but for the absurd restrictions upon trade, but we lose the great benefit, which we cannot estimate, which would accrue to this country from the increase of trade. If our trade with the United States last year was \$82,000,000, and if the adoption of this policy would run it up in twelve years to \$300,000,000, what amount are we losing? The loss is greater in that direction than the loss from duties or the loss from want of competition, and we can scarcely measure or compute the loss which Canada sustains through the duties which are imposed, and through the regulations which hamper the interchange of commodities between the two countries. I will conclude this branch of my subject by saying that unrestricted reciprocity would, beyond all question, benefit the farmer, that it would benefit the fisherman, that it would benefit the lumberman, that it would benefit the mine owner, that it would benefit the laborer, and, of the 287,000 people in Canada who were given by the census as belonging to the industrial classes, the great majority were blacksmiths, carpenters, shoemakers, masons, bakers, brickmakers, and so forth, all of whom would be benefited by this arrangement. In fact, it would benefit ninety-nine out of every hundred in this Dominion. In fact, it would benefit all except the rings and the combines and the pet industries which have been fostered and pampered by this Government, and have been permitted by unjust legislation to prey upon their fellow-citizens. I have no doubt that the adoption of this policy would increase the value of farm property in a few years by at least 30 per cent. I have no doubt that it would increase the value of mine property beyond computation. I have no doubt that it would increase the value of the timber lands in this Dominion by at least 50 per cent. I believe the adoption of this policy would stop emigration, that it would bring back to us a portion of the million Canadians whom we have lost through emigration to the United States. I believe it would lead to a rapid increase of wealth, and would be in every respect an unmixed blessing to the vast majority of the people of Canada.

Now, I propose to consider the question as to whether unrestricted reciprocity would injure the only remaining class that I have not alluded to, I mean our manufacturers. I have no doubt that a change as radical as this would be would unsettle some lines of business. I have no doubt that it might prove injurious to some manufactures. Common fairness compels me to say that I believe this might be the case, but I believe that the result of this policy, the average outcome of it, would be the conferring of great advantages on the manufacturing class as a whole of this Dominion, and I shall proceed to give to the House the reasons I have for this belief. There is no doubt that its adoption would rout the combines. It would rout the sugar combine and the cotton combine, and all those other combines that our friends on the other side of the House have felt compelled to have a committee to deal with.

Mr. HESSON. Have they not combines on the other side?

Mr. CHARLTON. I think they have, but they are about to strangle them there, while here they are the

result of the hon. gentleman's own policy, they are his own offspring, and he would hardly attempt to deal with them in that way.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE. It would be infanticide.

Mr. CHARLTON. An hon. gentleman says it would be infanticide, but these combines are hardly infants, they are monsters. I would like to enquire, why our manufacturers in Canada cannot succeed. Are we a people of less intelligence, or of less enterprise, than the Americans? Are we unable to compete with them in an open race in a fair field, with no favor shown? We will hardly admit that. Have we not as cheap labor as they have, and have we not as cheap capital as they have? I hold that we have, and I hold that in any industry in Canada that was adapted to the country, that was a natural industry, we could compete with the Americans, and I believe that opening the markets of 60,000,000 people to our manufactures would lead to a vast increase in the manufacturing operations of this Dominion. We have unrivalled facilities in this country for the manufacture of boots and shoes. We have hemlock bark enough to take all the hides on the continent, and the cheap labor to convert the leather into boots and shoes for the million. We have also unrivalled opportunities for engaging in manufactures of wood, and millions of dollars could be profitably employed in that direction. The various productions of wood in the United States employ over \$100,000,000 of capital. We have great advantages in this country for the production of a superior quality of tweeds, of blankets and of woollen goods of various kinds. We raise the best combing wools on this continent, which is a branch that could be indefinitely extended if we had access to the markets of the United States. We have great advantages for the manufacture of paper and of wood pulp. We have the forests, we have the raw material in abundance, and this might become a very important branch of manufacture in Canada if we had the market of the United States open to us for the sale of these articles. We have unlimited opportunities for engaging in the business of manufacturing charcoal iron. We have the ore, we have the forests to convert into charcoal, and the Americans are nearly destitute of that necessary article in their business, and the producing of charcoal iron might, and would speedily be transferred to Canada if the restrictions upon trade between the two countries were removed. We have great advantages for engaging in the business of fish canning. We might do almost all that business for the continent. We could supply 65,000,000 of people with canned fish and productions of our fisheries. I do not need to dwell upon the various means of manufacturing for which this country is peculiarly adapted. I repeat that wherever there was found a line of manufacturing for which Canada was adapted, a great expansion in that particular business would speedily follow the adoption of reciprocity with the United States. Now, a dread seems to possess some of our friends that it would be in the highest degree dangerous to come into competition with the manufacturing establishments, and with the great aggregations of wealth, in the older manufacturing States like Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York and Pennsylvania. It is apprehended that great danger would lie in the fact that while our own establishments are comparatively weak, while we have no great aggregations of capital such as exist in those States, we would be brought into competition with enormous establishments, with vast capital, with unlimited resources and with perfected processes. Well, there may be something in this. At first sight it would seem, Mr. Speaker, that this was a serious objection and it occurred to me that some light might be thrown upon this matter by looking into the statistics of the progress of manufacturing in the newer States of the American Union, States similarly situated with Ontario and

our Provinces. Well, I investigated the manufacturing returns of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota and California, and I expected to find in those new States, the most of which have only been settled recently, that the comparison between them, and the older States would be unfavorable to the newer States, and I was surprised to find that such was not the case. Now, the increase of the productions of manufactures in the Dominion from 1871 to 1881 was 88,000,000, equal to an increase of 40 per cent. The following table shows the increase between those dates, in Ontario and several States of the Union, with the percentage:—

<i>Ontario</i> :—1871	\$114,706,000	
1881	157,989,000	
Increase	43,283,000	= 38 per cent.
<i>Ohio</i> :—1870	\$269,713,000	
1880	348,298,000	
Increase	78,585,000	= 30 per cent.
<i>Indiana</i> :—1870	\$108,617,000	
1880	148,006,000	
Increase	39,389,000	= 36 per cent.
<i>Michigan</i> :—1870	\$ 91,716,000	
1880	150,715,000	
Increase	59,999,000	= 59 per cent.
<i>Illinois</i> :—1870	\$205,620,000	
1880	414,864,000	
Increase	209,244,000	= 101 per cent.
<i>Wisconsin</i> :—1870	\$ 77,214,000	
1880	128,255,000	
Increase	51,041,000	= 67 per cent.
<i>Minnesota</i> :—1870	\$ 23,110,000	
1880	76,065,000	
Increase	52,955,000	= 228 per cent.
<i>Iowa</i> :—1870	\$ 46,534,000	
1880	70,045,000	
Increase	24,511,000	= 52 per cent.
<i>California</i> :—1870	\$ 66,594,000	
1880	116,218,000	
Increase	49,624,000	= 74 per cent.
<i>Massachusetts</i> :—1870	\$553,912,000	
1880	631,135,000	
Increase	77,223,000	= 14 per cent.
<i>New York</i> :—1870	\$ 785,194,000	
1880	1,080,696,000	
Increase	295,502,000	= 37 per cent.
<i>Connecticut</i> :—1870	\$161,065,000	
1880	185,697,000	
Increase	24,632,000	= 15 per cent.
<i>New Jersey</i> :—1870	\$169,237,000	
1880	254,380,000	
Increase	85,143,000	= 50 per cent.
<i>Pennsylvania</i> :—1870	\$711,894,000	
1880	744,818,000	
Increase	32,924,000	= 4½ per cent.

So, Sir, we find that in the eight western States I have mentioned, in the period between 1870 and 1880, the increase in the manufactured products was \$561,000,000, or an average of 62 per cent., against the increase in the Dominion of 40 per cent., and an increase in Ontario of 38 per cent. Then, taking the old manufacturing States which produce more than one-half the goods produced in the whole Union, the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, I find that the increase during the same period was \$515,000,000, or about \$50,000,000

Mr. CHARLTON.

less than in the eight new States I have mentioned, and that the ratio of increase was 21·6 per cent., against 64 per cent. in the new States. This is a striking result, and it demonstrates that the ratio of increase in manufacturing is more than as rapid again in those new States, and the newer they are the more rapid the increase; the most rapid increase was in Minnesota, 228 per cent., the increase in Illinois was over 100 per cent., and in California over 74 per cent. Now, Sir, is there anything in the condition of Ontario, or in the condition of this Dominion, that exposes us to a more relentless competition with those old manufacturing centres than those new States were exposed to? Are we not as capable of making progress as these western States in the establishment, development and growth of manufacture? I hold that we are, and when I examined the statistics with regard to the growth and development of manufactures in the cities of the west, I was again struck with the wonderful result I discovered. The following table shows the value of manufactured productions, in 1880, in the principal cities of the west:—

Buffalo manufactures, 1880	\$ 42,937,000
Detroit do	30,181,000
Cincinnati do	105,258,000
Cleveland do	48,604,000
Louisville do	35,423,000
Chicago do	249,022,000
Milwaukee do	43,473,000
St. Louis do	114,333,000
San Francisco do	77,824,000

Statistics show that the ratio of increase is many times more rapid in these cities of the west than it is in the older cities of the east. In view of these facts, I think that we are needlessly alarmed, that there is no ground for the alarm that exists in the minds of some men, that the manufacturers of the Dominion are not capable of competing with those old manufacturing centres in the eastern States. The results in the western States give the lie to such an assertion. We may disabuse our minds of any fears as to our abilities to compete with those centres and to successfully maintain and sustain our manufacturing interests. The fact of it is, Mr. Speaker, that our manufacturers, as well as our lumbermen, our farmers, our fishermen and mine owners, need the blessings of continental free trade. They need a wider market. They are confined here to a market of 5,000,000 of people. They need the adoption of a policy that will break down the barriers and open to their access 60,000,000 of customers more, and there can be no doubt that they would derive vast advantages from the removal of those restrictions.

So much, Sir, for the question as regards the benefits that are to be realised by this country from unrestricted free trade. As I said at the commencement, this is a question which requires candid treatment, it is a question which requires fair treatment. It would be dishonest, it would be criminal on the part of any public man discussing this question, to seek to delude or mislead the people of this country. They have a right to demand of every patriotic citizen that he shall, at least, state what he believes to be true; and in discussing this question, Mr. Speaker, I would scorn to adopt a policy that was calculated to deceive my countrymen, for the purpose of securing a transient political advantage. Now, I propose, Sir, to examine candidly all the objections, so far as I am aware, that are urged against this proposal of unrestricted reciprocity. First of all, it is urged that it is disloyal. Well, Sir, to whom is it disloyal? It may be disloyal to Manchester, it may be disloyal to Birmingham, but is it disloyal to Canada? That is the question that concerns us. We are not charged with the guardianship of the interests of Manchester, of Birmingham, of England; we are charged with the guardianship of the interests of Canada. If we do not guard those interests expressly given to us, they will not be guarded. Time and again our

interests have been given away to advance Imperial interests, and it is our business to guard our own interests; and if this policy is loyalty to Canada, if it is calculated to promote the interests of Canada, that is as far as I care to enquire with respect to the question of loyalty. Now, there are 4,750,000 people in Canada. What are they? They are British subjects, and they are just as much entitled to consideration as 4,750,000 British subjects in England. How many British subjects in England are there who can possibly be affected by this proposed change? We imported from England last year \$44,496,000 worth of goods. Suppose they were all the products of manufactures, suppose they were all the productions of the skilled labor of England, how many men would it take to produce that amount of goods? I stated, in reading over the development of manufactures in the western States, that in 1880 Milwaukee produced \$43,473,000 worth of goods, within a fraction of the entire amount we import from England. How many inhabitants had that city? It had 115,000; and I venture to say that not one-half were engaged in manufacturing. How many people does it take to produce the \$44,496,000 worth of goods we import from England? In 1880, according to the returns, the production in the United States was \$1,950 per head for each man, woman and child engaged as factory operatives in that country. Upon this basis the production of that amount of goods means the employment of 25,000 operatives, it means that at the very outside 75,000 people in England are dependent upon the production of the goods that have been exported to Canada and sold in this country. And we are asked to do what? We are asked to place in one scale the interests of 75,000 people in England and in the other scale the interests of 4,750,000 people in Canada, and to decide that the claims of the 75,000 people shall out-weigh the claims of the 4,750,000. That is the kind of loyalty in this connection. I do not care for that kind of loyalty. I am engaged in looking after the interests of my constituents, and I care a great deal more for them than for nabobs in Manchester. What do you suppose is the amount of profits derived from this business in England? It may be \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000, or even a little more. How much British capital is invested in Canada? I am told there is \$560,000,000 invested. Now, the interests of those men who have made investments in Canada are intimately connected with the prosperity of this country, and even admitting that we were to sacrifice the interests of those people engaged in manufactures, would we not be benefited? How much money is there invested in England to produce the goods sent to Canada. The investment, at the outside, of \$30,000,000 will produce that amount of \$44,000,000 worth of goods. The ratio in the United States, in 1880, was \$2,790 of capital to \$5,369 of products, nearly two of products to one of capital; and it is a liberal estimate to say that \$30,000,000 of capital invested in England is all that is invested to produce the goods sent to Canada. Place in one scale the men having \$30,000,000 of capital engaged in producing goods sent to this country, and place in the other scale the interests of English investors in this country to the extent of \$560,000,000, besides the interests of all the people of this Dominion, and we are asked to say that we will consider the interests of the owners of \$30,000,000 of capital invested in manufactures paramount to the interests of the other class who have invested \$560,000,000 here, besides the capital of the people of this country. That is not the kind of loyalty I intend to stand by or advocate. It is assumed upon this hypothesis on which I have been dealing with this question, that unrestricted reciprocity would abolish imports from England. It will do nothing of the kind. It may temporarily check those imports, but the increased prosperity which will be sure to be given to this country will lead to increased trade.

It has ever been so and ever will be so, and the result will be that in a very few years, instead of abolishing English trade, there will be a large increase of English imports into Canada. I can remember the time, Mr. Speaker, when hon. gentlemen opposite were not so superloyal. I can remember when we were discussing the National Policy, and when it was urged that that policy was a disloyal one as regards England, that it threatened British connection, those hon. gentlemen said: "So much the worse for British connection." I rather suspect the motive which prompts hon. gentlemen opposite on this occasion to make such a leading cry of this cry of loyalty.

There is another feature of this case to which I might be permitted to allude most briefly in connection with the charge of disloyalty. I believe it is a matter of interest to the whole Anglo-Saxon race, to every English-speaking man, whether he may be in America, or the United Kingdom, or Australia, or New Zealand, or the Cape of Good Hope, or Hindostan, or wherever he may be on the face of this broad earth, for they are scattered over the whole face of it—I believe it is the interest of every English-speaking man that friendly relations should exist between the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon family. I believe that any policy that will draw closer the bonds that connect the United States and England, that will increase the cordiality existing between those two great powers, that will have a tendency to bring those two powers to act in concert and in alliance, is a policy that should receive the commendation and the support of every man, not only in Canada, but in every English-speaking country in the world. I do not need to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that no question is likely to arise—no question for many years, except the Alabama question, has arisen between England and the United States, threatening to dis-sever the amicable relations between those two countries—that has not had some connection with Canada. The fisheries dispute—we cannot say it ceases to exist—which so lately was an ominous question, threatening the relations between those two countries, was purely a Canadian one; and if we adopt any policy that brings Canada and the United States into closer commercial relations, and removes the danger of friction between this country and the United States, we adopt a policy that is likely to lead to that result which we consider so desirable, the drawing closer together of these two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race, I believe that a powerful argument in favor of unrestricted reciprocity can be founded upon that view of the case. I believe we would be justified in entering into negotiations and seeking to draw these two peoples closer together, closer in commercial and closer in social intercourse, if no other consideration had weight in the premises.

So much for the disloyalty objection. Now, the next objection urged to this proposed arrangement is that it would lead to annexation.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hear somebody say, "hear, hear." What does that objection admit—what does it tacitly, inferentially admit? It admits that it would be such a splendid thing we would want more of it, that it would work so well we would not be satisfied with a half measure but would go the entire distance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I say that it admits that it would be a good thing. Perhaps it would; but it would not be a good thing to the extent of bringing about annexation. It would have a direct tendency, on the contrary, to prevent annexation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I repeat it—it would have a direct tendency to prevent annexation. I remember when I was a boy that the annexation sentiment in this country was rampant. I remember a manifesto issued in 1849 signed by hundreds of prominent Conservatives in this Dominion, and it put the arguments in favor of annexation with great power and force. I know, Sir, that annexation was debated and discussed, and that the great mass of the people in that section of the country in which I live believed in it. What was the cause of it? Was it because they considered the political institutions of the United States superior to those of Canada? No, Sir, I think not. It was because they desired freer commercial relations with the United States and that they saw in annexation the only mode of obtaining it.

Mr. BOWELL. It had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. CHARLTON. It had everything to do with it, and I will show you how it had to do with it. In 1854, when we got freer commercial relations with the States, annexation died out. We never heard of it again while reciprocity continued. It was not a desire for annexation on political grounds, but the sentiment was created by the desire to obtain free commercial intercourse with the United States, and by that desire alone. Now, Sir, we have an annexation sentiment today, and it is growing in this country, and it is growing because of the mismanagement, the recklessness, and the extravagance, and the corruption of the party in power. If there is any one thing that actuates the public mind and that has a tendency to spread this annexation sentiment in Canada, it is the desire that is felt by the farmers, and lumbermen, and other producing classes of this country to obtain free trade with the United States. It is that, Sir. It is not because they do not believe that our political institutions in Canada, if honestly managed, are not as good as those of the United States, for, Sir, nine out of every ten of the people of Canada believe our institutions are better, as they have a right to believe. It is the desire for unrestricted commercial relations that promotes the sentiment in favor of annexation. Now, Sir, you secure an arrangement by which we can obtain unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and you will find, as a result of that arrangement, that agitation for annexation will die out completely. This would be the inevitable result of such a policy, and it is the way to put an end to the annexation agitation altogether in this country if we can have through a commercial treaty all the material advantages that can result from annexation.

So much for that objection. Then there is another objection made, and so far as I have heard it made, it is made by Conservatives and advocates of the National Policy, and it is this: that it would be a bad thing, because it would prevent our getting as good terms for annexation in the future when we want it as we otherwise could. Well, Mr. Speaker, all I have to say to that is, that it may be an objection that will have weight with some friends on the opposite side. We are not looking for terms of that kind and the objection has no weight with us.

Then, Sir, another objection urged is: "Well, we cannot get it and there is no use talking about it, and besides it would not be dignified to ask for it." That is what our friend from Huron (Mr. Porter) said the other night. He said that our abject whining and cringing must be disgusting to the Americans, as they had refused overtures for free trade. Sir, it is not abject whining, it is not cringing to come openly and boldly like a candid, truthful, man and say to another: "I believe that we can make an arrangement mutually advantageous, and I approach you with a proposition for an arrangement which I believe will be advantageous to both of us." What do those gentlemen want? What would they ask? Would they ask that 60,000,000 in

Mr. CHARLTON.

the United States should come to 5,000,000 in Canada, because it would not be dignified for 5,000,000 to go to 60,000,000? They must indeed have an extraordinary sense of their dignity when this would stand in their way. I do not see anything undignified or improper in either one of those peoples making proposals to the other. If we complete any arrangements which we, on this side, conceive could be effected to our advantage, it is neither undignified nor improper, on the contrary, it is in the highest degree dignified, to make approaches to our neighbors and lay before them what we believe to be the reasons that ought to actuate and influence us in entering into an arrangement for our mutual advantage and benefit. But, Sir, whether we can get it or not there is one thing we can do, and that is we can try. This word "can't" is a word that is not made use of very much by energetic business men. The way to ascertain whether you can do a thing or not is not to say, "I can't do it, and I won't try to do it." The way to do it is to go like men and to try and do it, and see what the chances are. If you fail to accomplish it you cannot accuse yourself for having been false to your own interests, and for not having made the attempt. But, Sir, there is another reason which will not warrant any man, who is acquainted with the chances of success, in saying or admitting that we cannot do it. We are warranted in believing that the Americans are ready to make a fair and equitable arrangement. We have, in fact, official assurance from the State Department of the United States that such is the case. We have assurances from public men of that country that such is the case. We are, in point of fact, invited to make our proposition, and we are decidedly assured that this proposition, if reasonable, will be favorably entertained.

Then, the next objection made is, that we cannot make a treaty on advantageous terms. Well, Mr. Speaker, we never need make a treaty that we do not consent to, and we never need consent to a treaty that is not satisfactory; and we never can tell whether we can make a satisfactory treaty or not until we have made the trial.

Then, the next objection is a very important objection. It is, that this arrangement will not yield us enough revenue. Now, Sir, I do not know whether I had better examine into this question on the basis of both a proposal for unrestricted reciprocity and on the theoretical basis also of commercial union, or not, for as a theoretical disquisition it might be interesting to take up the question on the basis of commercial union. However, Sir, I will proceed to show what would be the probable outcome if we made the arrangement contemplated by the resolution now before the House—unrestricted reciprocity. It would be admitted, I presume, that we would sacrifice the duties upon American importations, amounting last year in round numbers to \$7,300,000, the total revenue from excise and customs last year being \$28,087,000; deduct from this the collection of dutiable imports from the United States and it leaves a balance of \$21,388,000, which would be the revenue with the loss of the American duties. Now, Sir, in 1880 our revenue from customs and excise was \$18,479,000. On this basis I have named, admitting the loss of \$7,300,000, we would still have a revenue of \$2,909,000 more than we had in 1880. Our revenue in 1881 was \$23,942,000, and upon the basis I have mentioned our revenue would be \$2,545,000 short of the amount of revenue collected in 1881. Now, Sir, the revenue in 1881 was \$2,000,000 higher than the revenue in 1878 and the expenditure in 1881 was actually greater than this country was warranted in making or is warranted in making today. The question, Sir, is, can we under this arrangement go back to the scale of expenditure that existed in 1881? If we can do that, Sir, if we admit that we lose from our revenue \$7,300,000, and if we admit it is not possible to

readjust our tariff, and that it is not possible to supplement that loss by increased revenue from other sources which undoubtedly it is possible to do, if we admit that for the sake of argument, we are still warranted in saying that it is possible to go back to the expenditure of 1881 and that we would have revenue enough without any change in our tariff even with unrestricted reciprocity. Now, would it be possible for us to effect retrenchments? We who have run up our expenditure from \$13,486,000 in 1868 to \$35,658,000 in 1887; we who have increased our expenditure on an average four times as fast every year as the population has increased, is it possible to retrench in this country? Well, Sir, if it is not possible to retrench, it is not possible to avert ruin; if it is not possible to retrench, the country has got to go to the dogs; if it is not possible to retrench in this country, we may as well give up the case—the whole case. Now, I hold that it is possible. I will tell you where you might effect some retrenchment. You might abolish that sum of all political villainies, the Franchise Act, and you would save \$400,000 at one stroke, and you would also save your character, and your consciences would be clearer. You might get along with a little less expenditure on public works and buildings. I believe that in the United States, with all its wealth, there are about 86 cities only where they have public post offices. They only give post offices to large commercial cities such as New York and Buffalo.

Mr. FOSTER. How much do they take to build one post office?

Mr. CHARLTON. It does not matter. They have a good deal of money, and they have to build larger ones, because they do not build any in small towns. They do not go into the business of building little \$6,000 post offices in small villages as bribes to the people; they have not got as low in the scale of humanity as that. Well we might save very largely in the expenditure on public works and buildings; we might cut it all off, the whole thing, lock, stock and barrel. We could save by abolishing the vicious system of superannuation.

Mr. BOWELL. How much?

Mr. CHARLTON. It amounts to between \$200,000 and \$300,000 now. We could save on railway subsidies, and avoid the enactment of such little scenes as occurred in No. 8 a few years ago. We could save by putting an end to that system of bribery which consists in giving grants to useless railway lines of \$3,200 a mile. We could cut off the whole thing with advantage to our treasury, advantage to our morals, advantage to our charter, and advantage to our hopes in the future, not only in this world, but in the world to come. We have been spending millions of dollars for the purpose of carrying immigrants to the United States through this country, and we could cut off the whole of that appropriation with advantage to the public.

Mr. LISTER. What would the newspapers do without that?

Mr. CHARLTON. That is a question I cannot answer; I am afraid some of them would rat. Then, Sir, we could reduce somewhat, I think, the cost of the civil service. We have a great many incumbents in the service of this country who are most valuable officers, who, in fact, are underpaid, and we have a great many whose services are not worth a shilling a year—a great many useless appendages; and I venture to say that a business man could take charge of the departments of the civil service of this country, administer them on business principles, increase their efficiency 20 per cent., and reduce their cost 65 per cent. Then, if we had amicable relations with our neighbors, we could reduce the cost of the militia system by \$1,000,000 a year, and what we might spend beyond that would be mostly wasted. We could reduce the cost of legislation.

If it became necessary to revise our system, I think we could do with one member to represent 40,000 instead of 20,000; we could get along with half the number of members in this House; and as for the Senate, we might get along with any number you could name from half-a-dozen to sixteen, as it is only a little junta of very little use. We could get along with a reduction of the mail subsidies, and then my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has been fishing these nine years for reciprocity without changing the bait on his hook, could dispense with most of the fisheries appropriation—

Mr. FOSTER. I have a good bait.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not bait enough to get a nibble. He caught a gudgeon at Washington, and it was the only thing he got. Yes, it is possible to reduce our expenses by the entire loss we sustain from the American duties. We could reduce our expenses \$7,000,000 a year, with advantage to ourselves, advantage to our morals, and advantage to the taxpayer, and have a better Government than we have to-day. We could do it by cutting off the means of corruption which the Government employs, and so lavishly uses, in the management of this country at present. And then you must bear in mind that whatever policy increases the prosperity of this country will increase the tax-paying resources of the people. Whatever policy increases the wealth and population of this country will inevitably increase the imports; the man who has an ample income will consume more goods than a man who is straitened in his circumstances; and if we can make the great producing classes of this country prosperous, and at the same time vastly increase their numbers, we need have no fears of the revenue more than, perhaps, a temporary derangement of one or two years while we are getting ready to cut down our expenses. As I said before, I estimate the saving to the producing classes of this country, in the mere matter of duty, at \$15,000,000 a year. I also estimate that a vast amount is lost in destroying competition for the purchase of the goods we export to the United States; and a further sum is lost in placing an extinguisher on the growth of the population in this country. Suppose it was necessary to resort to direct taxation, the necessity of which I deny; but suppose for argument that it should be necessary, here is a policy by which we propose to save to the people of this country directly \$15,000,000, and indirectly as much more. The question is, can the people of Canada afford to give three or four dollars for thirty dollars? Can they afford, for the sake of gaining advantages amounting to from \$15,000,000 to \$30,000,000 a year, direct and indirect, to submit to a direct taxation of \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 a year temporarily? I should say that if the necessity existed, the people would cheerfully submit to the imposition; but the necessity does not exist. It would be, in short, a godsend to the country if we were compelled to retrench—to lop off many of these expenses which are neither for the good, nor the honor, nor the prosperity of the people of the Dominion.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 15) to incorporate the Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

Bill (No. 16) to incorporate the Chinook Belt and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Perley, Assiniboia.)

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

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Eastern Assurance Company.—(Mr. Kenny.)

Bill (No. 25) to confirm the charter of incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Bronson, and Weston Lumber Company.—(Mr. Perley, Ottawa.)

Bill (No. 35) to enable the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to run a ferry between Beecher Bay, in British Columbia, to a point on the Straits of Fuca, within the United States of America.—(Mr. Baker.)

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

KINCARDINE HARBOR TOLLS

Mr. ROWAND moved second reading of Bill (No. 30) to authorise the town of Kincardine, in the county of Bruce, to impose and collect certain tolls at the harbor in the said town.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Will the hon. gentleman give some explanation of the purport of this Bill?

Mr. ROWAND. I understand the object to be to renew the power of the town of Kincardine to impose certain tolls.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright and the amendment of Mr. Foster, resumed.

Mr. CHARLTON. I must apologise for the length of time I have occupied in discussing the resolution before the House. My excuse is that it is a large question, and I do not know that I could have shortened the time very much without failing to deal with some of the questions which I thought were essential to the discussion. I hope the House will not judge me to have been guilty of wasting its time, and I shall not trespass very much longer upon its patience in connection with this discussion. When you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was engaged in discussing the question whether the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity would leave Canada in a position where a sufficient amount of revenue could be secured to meet our actual necessities and wants, and I was endeavoring to point out the absolute necessity that rests upon this country, entirely apart from all considerations in connection with unrestricted reciprocity, to curtail its expenditure and diminish its expenses. I had pointed out, during the afternoon, the fact that we are in many respects competitors with the United States. We, as well as that country, offer homes for immigrants; we, as well as that country, expect to promote our growth by attracting to our shores people from the continent of Europe, and, in order to enter upon this race with any prospects of success, it is necessary that we should not be handicapped by expenses of administration and burdens of debt greatly in excess of those resting upon the shoulders of the people of the United States; and for this reason I now repeat what I said before that it is in the highest degree essential to the prosperity of Canada that we should retrench our expenses. I find, after deducting from the taxation of the United States the amount applied by them to the extinguishment of their public debt, that our duties of customs and excise exceeded those of the United States last year by \$2.15 per head. We raised \$6.03 per head, and the United States \$3.88 per head, aside from the amount which they applied to extinguishing the public debt. We must bear in mind also that the United States are called upon to provide for certain expenses from which we are

Mr. CHARLTON.

free. They have their diplomatic and consular expenses to provide for as a nation, and the only thing in this line for which we have to provide is the cost of the High Commissioner in London. Then they have to provide for an army and a navy. Last year, they expended on their pension list, \$75,029,000; upon the army, \$33,561,000; and upon the navy, \$15,141,000. Our expenses on similar items were, \$102,000 for pensions, \$1,974,000 for the militia and mounted police, and \$205,000 for ocean and river service, making a total of \$2,281,000 as against \$123,721,000 in the United States. To have made our expenditure on these services equal to theirs in proportion to population, we should have expended \$9,419,000 more than we did, and yet our taxation from customs and excise, applied to current expenditure, is \$2.15 *per capita* more than theirs. Whatever light we look upon this question in, we must be impressed with the necessity which rests upon this country to bring down its expenses somewhere in the region of those of the United States, ever bearing in mind that that great country is our competitor and will continue to be our competitor, that we lie side by side with it, and that, if we are to secure immigration and to people our great wastes, we must offer inducements to the population of the old world nearly, if not quite, equal to those which are offered by the United States.

In considering the objections that are raised to unrestricted reciprocity, I shall next refer to the seventh objection, which is the assertion that is made, that it will ruin our manufactures. I will refer to this briefly, because I have already referred to it in discussing the question whether our manufactures are likely to be able to compete with those of the United States, if trade restrictions are removed. I have pointed out my belief, and I think with reason, that our manufactures are able to compete with theirs, but even if they were not, I say the country would not be warranted in foregoing the advantages which would be derived from unrestricted reciprocity in order to promote the interests of so small a fraction of the people of this Dominion as those engaged in manufactures. Even if the manufacturing industries of Canada would be obliterated by the removal of these restrictions, which is not the case, still the great mass of the people of Canada would be benefited, and we would be acting in conformity with the principle that we should adopt the course which will do the greatest good to the greatest number.

The next objection made is that this would injure our shipping interest. I deny emphatically that unrestricted reciprocity would have any such effect. Those familiar with the shipping on the great lakes are aware that Canadian shipping on those lakes is not worth within 30 or 40 per cent. as much as American shipping, because Canadian vessels are debarred from the most profitable trade on these lakes, which is the coasting trade. A Canadian vessel cannot clear from Chicago for Buffalo, or from Chicago for any other American port on the lakes, and is debarred from transporting ore, which amounts to a trade of several millions of dollars per annum, from Lake Superior to the lower ports. In fact, Canadian boats are debarred from the most lucrative trade on the lakes; and, if we had reciprocity, it would open to them a business from which they are entirely precluded now. On the sea coast the case is the same. The most profitable trade is the coasting trade, from which we are now entirely excluded, and in that matter we would derive enormous advantages from the adoption of reciprocity.

The next objection is one which was raised by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, and it is an objection which has had great weight with some portion of the mercantile classes in the large cities. That is, that the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity would injure the wholesale trade in this country, that it would put an end to the distribution of supplies to the retail dealers scattered

throughout the country by leaving them free to make their purchases in the great marts of the United States. I do not know, but I apprehend that this objection, like most of the others, would be found to be nearly if not entirely groundless. I am not able to say definitely and with certainty what the effect might be on the wholesale trade, but I wish to point out the result in this regard in the American markets themselves. If the result were to be in Canada to compel or to lead all retail dealers to buy in New York, that ought to be the result now in the United States, where no trade restrictions exist. But that is not the result in the United States. The cities of Buffalo, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Detroit, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul, Omaha, San Francisco, St. Louis, Nashville, New Orleans—all these and many other natural centres seem to supply almost exclusively the country adjacent to them with the goods required. Scarcely a retail merchant in a thousand goes east to New York from the west of Chicago to buy goods, and it is found to their convenience, and to their advantage, to go to a wholesale market quite near to them rather than go to a distant one. The character of the trade now is to buy frequently, to sort up, as merchants term it, to buy in small quantities, and keep their stocks complete. In doing this it is not to their advantage to go to a distant and expensive market. The course of trade leads them to buy either of travellers or to send in their orders themselves, and the result in the United States is, that the wholesale trade of that country is distributed among the various commercial centres scattered over that country, and these commercial centres supply almost exclusively the retail trade of the country adjacent. Well, if the same rule would hold good in Canada in the case of unrestricted reciprocity, trade would not be removed from the actual commercial centres where it is now. The trade of New York and the trade of Chicago, to a considerable extent, consists in the supply of jobbing houses, jobbing sales, sales to large wholesale mercantile establishments in the interior, and a great number of these extensive New York houses would not care to be troubled with the small business of a great number of small retail houses; they would rather sell to jobbers direct than to supply these houses. And I think for these reasons that the fears entertained by the wholesale trade in Canada that the business would centre in New York, are entirely groundless.

The next objection made is this: We are quite prepared to take reciprocity, we are anxious to get it, we have been ready at all times, and we are ready now, to have reciprocity in natural products. Mr. Speaker, I can say truthfully that we also are ready for that. If it were possible to secure reciprocity in natural products, I would be in favor not only of having a standing offer to that effect on our Statute-book, but I would be in favor of publishing that offer in every city of the United States, of putting it upon every door post; I would be in favor of making that offer known by placing a circular before every voter in the United States, if we could secure reciprocity upon the terms upon which the hon. gentlemen are willing to take reciprocity. But we cannot get it, it is futile and useless to talk about it, and when they say: Oh, we are willing to take reciprocity on such and such terms, it is equivalent to saying: We will not have reciprocity and do not want it—because they only propose to take it on such terms as they know they cannot get it. What is the arrangement these gentlemen would be glad to make? The arrangement they would like to make would be an arrangement that could not be called an equitable one as far as the United States are concerned. The Reciprocity Treaty which was in existence from 1854 to 1865 was largely to the advantage of Canada. We sold to the United States everything that we could desire to sell to them, but they could sell to us very little that they had to give us in exchange for the produce we sold to them. They were called upon to

pay us largely in gold for the production of our farms, our forests, our mines and fisheries. Now, they said, that is not a fair system of trade. If we are to buy the products of your labor, we want to have the privilege of giving you in exchange the products of our labor. It is reasonable that they should have that privilege, and it is for that reason we cannot get a renewal of that treaty. It is for that reason we must admit the products of their labor into this country, in return for the privilege we ask of them to have the products of our labor admitted into theirs.

The last objection I shall refer to to-night is, that we can get something better. We do not need to look for this at all, it is said; it is all useless to talk of reciprocity when we can easily secure an arrangement that will be infinitely better to Canada. What is it? Why, we can secure Imperial Federation, and that will be infinitely better, it is asserted, for the interests of this Dominion than unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Well, Sir, what is implied by Imperial Federation? What do the advocates of that scheme in Canada propose to secure? Why, they propose to secure, on the part of Great Britain, the imposition of differential duties in favor of the colonies; they propose that England shall impose duties upon raw materials, upon food, upon lumber, upon wool, and upon all the raw materials that are imported into that country from all nations except the colonies. Well, does any sane man suppose that England is going to return to the corn law system? Does any man suppose that England will impose duties upon any raw material whatever for the benefit of her colonies? I think it is preposterous to suppose it. I do not think any party in England would venture to make such a proposition, and the scheme of Imperial Federation is not only not within the range of probability, but it is not within the range of possibility, as understood by the advocates of the scheme who propose it as an arrangement preferable to securing unrestricted reciprocity with the United States.

Now, Sir, I am through with dealing with the objections raised to the consummation of this scheme. I think that I have met these objections fairly; that I have stated them to the House without withholding any argument that can be raised against the scheme. I have striven to deal with this question in the spirit of fairness. I believe that it is in the interest of the party to advocate this matter and deal with it in that spirit. I believe that the case is so strong that we have but to state the arguments, have but to state fairly the advantages that would flow from the scheme, have but to meet fairly the objections that are raised, and to state reasons why they do not lie, in order to convince any candid and unprejudiced mind that what this country needs, that what will conduce to the prosperity of this country, above all things else, is the very thing that the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford declares would be beneficial to Canada. When this debate commenced, I confess I had my doubts whether this issue would be placed fairly before the people of this country. I was afraid there might be something kept back in connection with these fishery negotiations. I felt that it might be possible that the eminent gentleman who occupies the position of Finance Minister, and who was also one of the British Commissioners at Washington, might spring upon us during this debate, some document which would give color to the claim that he had actually attempted to get reciprocity on a basis fair and equitable to both peoples, and that we might be placed in a position where it would be difficult to combat a cunningly framed argument of this kind. But, Sir, fortunately for the party on this side, fortunately, perhaps, for the party on the other side, fortunately for the country certainly, the issue is a distinctly defined and sharply drawn issue. When the Government amendment was placed in your hands last night, there was no longer any doubt as to the character of the issue. It is

a clearly defined issue between unrestricted reciprocity and the National Policy of this country, nothing more and nothing less. That resolution says :

"Canada, in the future as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States, in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion, which was adopted in 1879, and has since received, in so marked a manner, the sanction and approval of its people."

In other words, the Government of this country is in favor of obtaining reciprocity upon unobtainable terms, and upon unobtainable terms only; they do not wish to obtain reciprocity on any other terms, except such terms as they know are not acceptable. That is the analysis of the position of the Government with regard to this question. They are not in favor of reciprocity upon any conditions on which reciprocity can be obtained. They consider the National Policy, that gigantic failure which has produced national disaster, as preferable to unrestricted reciprocity, and they prefer to go on increasing our debt, piling up taxation, sending thousands of our citizens from our country, and doing without the blessings of continental free trade—they prefer to pursue this line and continue the National Policy rather than to impair any portion of that policy by seeking continental free trade. That is the issue. I am glad the issue is so squarely defined. I may say for myself, and I think, for the party on this side of the House, that we shall be glad to meet the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House upon this issue. The country cannot misunderstand it. Men may take a position honestly on either one side or the other, and no doubt hon. gentlemen opposite have honest convictions on that side of the question, as we certainly have on the other. We will put the issue before that great jury, the people, and will leave it to that jury to settle the question which so intimately affects their own well-being and prosperity.

An hon. MEMBER. You may change your mind before another election.

Mr. CHARLTON. I must thank the House for the very great courtesy with which hon. members have listened to me. I have to promise the House, moreover, that the occasions will be very rare when I shall trespass on its patience so far as I have done on this occasion. I am happy to say, in conclusion, that I believe this country has great resources. I believe this country is destined by Providence to have a grand future, and that consummation can only be thwarted by its own folly and mismanagement. But I believe our autonomy cannot be preserved if we go on in the way we have been going. I believe that to persevere in the course we have been pursuing for some years past, to follow that course for a very few years more, would entail irretrievable ruin upon the Dominion. I believe our path is beset with difficulties, and I am sorry to say that the greater number of those difficulties are of our own creating. We have created them, we must bear the consequences of having created them, and we can only remove them by energetic methods, only by subjecting ourselves to the very unpleasant experience of retrenchment, of economy, of dismissal of officers, and of reducing the expenses of government. It was said by Artemus Ward that Brigham Young was a very much married man. We are a very much officered nation. We have in every department of the Government at least two officers where we require one; it is the case in the civil service, it is the case in this House. We have custom house officers, excise officers, weights and measures officers, you can scarcely count the number of officers in the pay of the Government, and one-half of them are useless officers. As I said before recess, a business man, or business men organising this Government on business principles, could carry on the public business with greater efficiency at very much less cost than is now incurred. We have, in addition to maintaining that great

Mr. CHARLTON.

number of officers, got into the habit of adopting very corrupt methods.

Mr. HESSON. Hear, hear—on that side.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is the innocent side. I was down the other day in the county of Prince Edward. I found there a gentleman, late a member of this House, now thank Heaven a member of this House, who had been unseated for what? Because an indiscreet friend had paid a drunken loafer, who voted against the Reform candidate, on the night subsequent to the election a dollar to get rid of his importunities.

Mr. BOWELL. That was only one charge.

Mr. CHARLTON. That was the most serious case and all the other charges were withdrawn. He was unseated on that charge. Now, what did I find going on in that county? The Dominion Government were dangling promises, in the shape of bribes, to the extent of thousands of dollars before the electors. I found the inhabitants of Picton were promised a new post office; and a gentleman who was in the way of the regularly nominated candidate had, as I understood, and it can be denied if it is not true, been promised that he would receive a good snug sum for the site for the post office if he retired from the contest. I see it is not denied.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman mean to assert that the Government made the promise?

Mr. CHARLTON. The Government, I understand, sent an emissary, and I understood he had made the promise?

Mr. BOWELL. There is not one word of truth in it.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then I should like to know what means were used to retire Mr. McCuaig. There were some means used.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in his secrets, so I cannot tell you.

Mr. CHARLTON. I found in addition to the post office promised to Picton that the people were to have the harbor channel deepened,—

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. CHARLTON—And a bridge was to be built from Prince Edward across the Bay of Quinté to Belleville, and an extensive marsh was to be drained and a channel was to be dredged out—all these things were to be done if the people of Prince Edward county would return a supporter of the Government. Those were the influences used there. They were told that they could not have one cent if they did not return a supporter of the Government, that they could not have a new post office, the harbor deepened, the marsh dredged, or the bridge built. These methods I condemn. They are having a most ruinous and demoralising effect on the voters of the country. The Government are increasing expenses uselessly, and it is time the people turned out of office men who resorted to those methods, and many worse, at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. HESSON. Explain the Glengarry case.

Mr. CHARLTON. When the courts give their decision the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) will be enlightened on that matter.

Mr. BOWELL. Then you will tell us it is the case of a drunken loafer.

An hon. MEMBER. He was spending his own money anyway.

Mr. CHARLTON. In addition to those methods pursued by the Government in elections we have the costly mistakes that the Government have made. No less than \$42,000,000 were expended on the Intercolonial, and the Government

has since been engaged in spending more millions to destroy that property by building the Short Line. Then there was the expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway; and there are whispers now that that portion of the road from Sudbury Junction to Port Arthur is to be abandoned. It might as well be abandoned, but we have expended tens of millions of dollars on its construction. Of our total debt of \$29,000,000 no less than \$80,000,000 were thrown away on the different mistakes made by the Government. We have this wildly extravagant expenditure, this mountain of debt, this terrible drain of the exodus, and we stand to-day a young nation in shackles, borne down by this mountain weight placed on its energies and progress, it is time the incubus was removed. The hour is not yet too late, but the hour may speedily come when it may be too late, and to remove this incubus requires courage and requires determination. The evils that confront us are of the gravest character. We cannot remove them merely by willing that it should be done, but we must make an effort and it must be a great effort too:

"Write upon your doors the saying wise and old,
Be bold, be bold, and everywhere be bold;
Be not too bold, but better the excess than the defect,
Better the more than the less;
Better like Hector on the field to die,
Than like a perfumed Paris turn and fly."

And the resolution, Mr. Speaker, which has been placed in your hands by my hon. friend to my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) points the way to extricate this country from these difficulties. The admission of Canada to participation in the commercial and business advantages arising from unrestricted reciprocity would mark the commencement of a new epoch in our history. Combined with retrenchment and economy, in the management of public affairs, it will stay the tide of humanity now ebbing from our shores; it would bring back again armies of those who have left us, it would bring in capital, it would incite enterprise, and it would make of this country that great nation which the bountiful gifts and the boundless resources that nature has placed in its possession will enable it to become.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened, Sir, with great pleasure to the speech of my hon. friend. That speech, in which he has gone over the whole ground, from his point of view, has occupied him nearly three hours, and I must ask the indulgence, not only of my friends but the indulgence of the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House while I attempt to answer this veteran parliamentarian. In rising to reply to my hon. friend, whom I met in 1882 on other fields of fight, I am conscious how arduous is the task which is before me, for he is cunning in fence and a great master of figures and details. Now, Sir, I confess I was struck by the fact that on this occasion, as on so many other occasions, the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, when they come to deal with the affairs of Canada, with its present and its future, ring the changes on the old set of bells. My hon. friend tells us that this question is to go before the electorate on the next occasion, and he, I suppose, anticipates winning on this horse. Well, Sir, all I have to say to him is this, that we have very recently come from fighting the battle along the whole line, and in great part the same issue that is raised here to-night, the issue raised the other night by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was before the country and has been before the country on three successive occasions, and the electorate have given their verdict on it with no uncertain sound. I am glad, Sir, that my hon. friend is so well pleased with the definiteness of the conduct of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Conservative party. In the conclusion of his speech he said he was delighted that the question had been put so fairly and squarely, and with no ambiguity from this side. But what do we find on the other side?

Under which king are you fighting? What horse are you to win on? Is it the horse of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), or is it that which the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has just trotted on to the field? Oh, I will not say he is either foundered or spavined; I will not say that. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in his speech, said:

"It has been made a grave ground, it has been attempted to set up as an extraordinary ground for objection, that when you propose to enter into a treaty for unrestricted trade with the United States you must thereby of necessity discriminate against English manufacturers and manufacturers of all other countries except the United States. Now that is true; I admit that."

What did the hon. gentleman the member for Norfolk say to-night, when my friend the Minister of the Interior asked him what he meant by unrestricted reciprocity? He told us that he meant by unrestricted reciprocity—I have his words here—"leaving the customs duties of each country free." Now, which is your policy? Is it the unrestricted reciprocity of the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who says that you are to let all the goods of the United States, whether they are such goods as are produced in Canada or not, in here free, and that the United States should let all the goods of Canada in free, and that we are to have our respective tariffs or the plan of the member for South Oxford? Which is it? We have the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) here now, and he ought to get up and tell us. He ought to enable me to pronounce the same eulogy on him, and on his party, for honesty and fairness and definiteness that the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) pronounced on our amendment to the motion made by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Sir, when I heard the ex-Finance Minister speaking the other night, and also when I heard my hon. friend who spoke last, I could not help being struck by the similarity between their demeanor and the doctor in *Le Malade Imaginaire*. When the doctor is dismissed he gets into a fearful temper, and threatens the unfortunate patient with destruction. You were physicians for five years, you were the doctors of this country, you had the prescribing for this country, and the country found, to use the elegant language of my friend a moment ago, that under your treatment it was going to the dogs. It dismissed you. The country dismissed you, and instantly you became angry. You declared that the country was in a terrible condition, and ever since that you have been ringing changes on these lacrimose and lugubrious statements, but the country has gone forward in spite of you; and I do not think, Sir, it is very likely that the discharged doctors will be taken back. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken seemed, in fact, to be conscious of the similarity between him and the doctor in Molière's famous comedy, for he said: "I will make a diagnosis of the case." Why, Sir, they have been making a diagnosis of the case for some years, and not only have they made a diagnosis but a prognosis as well. Their diagnosis was wrong, and their prognosis has proved at fault, for, as I have said, the patient is flourishing. Now, Sir, I shall endeavor to refer to all or most of the points made by my hon. friend. He lays down very properly the proposition—and it is the only proposition that has been laid down on that side since the commencement of this debate that will bear discussion—he lays down the proposition that the proposal which we are here discussing is one that intimately concerns the well-being of Canada. Yes, indeed, Sir, it intimately concerns her well-being, whether we adopt the views of those gentlemen, or whether we go on in the path of progress and expansion, confident in our future, and with that boldness, which, in the language of Longfellow, my hon. friend has enliterated. Why, Sir, that is what we have done; we

have been bold, but not too bold; we have had faith in the country, but those gentlemen would have us go forward with a timid step, and in such a tentative manner that the very danger of annexation, which hangs on the mind of some people when discussing this question—but which never hangs on my mind, for I have the utmost faith in Canada—would be imminent. If we had gone on in the way they wanted us to go, annexation would have been inevitable. So that is a proposition that I entirely endorse. Some of the other propositions that have been made I could not endorse, because as I will show as I go on, there is scarcely a proposition made by hon. gentlemen opposite that has not a major premise which, when stated, shows not only that the syllogism is fallacious, but that it is ridiculous. The hon. member said we should look at our environment, and I have no objection to look at the environment of Canada. I have no objection to look at what Canada is, at her resources, her surroundings, her opportunities; and the more I look at them the more confident I become in her future. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the growth of the United States. He told us he would compare the burdens of the two countries, and he took for his argument, I think, very fallaciously the *per capita* comparison, just as he has concluded his speech with a *per capita* comparison; and as the reasoning of himself and his friends on this subject is always fallacious so when they have recourse to facts, which is very seldom, they nearly always misstate the case. The hon. gentleman made the statement that our taxation amounted to \$6 and a fraction per head, and he stated that that was something like \$3 and a fraction more than the taxation of the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, what did you say?

Mr. CHARLTON. I stated that the taxation of this country from customs and excise was \$6.03 per head, if I remember rightly, and that that was \$2.16 more than was expended in the United States from customs and excise, aside from the amount paid on their debt.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that a fair comparison? Well, the hon. gentleman spoke very low at the time, and I did not catch accurately what he said; but I caught what he said in the beginning of his speech. The taxation of Canada in 1886 was \$25,226,15³/₄, or \$5.26 per head, while the total taxation in the United States was \$309,819,19⁹/₁₀, or \$5.28 per head, 2 cents in favor of Canada. But, Sir, it would never do for any hon. gentleman opposite when speaking of the condition and prospects of Canada, to bring forward a fact that would be in Canada's favor. When the hon. gentleman comes to make a comparison of Canada with the United States—with a country that is highly organized and that is nearly a hundred years older than Canada, what is the major premise, to talk in the language of logicians—and the hon. gentleman who brought forward this question is a ripe scholar—what is the major premise in his mind? Why, that a confederation which commenced its career some twenty years ago, with a population to-day, according to him, of only 4,700,000 people ought to make as good a showing as a federation of 60,000,000 that commenced its career a hundred years ago. That is his major premise, and the moment you state it, it sounds ridiculous and the whole argument disappears. The true comparison—and then, of course, you have to take into account the age of Canada—would be Canada's population plus her organized wealth, plus her incoherent wealth, and the population of the United States plus her incoherent wealth and her organized wealth, and then allow for the difference in the age of the countries. Of course, we could not for one minute think that the organized wealth of Canada would compare with the organized wealth of the United States—that would be perfectly absurd; but the incoherent wealth

Mr. DAVIN.

of Canada—the wealth of British Columbia in its mines, the wealth of our vast, rich prairies in the North-West, with its millions of wheat fields, the undeveloped wealth of our fisheries, timber and various other resources—will compare advantageously with that of the United States; in fact, we have more undeveloped resources than the United States. Therefore, the comparison when made properly is a comparison that tends to the advantage of Canada. Then the hon. gentleman made a comparison as to population, and tried to make out that Canada has not progressed as rapidly in population as the United States. In fact, he took the tone that is always taken by the leaders of his party, that we are not doing well, that we are going back, that ruin is staring us in the face, that, to use his words, we are going to the dogs, but that everything is halcyon and progressive and satisfactory in the United States. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not in his place, because I would like to read to him a few sentences, not spoken by a member of the party of which I happen to be a member; but I will read them for the edification of the party opposite, and, meanwhile, I will conceal the name of the man who uttered them until I come to the close. This is what he says:

"The statistics show that the exports of Canada *per capita* were greater than those of the United States, and her *per capita* imports are also greater than our own. Her *per capita* railway mileage is about the same as those of the United States. Her growth of population from the date of our Declaration of Independence up to the present day has been equal to our own, ours at that date being about 3,000,000, and hers being less than 300,000

"The records of her criminal courts show that she has a smaller percentage of crime than we have. She is the only country in the world whose national debt is not a war debt, with the exception of two or three millions expended in putting down the recent Riel rebellion. The whole of her debt has been incurred in the development of her internal improvements. In addition to her line of railway, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, her Government is subsidising a fast line of steamships to ply between Halifax and Liverpool, and the Imperial Government has agreed to subsidise a line to run between Vancouver, Yokohama, Hong Kong, and Australia. A company has been organized to lay an ocean cable from Vancouver, *via* Sandwich Islands, to Yokohama, Hong Kong, and Australia. An Atlantic ocean cable is to be owned by the same company which owns the Pacific cables.

"Thus her great railway, by means of the steamships which will ply between Halifax and Liverpool in connection with it, and the Pacific line subsidised by the English Government, which will also run in connection with it, will have both under its control. Its railways are reaching out for the carrying trade of the two hemispheres. Not only this, but the transcontinental telegraph system and both the Atlantic and Pacific cables, of which I have spoken, will be under the control and owned by her railways.

"These are not visions of the future. Most of them are realities of to-day. Already we can step into the most luxurious car which runs on this continent at Vancouver, on the waters of the Pacific, and ride continuously in it for a distance of 3,700 miles until you reach Halifax, on the Atlantic. This country has also a great inland water way from the mouth of the St. Lawrence, in the Atlantic, to the head of Lake Superior, and all her own, except the locks at Sault Ste. Marie.

"These great lines of commerce traverse broad stretches of our own country, will tap almost every important centre of trade on our northern border, and are now stretching their arms across the State of Maine to the seaboard, south to St. Paul, and the vast interests that centre in these grand transcontinental lines that are knit together by them, invite to other fields of conquest this side of the great lakes, until Portland, Oregon, St. Paul, Chicago, Buffalo, New York, and San Francisco pay tribute to these interests and share in their wonderful growth and development; and it may astonish some present to know that to-day the Dominion Government has subsidised, and is now subsidising, a railway in connection with this vast system across the State of Maine, to shorten the route to the cities of the eastern seaboard.

"Look for a moment to the unlimited resources of that country, with her great lakes and rivers, and forests; with her natural storehouses of gold and silver, of coal, iron, copper, and lead. Her pastoral and agricultural resources are unlimited, and 1,600 miles north-west of St. Paul we find actually the great wheat fields of this continent, and which, when fully developed, will not only equal, but far surpass the great Odessa region in Russia, and 40,000 square miles of coal underlie this same territory."

I need hardly tell you it is not a Canadian Reformer that speaks; it certainly is not a Canadian Reformer who has a seat in this House. The gentleman who speaks is Mr. S. J. Ritchie, of Ackron, Ohio. That is the way an American, a highly instructed American, looks at our resources, and I am only sorry that a countryman of his is

not present to hear what he said. If my hon. friend who spoke last were here, I am sure that would edify him; and I was rather surprised that my hon. friend did not wax a little conscious of the parent source whence he draws his life blood and say something in reply to one of his leaders, who, last night, sneered at immigrants, for, after all, the hon. gentleman is, like myself, an immigrant. The hon. gentleman spoke of the exodus. That was almost the first thing he took up, just as did the hon. member for South Oxford, when introducing his resolution. That hon. gentleman indeed, had so much to say about the exodus that he was almost through his speech before I became aware that he was discussing the tariff. I thought at first it was an immigration speech that the hon. gentleman was delivering; in fact, I thought he had got hold of a manuscript copy of a pamphlet which the hon. the Minister of Agriculture was likely to publish on immigration questions, and had misconstrued it, and misquoted it here. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk of the exodus. These pessimists derive great consolation from the exodus, forgetting entirely that nothing was more natural than that there should have been a large emigration from this country to the United States, as I shall show. Sir, in a moment. A great deal of that emigration to the United States took place before our Canadian Pacific Railway was built. We have in Canada, I am glad to say, a most highly organised system of education; in fact our educational appliances are in advance of our position in many ways. Our educational appliances are in advance of our organised society, and perhaps are in some respects misdirected, and the result is there has always been in Canada a large number of highly educated men, men educated at our normal schools, chiefly at the Government expense, who, when they do not find in Canada scope for that kind of activity for which their training fits them, turn naturally to a country in which city communities are larger and more numerous than here. In the United States a similar movement is visible. What takes place here, happens in the eastern States. Yet we do not hear of the New England States being destroyed because there is a large emigration from them to the western States. The fact is, that the line of emigration goes not on lines of longitude, but on lines of latitude. It goes from east to west, and it was natural, when we had no Pacific railway, that this emigration, on which hon. gentlemen opposite dilate at such length, should have taken place. Emigration from the eastern States is still going on. I have here a report of the Governor of Dakota, in which he says:

"Early in the spring a large colony of settlers coming direct from Vermont and New England points located in Hangar county, about 25 miles south of the Northern Pacific."

And the Governor of New Mexico tells how another colony went from the New England States. I do not believe, Sir, that if you were to enter into any legislative body in these States, you would find gentlemen standing up and declaring they were going to the dogs because the more energetic and restless spirits, persons who could not find scope for their abilities at home, took Horace Greeley's advice to go west. The argument that because a portion of our population has gone to the States, there must be something wrong, has been stretched beyond all reason. Did no one leave for the United States when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power? Did no migration take place to the States from Canada then? Did no migration take place before they came into power? Why, Sir, this thing has been going on for twenty-five years, and so long as we have in our brains the restless, aggressive, and enterprising pioneer blood of the Norman, Gael and Saxon, so long shall we find this emigration taking place. The hon. gentleman then proceeded to deal with the North-West. He seemed to think that the North-West was in a very bad way, and would be greatly

benefited by unrestricted reciprocity. Well, one of the first consequences of that policy would be that the American ranchemen who are now at their wits' end to know where to get food for their vast herds, would come across the lines and swamp our ranches. Do you suppose they would leave any money in this country or do anything to develop this country? They would not. In ten years, our vast grazing areas of the west would be eaten clean off, and these people would have sent the money they made out of the cattle to the States, to go into the pockets of the millionaire ranchemen living in New York, Chicago and St. Louis. That is what would take place in that part of the country under unrestricted reciprocity. Then, when the hon. gentleman went to the North-West, he dealt with the progress of population, and, of course, could see nothing but darkness and despair. But what are the facts? Manitoba, in 1870, had a population of 18,995, including Indians. Manitoba was admitted into Confederation on the 15th July, 1870, and what her population would have been to-day, if the policy of the right hon. the First Minister had been carried out, and the Canadian Pacific Railway built in accordance with the agreement made in 1873, it is impossible to say, but it is certain that the province would have a very much larger population than it has. Nearly ten years elapsed before the railway was built, and since the railway has been completed not quite ten years have passed. What are the facts? The census of 1886 showed a population of 108,640, and the census of 1881 a population of 65,954, or an increase in five years of over 60 per cent., and that notwithstanding the reaction from the boom of 1882-83. In the same period the occupied dwellings increased 86 per cent. Let us compare that with the hon. gentleman's favorite Dakota, with the territory that he can never mention without breaking into pæans of joy. In 1860 that territory had a population of 4,837. In ten years it had only reached 14,181, or an increase of less than 10,000. In 1880 its population was 135,177, so that their favorite territory had not done much better than Manitoba. Washington Territory, in 1878, had a population of 50,154, and, in 1883, a population of 92,508. In five years it increased only 42,354, while Manitoba in the same time increased 44,686. British Columbia has greatly increased its population in the same period. In ten years it ran its population from 36,247 up to 49,459. It only got the railway about three years ago, and now it is calculated that it has 60,000; and with that progress and with the extraordinary attractions of the Province of British Columbia, with its mining wealth, with its farming attractions, with its fisheries, there cannot be the least doubt that that Province will go ahead with giant strides. Take Utah again. It has three lines of railway, and from 1882 to 1887 immigrants only increased 11,074, and its present population is 196,500. Montana, those who would boom it say has a population of 130,000, and last year had a population of 120,000, but I am assured that the population is really not above that of Manitoba, and it has three lines of railway. New Mexico in 1860 had a population of 27,000, and in 1870 of 91,870, being a gain in ten years of 4,840. In 1880, after an active era of railway construction, it had a population of 119,565. Idaho again had a population of 32,610 in 1880, and now it is estimated that its population is about 90,000. Arizona was shown by the census of 1880 to have a population of 40,000, and now the population is estimated at 80,000. It has three lines of railway. Now I do not think that a comparison with those territories reflects any discredit on the progress made by Manitoba or the North-West Territory. My hon. friend, when speaking of the North-West Territory and of Manitoba, spoke about Minneapolis, and Milwaukee, and St. Paul, and said that our settlers should have access to those markets. Why, if our settlers had access to those markets in the unpatriotic sense he means, if you break down the wall, if you break down

the tariff, if you take away the protection, if you destroy the policy of the Conservative party, which I can assure the country can only be maintained as long as its friends are maintained, what will happen? All chance of Winnipeg becoming the Chicago of the west will disappear, and whether Winnipeg or some other city is to attain that eminent position, there can be no doubt whatever that the time must come when we shall have, west of Lake Superior, a great commercial city like Chicago; but there is no chance of it, if you destroy the tariff. Milwaukee, Minneapolis, St. Paul—these will be the markets to which the people of Manitoba and the North-West will go, and what will happen then to our farmers? They will not have a home market. They will not have what we find in Winnipeg to-day, and what will soon be in every town along the line, manufacturing energies and manufacturing industries, and the mouths to be satisfied and the stomachs to be fed which manufacturing industries produce. Now, speaking of Dakota, I read something of what a United States gentleman said. I am going to read something from the *Globe* for hon. gentlemen. I am sure it will prove most edifying. It used to be the bible of the Reform party. Whether it retains that rank at present or not I really do not know, but at one time it held a very eminent position as the organ of that party. The *Globe* sent a correspondent into Dakota. Probably the *Globe* told the correspondent to go into Dakota in order to get facts, booming facts for these districts for hon. gentleman opposite, facts probably to be used in this debate. I do not know, but here we have the special correspondence of the *Globe*, and this is what the special correspondent of the *Globe* says:

"I made it my first business to enquire into the existence of the so-called exodus of disappointed Canadians, or newly arrived immigrants into the United States; and as the result I have no hesitation in saying that such an exodus does not exist. From the Custom house officials and old residents on both sides, I learn that for some years there was a regular emigration of this kind; but last year no person crossed southward to settle, except a few so-called 'beats,' who left Canada per force, and for Canada's good, and even these were counter-balanced by a similar number of persons who had got on the wrong side of the American law, and were obliged to begin life again in Canada. For some time past there has been no movement of immigrants in either direction. How, then, it may be asked, is the undoubtedly more rapid population of Dakota, and especially the large number of Canadians, settled in it to be explained? In this way, before the Canada Pacific Railway reached Manitoba, a few years ago it was impossible for any settler to get there except by way of the American railways through Chicago and St. Paul, and then by team or water up the Red River into Canada. Manitoba, of course, was to these intending settlers little but a name; and along the whole line of their journey, from St. Paul northward, they were waylaid by American officials and dealers in real estate, who described to them in extravagant terms, the Arctic climate of Manitoba, and the distances and difficulties of the journey that remained, and so induced the majority of them, without difficulty, to remain and take up land before crossing the boundary. Since it is now easier to reach Manitoba than to reach Dakota, these influences have, of course, ceased to be effective, and Manitoba is undoubtedly filling up faster than either of the American States at the present day. I have spoken several times of the indebtedness of the farming class—"

I hope the hon. gentleman who spoke last night, the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) is in his place, because I am sure this will interest him. I listened with great pleasure to his speech. It illustrated what I have often heard, that farmers are constitutional grumblers; but, when I marked the vigor of his language, and saw how admirably he could state his case, I knew that we had in him a fine specimen of the settlers and yeomen that Scotland gives us, and, notwithstanding his lugubrious view of the situation, I believe him to be a successful man and to be surrounded by successful men. Now, I ask his attention. I know it will do him good. In case the glance he took into the abyss of misery, the caldron of unhappiness that hon. gentlemen there brew, should have disagreed with him, this will certainly act as a salve to his wounded feelings:

"I have spoken several times of the indebtedness of the farming class, and although this is a matter in which it is everybody's interest to suppress the facts on both sides of the boundary, I have many reasons to
Mr. DAVIN.

believe that the Dakota farmer is very much worse off in this respect, and that almost without exception, he is the prey of a shark-like class of jobbing money lenders of which I neither saw nor heard of an example in Manitoba. Certainly there is nothing half so significant or unpleasant there as the printed list I saw posted up in the elevator at Gretna, a list of 100 farmers on whose machines one machine company, (if I remember right, a threshing machine company, of Racine, Wisconsin) have chattel mortgages."

These are the friends of the hon. member for North Norfolk, the cheapness of whose machines, and the delicacy of whose commercial transactions he is never tired of eulogising.

"This was a warning to every one, especially the elevator proprietors, not to purchase the crops of these men, as they were mortgaged to the above company, and side by side with it was the warning of the elevator people, that they would prosecute for fraud any mortgaged farmer attempting to sell them his crops, as these crops could, of course, be distrained upon by the mortgagor. Thirty per cent., too, several people assured me, was a common rate of interest exacted by the money lenders. In one case I was even told of a loan renewed at the rate of 70 per cent."

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior was able to quote the *Globe* the other night as really coming round to the side of Canada, and I am glad to be able to quote the *Globe* to-night as doing some justice to Manitoba and the North-West, and some justice, also, to the pet territory of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Sir, as I told the House, I had the pleasure on several occasions in 1882, of hearing, and meeting, and fighting the hon. member for North Norfolk. And, Sir, he is a gentleman of great logical power, he is a very able man, he is full of statistics, he is so full of them that he sometimes misquotes them. He is not always accurate. He stated here to night: "There has never been a time when the prices of agricultural products were not higher on the other side of the line"—in Chicago, I think he said—"than on this side." Now, he made a similar statement in 1882 at Tilsonburg when I was fighting him in Norfolk. It was at Tilsonburg he made the statement that on the very day he was speaking the price of wheat was higher in Chicago than in Toronto. That was on the 29th May, and the quotations in the Toronto papers the following morning sent up from Chicago were to this effect: Chicago, spring wheat, \$1.23½ to \$1.25½. Toronto, spring wheat, \$1.33 to \$1.37, or a difference in favor of Toronto of 9½ cents to 11½ cents. On that occasion he said: "And it has always been so since that policy became operative"—meaning the National Policy. Sir, very frequently since then, the price of wheat in Toronto has been ahead of the price in Chicago. So much for my hon. friend's accuracy. He also spoke about Dakota and Manitoba, and the North-West farmers being greatly injured because they have to pay too much for their machinery. Why, Sir, my hon. friend the member for Selkirk (Mr. Daly) when speaking last session on this topic, dismissed, by facts, statements of that kind. I was up in Winnipeg in 1879. I know something of what the price of machinery was at that time, and I can assure the House that instead of the price of machinery having gone up the price of machinery has gone down. So the statement is entirely erroneous that the farmer in Manitoba or the farmer in the North-West has to pay more in consequence of the National Policy. My hon. friend, at this period of his speech, stopped, and he thanked God that we had an intelligent people. Well, Sir, I am thankful, also, that we have an intelligent people, because if we had not an intelligent people, I am afraid the views of hon. gentlemen opposite now being put forward, might be put into practice disastrously for this country. The hon. gentleman also reverted frequently to the exports and imports, and to the inter-state trade of the United States. We admit that they are a rich and a prosperous people. I have stated that the question is not whether five millions are as rich as sixty millions, but whether we are better developing the country on our own lines than if we were to jump into

the maw of the United States. That is the question. He asks: Have we a satisfactory exhibit? I should say we have. Having talked in this way of Canada, without having shown that the patient is suffering, like a doctor who should come to a perfectly healthy individual saying: Oh, you are very bad, you have this and you have that—he prescribes, and what is the remedy? He says: Honesty, economy, retrenchment, access to our natural markets. Well, Sir, at the next election we can discuss honesty and retrenchment, but it is more germane to the question now before the House to discuss the subject of access to our so-called natural markets. There is, I find, a remarkable consistency, after all, in the Reform party. I have in my hand here a speech made at New Glasgow, N.S., in August, 1881, by the ex-leader of the Opposition, a man whom I am sorry this House has even temporarily lost, because no one, whether he is opposed to the hon. gentleman, or whether he is a supporter or a friend of his, can doubt his ability, or fail to see what a gap he must leave in any assembly. Mr. Blake, speaking at New Glasgow, said:

“Your natural channel of trade is with the neighboring Republic. Your exports will find the best market there, and your imports should come from there.”

That is the remedy! We are to seek our market in the United States, we are to get our imports from the United States! The hon. member for North Norfolk says that our geographical position is of such a sort that we cannot do other than seek our imports from there and send our exports there, if we want to succeed. A great deal more is made of our geographical position than is warranted. In the first place, the argument from geographical position is greatly discounted by the fact that we live in an age of railways and telegraphs. That makes all the difference in the world. It has made a difference in the sites of towns; it is no longer absolutely necessary to choose a river bank for the site of a town. Again, the telegraphs have brought places nearer each other. British Columbia was almost an infinite distance from the Maritime Provinces before the era of railways and telegraphs. It would be impossible to cross the Rocky Mountains with any sense of national connection if there were not railways and telegraphs. But if there is any force in that argument let me call the attention of the House to this: that the argument tells as much against the United States as it tells against Canada. Does not the United States stretch across the length and breadth of the continent? Has it not the Rocky Mountains? Has it not a vast stretch of barren territory, too—I use the language of the hon. member who introduced the motion—separating one part of it from another? And if we are to go to geography for arguments against national development, why the geographical features of North America would suggest, not one vast federation, according to the utopian dream of some people, but three great republics or empires, one on the shores of the Atlantic, one on the shores of the Pacific, and one in the centre, with its outlet to the sea in the Gulf of Mexico, and probably one north with its outlet in Hudson Bay. That is the division, if you are going to follow geography. But it is too late; it is as absurd for a young nation like ours to go thinking over what might have been as it is for a man to do so. A man of twenty-five or thirty may think that if his education had been directed into different channels he might have had advantages that he had not obtained and matters might have been different with him; but a man brooding over the past is a very foolish man. The only thing over which we have any control is the present and the future; that is the only thing on which our wills can make any impact, and if we are sensible men it is the only thing with which we will busy ourselves. So it is with a nation. It is useless to think about these geographical features. It is all very well for a student, in his

library, who is not engaged in governing the country, to sit there and discuss difficulties of this or of the other kind, and say that a geographical difficulty exists here and a geographical difficulty exists there, and that certain laws will operate in this way and certain laws in the other. But for us here, who are practical men, the question is, and it is behind this whole matter, shall we, to use the language of hon. gentlemen opposite, throw up the sponge, or shall five millions of men, the chief elements of whom belong to the greatest nations of the world, nations that could stand up to any nation that ever existed, whether these five millions, with the vast wealth of Canada, with its millions of acres of fertile lands, with its mines, its lakes, its rivers, are to develop this country, or whether they are to shrink from the task on account of the bug-bears raised by a student in his library about geographical difficulties? Too much altogether has been made of that. Geographical difficulties indeed! Why the French-Canadians, with some of whom I have the pleasure of sitting side by side in this House, did not shrink from the greatest possible difficulties, and in the land whence I come, in the North West, say it is true of the whole of Canada,

“Our meanest rill, our mightiest river,
Roll mingling with their fame for ever.”

It is absurd to suppose that the descendants of those men, to suppose that French-Canadians, that descendants of the Anglo-Saxons, that descendants of the Celts in this House and in the country, that five millions of men, with such antecedents, with the opportunities we have, should shrink from the noble task of building up a great nation; because that is my hope, and if I did not cherish it I would throw up the sponge at once and would not care to live here—

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. DAVIN. But I say “yes.” I was not sure that it was an hon. member, but I thought that it was another species that interrupted me. Canada is described as having length without breadth, as an eel-skin, as a few miles of fruitful and fertile territory stretching along the boundary line. But the real facts are thus set forth by a well-known authority, Mr. Watson Griffin:—

“About 100 miles north of the great lakes is a belt of rocky country, the greater part of which is of little value for agricultural purposes; but there are rich mines, vast areas of timber and valuable fisheries, and grasses grow with such luxuriance that it must become some day one of the greatest stock-raising countries in the world. This region extends northward to the height of land, the water-shed separating the waters flowing into the great lakes from those flowing into Hudson Bay. On the other side of the height of land a fertile, well-wooded country slopes down to the Hudson Bay. The rivers all rise in the neighborhood of the rocky section. If it were as smooth and fertile as other parts of the country it would soon be stripped of timber near the sources of the rivers, and the country would be subject to floods such as those which have devastated Ohio and other sections of the United States owing to the destruction of forests. But the Ontario Government, having wisely recognised the necessity of preserving the forests—

As they have done under the guidance of my friend Mr. Phipps—

can easily keep that region at the sources of the rivers always well-timbered. The mines and the fisheries can be developed, lumbering can be carried on under the supervision of a government forestry bureau, and stock raisers can avail themselves of the succulent grasses. North of that narrow strip are millions of acres of fertile farm lands. The country between the height of land and Hudson Bay only requires a railway to develop it, and a railway has already been chartered. According to the reports of Professor Bell and other well known scientists there are immense deposits of iron and anthracite coal side by side along the rivers emptying into James' Bay. The distance from Toronto to James' Bay via the Northern Pacific Junction and James' Bay railways will be 575 miles. When the railway to James' Bay is completed anthracite coal will be brought from the northern mines to the people of southern Ontario. Near the city of Ottawa is a mountain of the finest iron in the world. The coal mines of the James' Bay region will be connected by railway with Ottawa, and also with the rich iron mines on the north shore of Lake Superior, less than 300 miles away. South of the anthracite coal region are enormous beds of lignite coal, peat and porcelain or China clay of superior quality.”

Canada has breadth as well as length, and if they will only pay half the attention to the capacities that Canada possesses which they do to the United States they will be able to grow as enthusiastic about their own country. This year has brought painfully before us the superior advantages of Canada: painfully I say, because there was a loss of life on the part of many American citizens in that great blizzard which visited the American North-West. Our whole Dominion lies north of the cyclone belt. Three-fourths of the land adapted to the production of wheat is in Canada, and Mr. Wiman, one of the inspirers of this movement, in fact he is the Coryphæus of the movement, tells us that we have two hours more sunshine in the North-West than they have in the land below the line, and that under these circumstances he says that we have great advantages for wheat growing. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) dwelt on the inter-state trade of the United States as enormous, and he seemed to think it was a fair thing on his part to compare the inter-state trade of the United States with the export trade of other countries. But, Sir, when he compares the inter-state trade of the United States with its own export trade he will know, what he would have known had he compared as he might—although our statistics, I am sorry to say, are not in a first rate condition—but if he takes Mr. Blue's report for the Ontario Government, and Mr. Blackeby's report to Sir Leonard Tilley in 1885, he will see that the internal trade of Canada is enormously greater than its export or import trade. How come the United States to have this great inter-state trade? How come they to have the home market that he lauds so much? It is, Sir, because of that very protection that he wants us to forego. He does not seem to have observed for one minute that when he was pouring on the States all the applause that he could, about their development and internal wealth, that this only shows that the policy of the United States, which Alexander Hamilton and Madison and Webster, from one time to another advocated, was the true one, and, I may say, the policy that the hon. gentleman himself would fain advocate because he believes in protection. Well, Sir, what does his argument prove? It proves that if we want to become a great nation, if we want to develop our resources in such a manner that the internal trade shall be a great factor in our life, we must imitate the United States and pursue the same policy of protection. What did one of the Cobden tracts say in regard to the United States some years ago?

"It is our guarantee that if America will put down monopolising manufactures, when our election time comes we will lay Manchester and Sheffield alongside Indiana and Illinois, the finest States of the Union. These artisans and these mechanics will manufacture for them and they may grow food for us."

Now, Sir, we know very well that it does not make much matter, from the point of view of helping an industry, what form protection takes. It is well known that a time came in the history of England when actually free trade was the surest way of protecting its manufactures, and that the way to give protection to those manufactures was to open the doors to cheap food. The fact that manufactures are more advanced, are richer and are more highly organised in any State than in another is sufficient protection. If we adopt the course suggested by the hon. gentleman what will happen? Our manufacturers will be placed in competition with the manufacturers of the United States, who are protected as compared with our own manufacturers, not only by the fact that a great deal of what articles they deal in are patented, but by the fact that the United States manufacturers are richer, are more highly organised, and that they are in fact long come to maturity, while our manufacturers are only in an adolescent stage. The result would be to place us in the position sketched out in the Cobden Club Paper. That policy would bring St. Paul and Minneapolis and eastern cities of the United States into

Mr. DAVIN.

that relation to our country that they would manufacture for us and we should grow food for them. I will show you by-and-bye the market that those gentlemen think is so valuable is a treacherous one, and there is no guarantee whatever that the demand will continue for the class of articles that we export to the United States. Mr. Hitt is a United States statesman who takes much interest in our affairs, and he is of course in favor of commercial union. Indeed, I think judging by the speech of my hon. friend the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that he, too, is in favor of commercial union.

Mr. BOWELL. Of course he is.

Mr. DAVIN. In an interesting speech, which I remember reading, the hon. gentleman said that "whatever the Liberal party would do he was determined to stand by commercial union, and he nailed his colors to the mast." What do we find here to-night? His colors are not nailed to the mast. He has hauled them down. I am sure that the ship is just the same, but he has given her another coat of paint and put a different name on the prow, and the hon. gentleman sits in the poop with the sails flapping against the mast waiting for a breeze. But, Sir, the breeze is not to be coaxed by any such metamorphosis as the ship has undergone. The hon. gentleman, for a man so well informed in figures, is sometimes very reckless in his statements. He said that the treaty should not be like the old reciprocity treaty, which, he thought, was all on the one side. He declares that that was a one-sided treaty, that it was a jugg-handled treaty, and the advantage was on the side of Canada. I have here in my hand the treaty and Mr. Brown's statements in regard to what took place, and the figures, Sir, are irrefragable; I have tested them by authentic sources. It is impossible they should be wrong, because they would have been exposed at once. This is a memorandum by Sir Edward Thornton, K.C.B., and the Hon. George Brown on the commercial relations past and present of the British North American Provinces with the United States of America. I find from this that in the thirteen years of the operation of the reciprocity Treaty the Provinces purchased from the Republic, according to the United States returns, commodities to the value of \$346,180,264, and the Republic purchased from the Provinces \$325,726,520, leaving a gross cash balance in favor of the United States of \$20,454,246. But the balance was, in fact, much larger, the memorandum contending that during the first ten years it was \$62,013,545 in favor of the Republic. According to the official returns of the British Provinces, the gold balance in favor of the Republic on the transactions of thirteen years during which the provinces purchased from the United States to the amount of \$363,188,088, and the Republic from the provinces \$267,612,131, showing on an international traffic of \$630,800,218 a gold balance in favor of our neighbours of \$95,575,957. Yet the hon. gentleman tells us that the treaty was, in its operation, all on the side of Canada! In speaking of that treaty I confess I thought the hon. gentleman was a little disingenuous; I do not use the word offensively, as he knows well, because it is not in my nature to say anything offensive of anyone. He spoke of the enormous volume of trade during the continuance of that treaty, and how much Canada gained by it. There was an enormous trade done between Canada and the United States at that time; but, Sir, the hon. gentleman never told the House—I do not suppose he would treat his constituents in the same way—what is one of the conditions of a true view of the case, that during a part of that time the Grand Trunk Railway was building, that a great war had gone on below the line, that millions of people were taken from the factory and workshop to the battle field, and that therefore the people of the United States had to go where best they could for their goods. I think when these things are taken into account, it will probably be found that in-

stead of \$20,000,000—to take their own returns—being in favor of the United States in ten years under a treaty of that sort, under ordinary and normal circumstances there would be a far larger sum. The hon. gentleman spoke about the market of the United States for Canada, and it seems to me that there is a great fallacy in the way hon. gentlemen speak about the market. To revert again to the language of logicians, that is what is called the fallacy of division; it is distributing one term in one premise, and leaving it undistributed in another. It is assuming that what would be good for one man or one set of men in a country would be good for all men in that country. The hon. gentleman refers to our export of horses, rye, barley, oats and what not, to the United States, and he argues with curious inconsistency that when we import from the United States we pay all the duty on what we import, and when we export to the United States we pay all the duty on what we export. Well, Sir, that is a most extraordinary state of things. It revolutionises political economy. But the hon. gentleman who is leading in this debate said the other night that “nice customs court’sy to great kings,” and I suppose such heaven-born geniuses can revolutionise political economy and overturn the laws of exchange. But, I am inclined to think that that is a mistake. The Hon. James Young, who is a prominent member of the Reform party, and an exceedingly able and honest man, says it is perfectly absurd to say that we pay the duty on the horses that we send across the line. Now, Sir, dealing with this question of the market, I will ask the House to bear with me while I bring before them the relative markets that we have. Our aggregate imports and exports from 1873 to 1887 inclusive, were as follows:—

Aggregate imports and exports.....	\$2,864,000,000
Trade with United Kingdom.....	\$1,243,000,000
do United States.....	\$1,230,000,000
do other countries.....	398,000,000
do countries other than United States.....	\$1,638,000,000

Our aggregate exports for the same period were:

Aggregate exports.....	\$1,305,000,000
To United Kingdom.....	650,000,000
United States.....	\$529,000,000
Other countries.....	126,000,000
Countries other than United States.....	\$ 776,000,000

Our total exports for 1887, including amount returned short at United States ports, were:

Exclusive of coin and bullion.....	\$89,510,242
Inclusive.....	89,575,811
Coin and bullion.....	\$ 5,569
To United Kingdom.....	\$44,571,946
Other parts of Empire.....	3,446,810
Total, British Empire.....	\$48,018,656
To United States.....	\$37,660,199
Other foreign countries.....	3,836,956
Total, foreign countries.....	\$41,497,155
Total countries, other than United States.....	\$51,855,612

The percentages for 1887 were:

United Kingdom.....	42·8 per cent.
Other British countries.....	3·8 do
Total, British Empire.....	53·6 do
United States.....	42·1 do
Other foreign countries.....	4·3 do
Foreign countries.....	46·4 do
Countries, other than United States.....	57·9 do

Now, our imports for 1887 were:

Total imports.....	\$112,892,236
From the United Kingdom.....	\$ 44,962,233
do other British countries.....	1,704,200
Total from the British Empire.....	\$ 46,666,438
From the United States.....	\$ 45,107,068
do other foreign countries.....	13,865,919
Total from foreign countries.....	\$ 58,972,985
Total from countries other than the United States....	60,532,362
Our aggregate trade.....	202,408,047

The percentages on home consumption for 1887 are as follows:—

United Kingdom.....	42·6 per cent.
Other British countries.....	1·6 do
Total British Empire.....	42·2 do
United States.....	42·8 do
Other foreign countries.....	13·1 do
Foreign countries.....	55·9 do
Countries other than the United States.....	57·3 do

Our aggregate trade for 1887 was as follows:—

Total aggregate.....	\$202,408,047
With United Kingdom.....	\$ 89,534,079
do other British countries.....	5,151,010
do British Empire.....	\$ 94,685,089
do United States.....	\$ 82,767,265
do other foreign countries.....	17,702,886
do all foreign countries.....	\$100,470,150
do countries other than United States.....	\$112,387,974

The percentages for 1887 were:

United Kingdom.....	44·2 per cent.
Other British countries.....	2·5 do
British Empire.....	46·7 do
United States.....	40·9 do
Other foreign countries.....	8·8 do
Total foreign.....	49·7 do
Countries, other than United States.....	55·5 do

It will be seen that our trade with countries other than the United States, that our trade with the British Empire, is an exceedingly valuable trade; and as the hon. gentleman specified the goods we exported to the United States, I will ask his attention to tables that have been prepared by Mr. McGoun, of Montreal, for 1885. I found in testing them that they were perfectly correct, and that about the same ratio of figures would apply to last year, and therefore I make no scruple of adopting them. The first table, like those that follow, shows the principal free exports for 1885, from Canada to the United States, of all articles entered there in which exports to the United States amounted to \$100,000 or over.

Principal free exports, 1885, Canada to United States (Canadian returns):

Fish—Cod, &c., dry salted.....	\$ 641,000
Mackerel, pickled.....	625,000
Herring do.....	290,000
do smoked.....	133,000
Lobsters, canned.....	712,000
Salmon, fresh.....	223,000
Fresh, N.E.S.....	447,000
Eggs.....	1,826,000
Gold quartz (British Columbia).....	999,000
Hides, skins, furs.....	459,000
Bark for tanning.....	364,000
Firewood.....	316,000
Furs (undressed).....	185,000
Logs.....	143,000
Railway sleepers.....	142,000
	\$7,805,000

Total free imports from Canada (United States returns), \$12,642,000. Amongst these articles we find eggs, of which the hon. gentleman tried to make a great deal.

The second table is that of the chief exports of Canada to the United States of articles of which the United States export to the world at large exceeds the United States import from Canada; and I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this, because he stated that the question before us was a very important and critical one. He said nothing could be more solemn than the nature of the question we are discussing, and, therefore, I may assume that if I can prove to the hon. gentleman he is mistaken in the view he takes, he will show, by turning from unrestricted reciprocity, the same conscientiousness he has displayed in turning from commercial union, and we shall find him voting with the Conservative party and supporting what is really the affection of his innermost heart, a protection policy. I will take first the item of coal, of which the export from British Columbia to the United States amounts to \$1,178,000, and the exports of the United States of coal reached in value \$1,999,000. They must take our British Columbia coal whether they like it or not. Copper ore, we exported to the United States \$245,000 worth, and the United States exported \$1,739,000 worth. I call the attention of the House to that item, because the hon. gentleman, echoing Mr. Wiman, declared that if we had unrestricted reciprocity, any amount of copper ore would be sent from Canada to the United States, yet, as I have shown, the United States export copper ore to the value of \$1,739,000. The same remark applies to iron ore. The hon. gentleman's dulcet utterances are still ringing in my ears, as he declared that we should send any amount of iron ore to the States, were his panacea applied. Well, we exported iron ore to the States to the value of \$132,000, and the United States exported to the value of \$12,891,000. Take horned cattle. Of horned cattle, we sent to the United States \$1,411,000 worth, and the United States exported \$12,906,000 worth. Hides, horns and skins, we exported to the extent of \$459,000, and the United States exported \$4,153,000 worth. Peas and beans, we exported to the United States to the value of \$484,000, and the United States export of these articles reached the value of \$522,000. Wheat, we sent to the United States \$268,000 worth, and the United States exported \$72,933,000 worth. Yet, that is the country where we are to obtain an enormous market for our farm products! Is the hon. gentleman aware that within the last ten years the development of wheat-growing in India has made such strides that in the English and the other European markets it threatens to expand even to the exclusion of United States wheat? Why, at a farmers' convention held a few months ago in Chicago, the probability was discussed of the time coming when not a bushel of wheat would be sent across the Atlantic. Only that I do not want to trouble the House with more statistics than are necessary to prove my case—and I have here the statistics showing the progress made in wheat-growing in India—I would enter more fully into this part of the question. Of rye, we sent the United States \$150,000 worth and they exported \$2,000,000 worth. In potatoes, our export to the United States reached the value of \$108,000 as compared with an export from the United States of \$265,000. I understand the soul of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), was troubled the other night in the matter of potatoes. Let me point out to the hon. gentleman that the United States export more potatoes than we send them, and therefore the glowing vision that rose before his imagination of any amount of potatoes going to the United States is born entirely of an uninstructed fancy. Of wood staves and headings, we sent to the United States \$314,000 worth, and they exported \$1,950,000 worth. Other lumber, we shipped to the United States to the value of \$184,000, and the United States exported to the amount of \$1,181,000. Household furniture, we exported to the United States to the value of \$147,000 while the United States exported \$2,128,000 worth. Of other wood manufactures, we sent across the line \$221,000 worth, and the United States ex-

Mr. DAVIN,

port was \$1,590,000. The total export of all these articles to the United States from Canada amounted to \$5,300,000, while the total exports of the United States to the rest of the world reached \$119,248,000; and yet that is the market they say we are about to capture!

I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to another table which is still more instructive, and that is a statement of the articles that we export to the United States and of which the United States retain the whole or the greater part. Wood planks, we exported \$6,956,000 worth, and the United States exported \$6,570,000 worth. Laths and palings, we exported to the United States \$220,000 worth, and they exported \$48,000 worth. In shingles, our export amounted to \$133,000, and the United States export reached \$132,000. Barley we exported to the extent of \$5,477,000, as against the United States export of \$346,000. Of hay we exported to the United States \$1,181,000 against their export of \$204,000. Malt, we exported to the United States \$230,000, and they exported none, and malt was one of the articles the hon. gentleman dwelt upon. Horses, we exported to the States \$1,524,000 worth, and they exported \$377,000 worth. Sheep, we sent to the States \$773,000 worth, and the United States exported \$512,000 worth. Wool, we exported to the United States \$186,000 worth, and they exported \$88,000 worth. The American returns show that their import trade with Canada in these articles I have just mentioned amounted, in 1885, to \$17,575,000, while they exported to the value of \$8,277,000. The total import—and I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to this—of these articles, according to the United States returns for 1885, was \$20,509,000 worth, and according to the same returns our total export to them was \$17,575,000. These are articles they must have and on which they must pay the duty. Now, these are the only things for which we could find a profitable market in the United States, and yet what is the fact? We sent them \$17,500,000 worth out of the \$20,000,000 which they imported, so that at present, even with the tariff, as it is, we control the only part of our trade with the United States which is really valuable to us. In regard to all the other things, in regard to things that we send them which they send away, what is to prevent Canadians, with the enterprise that the hon. gentleman said our manufacturers should have, with the energy which our manufacturers should have, and which I know they have, what is to prevent them finding out the markets themselves and keeping the profit in Canada which goes to the middleman in New York? The hon. gentleman asked in connection with this, who paid the duty? I have already pointed out the absurdity of saying that we pay all the duty on our exports to the States, and that we pay all the duty on our imports from the States. That is a very jug-handled affair. Some malign fairy must preside over the laws which govern exchange and strangely alter them, in order to give the hon. gentleman an argument, but I think I have shown that, when the hon. gentleman wants a fact to buttress up his argument, he takes the readiest way—he invents it; he falls back upon his invention for his facts, and I am bound to say that, in this respect, he is a man of great capacity. As to this statement about paying the duty, I have heard the hon. gentleman speak about so much being paid on horse shoe nails. I remember he made a speech when I met him in 1882, in which he declared that, if I wanted to shoe my horse, I was taxed something like 41 per cent. on the nails, and the hammer taxed 40 per cent that drove them in; that my penknife was taxed 4 ½ per cent.; that the sheets I slept in were taxed 30 per cent, and the blanket 70; shoes and hat each 30 per cent.; if I smoked a cigar, I was taxed 120 per cent. on that; and I found that he taxed me so much that at last I discovered that, in smoking cigars, and shoeing my horse, and getting wearing apparel, I was taxed many times beyond my income, which has always been a very moderate one. That was answered very prac-

tically in this House by my friend, Mr. Wigle, who is no longer here, I am sorry to say, and who is a loss to this House. From that gallery I heard him demonstrate the utter absurdity of this statement, that we paid the duty on all articles which appear in the tariff as dutiable if imported. The duty is paid on articles which pay Customs duty when they come in, but most of these articles do not come in; they are made in the country. The other day, when one of the hon. gentleman's friends was making a speech at a bye-election, he described how much was paid on wool which entered into the manufacture of garments. In fact, he diagnosed—I like that word “diagnosed” which the hon. gentleman gave us to-day, and I shall never forget it—he diagnosed the unfortunate situation of the people of Canada in that respect, and an old fellow who was there listening to him, and who had a wife who was handy at making clothes, took a pair of his unmentionables in his hand and said: “That wool was grown on my own sheep, the cloth was made at home, how much duty do I pay on that?” And the old fellow stroked his knee with the perfect satisfaction and confidence that he had overturned one of the Reform missionaries. I will read three or four lines, if it be only to recall the pleasant voice and the incisive logic of my friend Mr. Wigle. He says:

“Home competition brings down the price. But that is not the best of it. Without this National Policy, we would be compelled to get these hats in the United States; and the manufacturers of hats would have all that country to sell their hats in, and would bring their surplus here. Now, without this policy, we would have to pay that dollar. Where would it go to? Every man knows that it would go to the United States. The hatter would pay the dollar to the wholesale man, the wholesaler would pay it to the retailer, the retailer to the laborer, the laborer to the butcher, the butcher to the farmer, the farmer to the blacksmith, and the blacksmith to some one else, and every man whose hands that dollar went through would make from 10 to 25 per cent., and it would benefit thousands of people in the United States. Where would the hat be? In Canada, and in six months it would be worn out, then we would have neither hat nor money. I have a hat that was bought in London at the rate of \$4.50 a dozen, or three York shillings a piece. That hat can be sold for 50 cents, giving a profit of 33½ per cent.; and the result is that, when that hat is worn out, the money is in the country, and the poor man can buy another with it. But the argument of the hon. gentleman is that the poor man has to pay this duty. Now, how is it? The poor man comes into a store where there is a hat for 50 cents, another for 75 cents, another for \$1, and another for \$1.25, all manufactured in Canada, but, if he wants a finer hat, he takes a fine wool hat on which duty has been paid; and I say that, if he buys a \$4 hat, that is his business, and not the business of the Reform party of this country. The poor man is not compelled to buy that kind of a hat, but if he wants a hat like the one the leader of the Opposition wears, and he pays his \$3 or \$4 for it, that is his business and not the business of the Reform party. Now, Sir, we will come to the question of a particular kind of cloth. The hon. gentleman, when talking to the people of West Kent, told them that the poor class of people paid 50 per cent. on their cloths, while the rich man paid only 23 per cent. Well, I had occasion to go to a factory in West Kent, and I said: ‘I want a yard of your heaviest cloth.’ There is the piece of cloth I got.”

He held it up before the gaze of the Commons—

“It has a pound of wool in it, and I paid 50 cents a yard for it. It cost 30 cents to manufacture it. Now, I would like to know where is the 50 per cent. paid on that piece of cloth. I will promise the hon. gentleman that, if he or any of his supporters behind him—and there are a lot of merchants there—can stand up and show the House that there is 50 per cent. of duty paid on this kind of cloth, I will leave this side of the House, and go and support the hon. gentleman.”

I quote that because it is put in a more emphatic and a better way than I could put it. But I will also use the language of the Adam Smiths and the Bastiats in regard to this matter. What they lay down is that the moment you invest capital, it always displaces two capitals, and if you send the capital out of the country, you have only displaced one capital in your own country and have lost the money you have sent out; and there cannot be the least doubt on that head. In this connection the hon. gentleman referred to eggs, and he dealt in superlatives as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) did. In fact, when I heard the hon. member for South Oxford, I was reminded of what Sydney Smith told the Yankees of his day, that they should avoid superlatives. Everything with him was

enormous. And to-night the hon. gentleman told us that, if we had unrestricted reciprocity, our trade with the United States in ten years would amount to \$300,000,000.

An hon. MEMBER. He said \$500,000,000.

Mr. DAVIN. He said \$500,000,000, did he? Oh, a couple of hundred millions are nothing to the hon. member. He does not give us the least ground for believing him when he says that. He merely makes the statement, just as it is enough for the ex-Finance Minister to make assertions. I read his speech at Ingersoll, I have it here, and in fact it would have saved the reporters a lot a trouble if, instead of taking down his speech the other night, they had cut out of the newspaper the speech delivered at Ingersoll and set it up, because it was the old Ingersoll speech over again. I have it here, and the ex-Finance Minister, whose demeanor shows how modest a man he is, thinks it is enough for him to say that there would be an enormous development, an extraordinary development of trade if this were done, and his first lieutenant in this matter takes the same course, and gives us his *ipse dixit* as to the wonderful progress that would be made. Now, he instanced the case of eggs. I will show him that his eggs are not what they are cracked up to be. Now, he says that under free trade between us and the United States, there would be an unlimited expansion. That is what his leader says in this matter, too, although on *a priori* grounds, it can be demonstrated that such a thing could not be. Suppose I take the market of the United States as represented by 100. He says you would have the market of 60,000,000. What does that mean? It would be a market of 60,000,000 *plus* the 5,000,000 in Canada. The size of a market is relative to the number of people who trade in it. If you have a market, say, of 100, and let there be ten persons coming to that market, of equal energy and equal push, there is one-tenth of the market for one of them, and therefore the size of the market is a relative thing. But when the hon. gentleman says that we would have a market of 60,000,000, and that our trade would go on with unlimited expansion, does he suppose that the energy of the people of the United States is to lie in abeyance during that time? Does he suppose that they are not going to come into our market? The honorable gentleman has used a most fallacious argument in this connection. He has taken the enormous product of the United States in one or two particulars, and he says: “Look at what we send them, or look at what we import. Do you suppose,” he says, “that is going to be a matter of any importance to people who export and import so much?” There he falls into the fallacy of regarding the people of the United States as a single person, he falls into the fallacy of attributing to the various minds that make up the trading community of the United States, a sentiment that would come into the mind of a single man if he were exporting or importing these enormous quantities. To that single man his proportion of the trade of Canada would be a very small thing. But the truth is that the markets of the United States, the merchants of the United States are made up of units, all of them looking where they can make a dollar, where they can plant a dollar which will produce the most profit to them. Of course, instead of their disregarding the Canadian market, we find gentlemen who are advocating this thing in Congress, pointing out the value of our market, pointing out that the result would be that from Halifax to Vancouver, in every shop and every store, they would see United States goods and United States machines. And so, Sir, there is the same fallacy in supposing that because one article may have made progress under free trade, every article will do so. It so happens that they need our eggs. I do not think they would need a large amount of our machinery, or a large amount of our furniture. I do not think they would need a large amount of those things which they export in 10's and 50's of millions.

But let us take the egg. The hon. gentleman declares that in twelve years we should have a trade worth 300,000,000 under free trade; I ask his attention to what took place in regard to eggs. In 1853, under free trade, we exported 13,413,744 dozens of eggs, to the tune of \$2,251,304, or 17 cents a dozen. In 1886 we exported 12,702,883 dozens of eggs, to the tune of \$1,728,032, or a decrease in those three years of over half a million dollars. So you see that the reasoning of the hon. gentleman does not go down to facts. He contents himself with saying: Oh, there will be an immense expansion; there will be an immense trade, and he talks as if it was to go on in mathematical progression. He says: Look at eggs. We do look at eggs, and they do not bear out what he says. I do not know what the eggs were that we exported, but I know that the eggs of the hon. member for North Norfolk are cracked; at all events I have cracked them now. I could show in other lines how variable, how treacherous is this market.

Now, Sir, on this occasion the hon. gentleman broke out into a tirade against combines in Canada. I hope the committee that my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) has moved for will lead to the suppression of this evil, because combines on the part of traders or manufacturers with a view to keeping up the price of an article are an evil. I have heard of such things in Canada, and I hope that if there are such they will be dealt with vigorously and put down. But I would ask my hon. friend: Are there no combines in the United States? Everything is *couleur de rose* in the United States; there is nothing wrong in the United States. Although the hon. gentleman is a member of the Parliament of Canada, and aspires to be a Minister, I am glad to see that the sentiment of patriotism is so fervent within him that he can see nothing wrong in that great land. But he cannot expect us to look at things in that light. We are practical men here who must not look at things from the point of view of sentiment. We must look at them with close logic, with the responsibilities that attach to our position as members of Parliament, and such unsubstantial rhetoric as we have had from those hon. gentlemen on this question, cannot be allowed to weigh with us, and I know it will not weigh with the country. Then he says this new scheme will bring back part of the million of Canadians. Why does the hon. gentleman suppose if you had unrestricted reciprocity, that the merchant who is established in Chicago, or the professional man who is established in Chicago, or New York, or the western States, the farmer who has built there his house, the mechanic who has gone there—does any man suppose, does the hon. gentleman himself suppose, if he will be candid with me, that any portion of these 700,000, some of them Canadians, others, I believe the sons of Canadians, would come back to Canada? Why, it is a most absurd idea. Sir, I do not consider that we should perpetually mourn over the fact that the natural restlessness and the natural ambition of the races from which we spring, should assert themselves, and should lead to an occasional migration to the States. I have explained, however, that the conditions which led to any large migration, no longer exist. Then he asked the question, whether unrestricted reciprocity would injure our manufactures. He says: "I admit it would injure some lines of business." That itself is a very serious matter. The hon. gentleman admits that the proposal he makes here, which neither the hon. member for South Oxford nor himself has shown will confer the least benefit on Canada—for they have only said it will do this or the other, but they have not given us any solid ground on which to rest—will do serious injury to certain branches of business. That is a very important admission. But he says it would be advantageous to the majority. There is sitting near him an hon. member who is well acquainted with the trade of Canada, and he knows well that what I am going

Mr. DAVIN,

to say is true. He is perfectly familiar with the fact that when a manufacturer or merchant, but especially a manufacturer, is competing with a rival in business, two cents a ton in freight is a very important matter, especially when he is engaged in a struggle with a new competitor. We will suppose the line between the two countries wiped out, and that our manufacturers are face to face with the manufacturers of the United States, and that the American manufacturers are coming in here to seize and capture our market, then those manufacturers will do what a witness before a Parliamentary Committee of the House of Commons stated that English manufacturers had done, sell at a loss in order to capture the market, and, when they have crushed out competition, recoup themselves by selling goods at any prices they like. The hon. gentleman knows that under those circumstances a few cents a ton is an important matter. We will suppose that our manufacturers are face to face with this market of sixty millions and are trying to get into it. What do they find? They find that they have a longer haul than the American manufacturers in order to reach the market, a difference of two hundred or a hundred or fifty miles as the case may be; but supposing it is only fifty miles, we in the west know what a difference is made even by that distance. Not only so, but the Canadian manufacturers would be utterly unknown there, and would have to compete with old established rivals and make a character for themselves. They would in many cases be wholly shut out by patents. They would be handicapped from the word go, and would have none or very little chance with their rivals—one or two might succeed—while the American manufacturers, owing to their greater wealth, more highly organized industries, and the greater perfection of their "combines"—for they are not putting them down there as we are doing here—would be able to stalk victorious through our Canadian markets.

And our manufacturers destroyed where would our workmen be? Would they not swell the exodus?

But in this connection I must remind my hon. friend of a phrase that he used in a speech which I read with great interest—"that protected-to-death country, the United States." How very inconsistent it is that we should be asked to go into that protected-to-death country by free traders, the men who once followed the Hon. George Brown, who was once considered the Bright of Canada, who thought that the sun rose only over Manchester—that those men and the followers of Hon. Edward Blake should actually want Canada to go into that protected-to-death country. When speaking of paying the duty I should have mentioned another thing. If a citizen of Canada pays heavy taxation now, what would he have to pay if this country joined the United States, because by the same parity of reasoning you have to put on the duties, whether the system of the hon. member for South Oxford or that of the hon. member for Norfolk be adopted; if you take goods from the United States you have to add the duty in the United States port of entry. So an unfortunate Canadian would be taxed a great deal more under this *régime* that the hon. gentleman would fain introduce. But happily it is out of the question.

The hon. member dwelt on the great advantages we should possess if his proposals were carried out. He actually said that we could supply the whole sixty-five millions of people with canned fish, although they have large canned fish factories of their own. I am afraid we should not drive them out of that market. When asked the question as to whether we should not be brought into competition with such manufacturers as I have described, the hon. gentleman in order to get rid of it made a comparison, the fallacy of which I will show. He instanced Ohio, Indiana and California and some other States in their manufacturing progress. How is that progress in regard

to manufactures made? Any man who knows anything about those States and Territories is aware that rich capitalists go in there from the eastern States and invest large sums and build great factories, and in some cases a large proportion of the profits goes to the eastern States. That is the way it is done, and we hope as Canadians that the same thing or something like it will take place here. But give us time—there is no need for such tremendous hurry. We will do the same thing in Canada, and indeed we have already started in the same way. In fact people are going into the North-West not only from the eastern Provinces but from England and France and are investing large sums.

Then the hon. gentleman dealt with the objections that might be raised to the proposition. The first objection to which he referred was that of loyalty, and he declared that he was as loyal as any one, but his loyalty was to Canada. I will say here that there is no man living whose heart beats with more pride than does mine at the sight of the British flag; but my first duty is to Canada too, the first duty of all of us is to Canada, and it is because that is our first duty that we supported a protective policy. If we were thinking more of England than of Canada we would never have imposed protective duties because we knew there were a great number of people in England who did not approve of that policy, who even resented the tariff we adopted. The hon. gentlemen talk about their loyalty! I have here a speech delivered by the ex-Finance Minister at Ingersoll, and in it he speaks of the subject of loyalty in a very strong manner. He says, that for his part England does not take much interest in Canada, and he does not see why we should trouble ourselves so very much about England. Let me say about this matter of loyalty that it is not merely a sentiment, and I hope there is not a man in this House that would sneer at sentiment—it is a most practical thing, our loyalty to England. If we were to make such a treaty as those gentlemen would have us make with the United States, what would happen? It would have to be inaugurated by Congress according to the constitution of the United States, for the third power given under the clause of the constitution which deals with this declares that only Congress can regulate such a matter. Congress cannot merely inaugurate but it can modify a treaty, and as Mr. Hitt the other day said: "If we do not like the treaty or if we find it act unfairly we can change it." What is the meaning of "change it?" Does it not mean to go back on it after probably doing any amount of damage to Canada? and after we had overturned a system under which we are prospering? The people of the United States would put the interpretation of power upon any arrangement we might make with them, and then, Sir, we should not be in the position that we are to-day. When the hon. member for Cumberland and the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain went down to Washington, if they made a treaty binding Canada how should we feel in regard to it? Why, we know well, that in regard to any instrument that the United States authorities had put their seals to, and that the plenipotentiaries representing Canada and England had put their seals to also, that the lion of England would look on and see that it was observed. Then, Sir, we should find that loyalty was a practical thing.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, "hear, hear." That lion is as powerful and as strong as ever he was and in any arrangement that we may make, as long as we are true to our position as members of a great Empire, we have the power of England to see that we are not handicapped and that our agreement is carried out by the other side. But, Sir, suppose the agreement is made, and we have a reciprocity treaty arranged to suit the Americans but with our own duties

on the seaboard. What will be the result? We have admitted the United States manufacturers free, we have discriminated against England, we have discriminated against our fellow colonists of the Empire, and we have discriminated against the whole world in favor of the United States, and the United States after a few years says to us: "We see you have the advantage,"—as I admit we might have an advantage in a certain direction under that plan—"you must put up your tariff to the same height as ours." We might say: "This is not in the agreement;" but they will tell us: "Congress is going to take that course and you will have to follow suit." And suppose Congress does insist, can we go to England and ask her to help us to make the people of America carry out the agreement? Would not England say: "You have repudiated me, you have discriminated against me, how can you ask me to help you to do this thing?" We then should be abandoned and by either the arrangement which the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), or the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), proposes, we should put ourselves in chancery, and be like a rabbit in a wild cat's claw. Is that a position that my French-Canadian friends, or the other members of this House, would wish to place themselves in? I have before me the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at Ingersoll, to which I have already referred. I once spoke in Ingersoll and I know what a hot-bed of liberalism it is, but I notice that in all that speech where he deals with this question completely, and where he lays down what the possibilities would be, he does not receive a single cheer. I state here that I do not believe that on this question the Reform party of Canada will follow the hon. gentlemen opposite in the disloyal course they are taking.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Well the next election will tell you, as the bye-elections have told you, about commercial union. What is the difference between commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity? It is the difference between tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee, and so far as there is a difference it is against Canada, for we should lose our part of the pool. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) goes from the disloyal cry to annexation and he does not think his policy would lead to annexation, but at Ingersoll his leader said, speaking of the danger of annexation: "There is a risk I cannot overlook, but it is a choice of risks, and our present position is anything but one of stable equilibrium." The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that "those who say it would bring about annexation only admit that annexation would be a very fine thing, and that having got so much of reciprocity we then would be most anxious to go in for annexation." Sir, I have shown you that if we went in for unrestricted reciprocity we should be in such a position that the wolf might continue to complain that the lamb troubles the stream, and the complaint would have more the character of a menace than it can have to-day. Any one who has given attention to political economy knows that you cannot, in regard to any article of import or export, make a tariff that can last for five, or four, or two years even. In anything so delicate as the exchanges between countries, the most skilful arrangement of tariffs will be coarse and clumsy, and, therefore, we never can be certain that changes may not have to be made. If we once took this step which is proposed, we should simply be helpless in the hands of Americans. What should we do under such circumstances? Why, Sir, every year we should have to send delegates to Washington to wait in the lobbies there to get their orders to bring back to this House. The Parliament of Canada, which is now as free as any Parliament that exists in the world, and the next Parliament in importance of English-speaking men to the Parliament which meets at Westminster, that Parliament

which has looked forward to such great things for this country, would have to send down its delegates to the lobbies and treat with fair and unfair lobbyists until Congress had decided what our fate should be. Very naturally, if this were the case, we would say: "Let us get rid of this, anything is better than this state of things," and we would be ready to go in for annexation. Then about the "better terms," which my friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said certain Conservatives expected some years hence. I do not think I need deal with that. No Conservative, I fancy, looks forward in that way, and if he did he would not be worthy of the name of a Conservative, and not worthy of the name of a Canadian either.

The hon. gentleman then dealt with the question of revenue, and I am bound to say that he dealt with it in a very gingerly manner. He pointed out that we should lose right off over \$7,000,000. And if it happened as Mr. Blake said it should be, that we got all our imports from the States and sent our exports there, where would our revenue be? Should we get the same amount on our customs? We should have to go in for direct taxation, which the hon. gentleman says he does not fear. Well, as the hon. Minister of the Interior pointed out, there is no taxation the incidence of which is so unfair. An income tax is very unfairly collected, it depends so much on the honesty of the men on whom it is imposed. The hon. gentleman says he does not fear it, but I venture to say the people of the country, and especially the people with small known incomes, do

He talked about the danger to our shipping. Why, Sir, of course our shipping would disappear, if we got all or the bulk of our imports from the United States. Imports and exports have to pretty nearly balance each other; you have to pay for imports with exports, and if we are going to trade with the United States, all our business would have to be done over lines of railway and not in ships, and so our shipping would disappear. Then, Sir, he alluded to Imperial Federation. Well, I do not think Imperial Federation is up here. If it were, one might be inclined to say something on it; but I have no desire to go outside the record.

Now, Sir, I will call the attention of the House to a view of this question that has not yet been touched on. It is admitted by the hon. member for South Oxford and the hon. member for North Norfolk, that there would be a danger of annexation. I have never been afraid of annexation, for this reason, that I know very well that the United States have no desire to commit the blunder of forcibly attempting to annex the people of Canada. In the first place, they would fail; and in the next place, if they succeeded they would have a more unmanageable Ireland on their hands, and other elements of discord and disruption that are working in their midst at the present moment, would make themselves felt. There is an important question that bears on this subject. If a sensible man were going to make a new departure, he would ask himself, is it likely to have the element of permanence? Can we be certain that the future of the United States is assured? Are there no clouds upon the horizon? Prof. Gilliam and Judge Tourgée have written books showing the enormous growth of the black population of the South. They have shown that ten years hence there will be eight black republics on the hands of the United States. They have shown that the negroes are increasing at a ratio far greater than the increase of the whites from immigration and from natural increase, and calculate that in 1900, the very period at which the imagination of my hon. friend the member for North Norfolk fired, the blacks, who were six millions in 1880 in the southern States, will then be twelve millions; in 1920, 24,000,000; in 1940, 48,000,000; in 1960, 96,000,000, and in 1980, 192,000,000.

Mr. DAVIN.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. gentlemen may laugh and say "oh" to that; but if they will take the trouble to read those books, written by some of the first men in the United States, and if they will give so humble and so illiterate a person as myself some credit for appreciating an argument of the kind, it will probably be as creditable to their intelligence as any utterances of that sort that they may indulge in. I say, Sir, under those circumstances, with an element in the United States calculated to give rise to disturbance, an element no counterpart of which exists in Canada, with the black population increasing at a ratio that menaces the future of the republic, it would be a most monstrous thing on the part of Canada to throw in her lot with the United States. And, Sir, let us make no concealment of this. The real issue, the issue underneath this movement, the important issue, is: Shall we take a step that will land Canada in the United States and make this country part and parcel of the republic? There is not a man of any reflection in the country who does not know that that is the real issue, and the reason hon. gentlemen are so intent on saying it is not the issue is because they know that the young men of Canada—aye, and the old men too—the men of the Reform party—the greater part of them, no less than those of the Conservative party—for, as in Israel of old, there are seven thousand that have not bowed the knee to Baal—are loyal to Canada and have faith in Canada's future. When I read originally the speeches made by my friend Mr. Goldwin Smith, by Mr. Wiman, by my friend the Hon. Wm. Macdougall, about all that this thing would do for Canada, I was amazed; and when I heard the hon. member for South Oxford the other night dilate on the enormous progress, the vast expansion, that would take place if his policy were carried out, it reminded me of one of those blood-curdling incidents of the old German ballads, where we see a young maid dressed in bridal robes, full of hope, full of life and splendor and joy, but the bridegroom proves to be a skeleton, and the marriage couch the cold earth. These gentlemen come and talk to Canada, to this young nation, of untold wealth, of unmeasured prosperity, of delusive progress, of intoxicating dreams; and what do they ask her to do in order to attain all this? To shiver her solid existing prosperity—to realise aggrandisement by extinction—to live a fuller life by walking into her tomb. But, Sir, I tell these preposterous propagandists of a contemptible pessimism, who whine out that Canada is doomed,

"The grave's not dug where traitor hands shall lay
In fearful haste her murdered corse away."

No, Sir, Canada's future is secure. She is still young; but the day of maturity is at hand; and centuries hence, when the historian shall have marked with a pen of indelible scorn the character of this movement, her heart will be strong, her life vigorous, she will go forward in ever-expanding progress, beauty's ensign purple on her lips and on her cheeks, and the day remote beyond human ken when death's pale flag will be advanced there.

Mr. LAVERGNE. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly the most important question that has been discussed in this Parliament since Confederation, and it would be presumption on my part to attempt to add any arguments in support of reciprocity after the eloquent and elaborate speeches which we have had the pleasure of hearing from several members of this House. But, Sir, the reasons which have been urged in support of the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford apply so forcibly to the Province of Quebec that I think many voices should be heard from that quarter. It is thought in certain sections of the country that the Province of Quebec did not take any interest in that matter. Even a zealous advocate of reciprocity wrote a pamphlet in which he asserted that the present attitude of the Prov-

ince of Quebec is one of isolation, and went on to say that, if isolation in commerce would make a people great, then the destiny of the Province of Quebec, in her present frame of mind, was one of superlative greatness. I must say at once that this opinion is entirely incorrect. It was no doubt asserted in good faith, and for that very reason it becomes the more necessary to repudiate it as damaging to the cause of reciprocity as well as to the Province of Quebec. In no class of the people there, does any such desire of isolation exist, either politically or commercially. A friend of mine, a fierce Tory, was telling me some time ago that he would favor political annexation to the United States, because he felt himself lost in the Province of Quebec among the French Canadians. I can say this for my countrymen, that they do not think they are lost in Canada, although they are surrounded by an English population, and if it were a bad thing to be so surrounded, they would not think it much worse whether the surrounding people were called American or British, and they would consider it a great blessing if closer relations of some kind were effected with the United States which would bring in prosperity to their homes. I do not say this to express any desire to sever our political connection with Great Britain. I am an admirer of British rule. I do not think we could have a better form of government than the one we now enjoy. One single reform would make that Government a model one, and that reform would be commercial independence. If we had that freedom we would have nothing to envy anybody. Yet we must not be blind to the truth. We must see things as they are. The time when the very name of the United States was a bugbear in some parts of the Province of Quebec has gone by. At that time it was thought a sin to think of closer relations with our neighbors, but since then the sinners have become so numerous that we have had to strike that sin off our list. There is not perhaps one family out of ten in French Canada, which has not one or more of its members now residing in the United States, and I can say without exaggeration that there is nearly one-third of the whole French-Canadian population now residing in the United States, some permanently and some temporarily. These people know well all the advantages that would be derived from closer relations with that country. It is there they go for money when they are penniless. It is with American money they pay off the mortgages on their farms, and I can say this, that there has been in some parts of the Eastern townships of Quebec so much money sent by Canadians from the neighboring Republic that it reduced the rate of interest. Twelve or 15 years ago, it was a common thing to see money lent at 10 or 12 per cent. on mortgages. Now 8 per cent. is a very heavy rate. I must also say that in some of these localities the agricultural interest is in such a state of depression, particularly in places where the farms are not very good that one-half of the farms would have been abandoned by this time, if the United States were not there as a place of reserve in days of need. Under these conditions, it is impossible that the Province of Quebec should have any desire to remain isolated from the other Provinces. On the contrary, that province is quite ready to help in any movement tending to improve its condition, and in support of this statement I might mention, without looking further back than a few months ago, that at the Provincial Conference held in Quebec, and from where the idea sprung, unrestricted reciprocity with the United States was recommended by the representatives of the Quebec Government as well as by the leading men of most of the other Provinces. Now, before speaking of the advantages which would result from reciprocity, I cannot help answering one great objection which is made against that policy. It is said by the adversaries of reciprocity that it will discriminate unfairly against Great Britain. I cannot, for one moment, admit this. I am sure that if we had that reciprocity, it would

stimulate our business to such an extent that before many years we would do far more business with Great Britain than we do now. Yet supposing that assertion be true, we can fairly reply that England does not discriminate in our favor. England treats us just as she treats every nation on the face of the earth, and it would not be in her interest to discriminate in our favor. In support of this proposition, we might well use the argument which has been used by the First Minister, when discussing a policy which was improperly called the National Policy. "As a self-governing people," he said, "we have a right to consult our own interests first." This argument will be conclusive of itself, but there are many illustrations of its force. Let us recall to memory some of the events of the past, and we will see that the motive power of politics in this country has always been self interest. We, in Quebec, are not in the same position as the other Provinces of Confederation, and I speak more from the Quebec point of view than from the general point of view. In 1760, when Canada was conquered by England, was it through a motive of love, was it through any kindly feeling that Canada was taken away from French domination and made an English colony? Surely it was then self interest that dictated England's policy. After that we were governed several years by military rule. Surely that rule was not inflicted on us through a motive of justice, but purely through self interest. Whether rightly or wrongly, it was thought to be in the interest of the conqueror to deal in that way with the conquered. I do not mean this as a grievance, but I say it tends to prove my theory. After that again, in 1774, when the standard of rebellion was raised among our neighbors, England thought fit to deal with us more fairly, and we were then granted the Quebec Act. We were given back our French civil law, and we were exempted from the test oath. It was surely again interest that dictated such a policy. It was the fear of seeing us join the rebellion. It might be said that in our history there are some exceptions, but those exceptions will only confirm the rule. At the same time, when the twelve States sent delegates to their first Congress in Philadelphia, what was their first move? They passed resolutions remonstrating, in virulent tone, with the Imperial Government for the beginning of freedom which had been granted to this country. It was not in their interest that they did that, and it was soon after proved, and they immediately afterwards understood it themselves. A very little word thoughtlessly spoken prevented us from joining them. Shortly after, they voted three addresses, one to the King, one to the people of Great Britain justifying the action they had taken, and a third to the Canadians. In that address they expressed very different views than those contained in their resolutions. They offered us as many privileges and advantages as has been granted us by England, and in that they acted according to their interest, but it was too late. I might say that all and every important event of our history will prove that the motive power of politics in this country has always been interest. We have fought for years for rights which have been admitted to be just and legitimate. We have fought for British rights and they were granted to us. England yielded to our just demand when she thought it was her interest to do so, when it was seen that the game was a very expensive one. I do not say those things to recriminate. I do not suppose that we would have been treated any better by any other nation on the face of the globe, but I say that this theory is a common axiom of common sense. I admit that for fifty years we have been most fairly treated. We have enjoyed great freedom, and under no other flag than the British flag would we have had better treatment, and I do not deny that we owe gratitude to England, but in a case of interest like this, our debt of gratitude is not so enormous that we should sacrifice our own interest, not even for England but for a certain number of her manufactures. It

is a very strange argument to hear the hon. gentlemen on the other side not saying that reciprocity would be bad for Canada, but that it would be bad for England. It appears that we are very rich, and that we must toil for poor England. As I have heard here in this House, not only loyalty but charity begins at home. Now, before enumerating [some of the advantages which I think would result from reciprocity, I think I should answer a few of the other objections which have been made to the motion presented by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman who preceded me began his brilliant address by a long citation from one Mr. Ritchie of Ohio, and that Mr. Ritchie, it appears, knows our country very well. He made a very brilliant exposition of our wealth, of our natural resources, of our mines, our beautiful rivers, in fact, of all our natural wealth he made the most brilliant picture; but I would have been most happy to hear that citation continued up to the end, to hear the conclusion of that citation, and I would have been very much surprised if Mr. Ritchie did not conclude that this immense wealth, these immense resources wanted to be developed, and that the best way of developing these immense resources was by the way of reciprocity or commercial union. There can be no doubt that this gentleman made this brilliant exposition with an end and with a desire, and what desire could it have been if not a desire of participating in those immense resources. Now, we are told, that we are a young country. I will admit that, as far as growth is concerned, we are a very young country, but as far as age is concerned, we are not so much younger than the country adjacent to us. The hon. gentleman had the advantage of being born in a country far more important than this, and perhaps we have over him the advantage of knowing the history of this country a little further back, and, if I have been well taught, and I think I have been correctly taught in that fact, I think this country was settled over three hundred years ago and not one hundred years ago. We have been also told that it is not true that we pay duty on all importations and pay duty on all exportations, and the proof in support of that is that it is against all the principles of political economy. I could not see any conclusions arrived at by the hon. gentleman. Yet, if the hon. gentleman was here, I would relate to him something which occurred in my county, and to my personal knowledge. One of my present constituents, in 1878, was a great Conservative, a great admirer of the Conservative policy, and endorsed protection. That man happened to be a farmer and a cattle dealer. He endorsed that policy, and made a great deal of noise in his parish, and perhaps he made conquests of electors for his party. In 1882, after having driven his cattle to the United States at different times, he began to think that policy was not as sound as he thought at the beginning. He began to find out and was able to make out who it was that was paying the duty. In 1882 he voted, but he did not brag any more. He did not say anything. In 1885 there was a local election in that county, and mixing up both Governments, holding both Administrations, which were both Conservative, responsible for their faults, he did not vote at all. Then he began to understand that it was the farmers who were paying the duty on the cattle he was driving to the United States. In 1887 he was one of my strong supporters. I will not follow the hon. gentleman on all the grounds he has gone through. He has taken us from the Hudson Bay to the Gulf of Mexico. Certainly he has displayed a vast amount of knowledge, and I can say that I have admired his brilliant expositions, but owing to my own deficiency, owing, perhaps, to my not understanding his language, which is not my own, I could not see the bearing of all he said. Now, I have heard an hon. member of this House speak of inconsistency. Although the hon. gentleman for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is not present at this moment,

Mr. LAVERGNE.

I wish to remark that citing speeches made ten or fifteen years ago are no great answer to serious arguments. If we were to argue on that line, I would have to ask the hon. member if he always held the same opinions he does now of the administration of the right hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, it has been said that we are in a very prosperous condition, and, therefore, we do not need a change. In support of that argument we have had extracts read from a speech of the Hon. George Brown, made ten or fifteen years ago. I do not say that I share the opinions of that gentleman at that time, but I say that speeches made ten or fifteen years ago are no answer to arguments made to-day. Now, I come to the real point at issue—would it be to our interest to have reciprocity? Perhaps it has been thought that I was not friendly towards England and was aiming at some change in our political position, in the beginning of my remarks. That was far from my object. I sincerely believe that if we wished for a political change in this country, we could find no better mode of bringing it about than by maintaining our present trade relations with the United States. It is to be remembered that in the Province of Quebec, French-Canadians do not hold the same sentiments of attachment to England as English-Canadians. We all admit that we owe a debt of gratitude to England, but we know very well that in this question there is not the same feeling in the Province of Quebec as may exist in the other Provinces. If our present trade relations continue for 25 years, not only will one-third of our population be found in the States, as at present, but the majority will be there. There will be a temptation for them who are not of a British origin, who do not make such a great difference between Americans and Englishmen, there would be a temptation for them to say that they would just as well like to have Washington for their headquarters as London. Would it not be a temptation for them to say that they saw more convenience, and, perhaps, more advantage, in having their metropolis at Washington than across the ocean? I do not say that we have any such desire, I do not say that we even think of annexation, but I say that if the present situation continues for a long time, certainly there will be temptation toward a political change. If we are true patriots, if we desire the Provinces to remain united, we should adopt some means to prevent the disintegration of this Dominion. I say, Sir, that the best means of obtaining such a result is to improve our trade relations by commercial reciprocity with the United States. Certainly we cannot say that the National Policy has been a success in this country; I cannot say it has been a success in the Province of Quebec. In the city of Montreal, perhaps, some new industries have been established, and perhaps in a few other places; but I would not say that even in the city of Quebec the manufacturing industries have been promoted by protection. There are natural industries in the city of Quebec that live by themselves, they are established on solid foundations, and reciprocity would not affect them in any way. There are also, perhaps, a few manufactures in the city of St. Hyacinthe, and I know that my hon. friend who represents that county will support the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford. But, Sir, where are the manufactures in the rural constituencies of the Province of Quebec. When that policy was inaugurated we were promised that it would not only benefit Montreal, that it would not only benefit three or four cities in the Province of Quebec, but it was to benefit the whole Province. Where is the increase of population? Where is the decrease in the immigration of our countrymen? There is none. Where are the promised industries in the rural constituencies? There are none. I say the situation is worse than it was ten years ago. The people naturally look for a change in order to better their actual position. This agitation was commenced in the Province of Ontario, and it has not been carried to the same extent in Quebec. Yet the

echos of that agitation have reached us, it has reached all the Canadian homes, it has reached all the fathers who have seen more than half of their families leaving their home for the neighboring republic. I have visited a certain number of localities in my constituency, and when I have spoken of reciprocity, I have pleased the people immensely. They recollect the prosperity we enjoyed when we had a partial measure of reciprocity before. They know that reciprocity means about 20 per cent. increase in the value of their products; they know that if they have horses, cattle, oats, potatoes, poultry, hay, lumber, to sell, they will get for all these articles at least 20 per cent. more. They know it from experience. Now, Sir, it is said that farmers do not pay anything of that taxation in the way of duty. I think it is easy to show that they pay an enormous taxation. I will only give an example on that point. I will take the counties near the St. Lawrence River—Champlain, Montmagny, Berthier and Laprairie—in which counties the people produce a large quantity of hay. It is not unusual for some farmers to sell as much as 100 tons of hay in a year. Many of the farmers in the Province of Quebec have sold their hay in the United States, in fact it may be said that the hay of the Province generally goes to the States. A farmer who ships a hundred tons of hay has to pay a duty of \$100. If a farmer, sends a horse there worth \$100 he has to pay \$20; on \$200 worth of cattle he is compelled to pay \$40. If he sells three hundred bushels of potatoes, which is not an excessive quantity, the duty will amount to \$45. Let me say here that the farmers understand who has to pay the duty. I will not say more on the point, except that I am satisfied that a farmer of average circumstances will pay \$300 a year duties on products shipped to the United States. Our geographical position also impells us to the adoption of this policy. Grant that our facilities of commerce are equal to the demand, although I do not think that they are at the present time, for neither the Canadian Pacific Railway nor the Intercolonial answer the demands of commerce, the people of the Maritime Provinces could not trade with any advantage with the people of the North West or British Columbia, and not even with the people of Ontario. I might go further, and say that although there is plenty of flour to be purchased in Ontario, yet in spite of the tariff wall erected, the Province of Quebec, not further back than 1886, brought over \$400,000 worth of flour in the United States, paying a duty of \$51,000. On some occasions Quebec has not been able to raise sufficient breadstuffs for her people, and on those occasions she has found it more advantageous to deal with the States than with the neighboring Province of Ontario. Is it not, moreover, a fact that Ontario buys a large quantity of coal from the State of Pennsylvania? It will be unnecessary for me to discuss at length the interests of the fishermen in this question, for they have able advocates here; yet I may say that the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces find it more advantageous to deal with the New England States, and the Americans are their best customers even in spite of a tariff of 30 per cent. In regard to the lumber interests, we have heard the statement of gentlemen of experience and who are engaged in that business, and while it will be needless for me to go over the ground again, I may remark that the farmers of Quebec are highly interested because they have yet large tracts of forest, and when they clear their lands they have to destroy good timber, and if they could obtain a fair return for the timber they would be largely benefited. The adoption of such a policy as is proposed might, perhaps, be disadvantageous to the manufacturers of Montreal, and perhaps to two or three small places, but the majority of the people, the great bulk of the people, would derive immense benefit from such a policy. It seems now as if this country is to be administered for the benefit of a small minority of its inhabitants. Everybody will admit

that if the rural portion of the country were in a prosperous condition, if the farmers were prosperous, the laborers and mechanics who live among them would also be prosperous; and if all those classes were prosperous, certainly the country merchants would be prosperous, and if they were prosperous surely the city and wholesale merchants would also be prosperous. Thus the whole country would immensely benefit by the introduction of such a policy. I am satisfied that the objections made to this proposition will disappear if the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government chose to advocate such a measure, and not one out of 25 of his supporters would fail to follow him, in fact they would all fall into line very quickly. The Premier would earn the gratitude of almost the whole people of Canada if he were to confer such a boon on this country. I go further, and say that in regard to political power—and we are not interested in saying this—if the hon. gentleman would advocate that cause and carried it to a successful conclusion he would secure power for himself and his friends for the remainder of his life, which I hope will be a long one. But even supposing it had not that result, but that his friends and supporters who are the manufacturers and monopolists of the country should turn against him and forget past favors, suppose that they should not support him any longer, which is most improbable and almost impossible, nevertheless the carrying of such a policy to a successful conclusion would be a glorious ending to his career. The hon. gentleman would certainly acquire a name and fame unequalled in this country. And, Sir, he would follow an example which he need not disdain. He would follow the example of another Tory—an English Tory—whose name is cherished in the old country, he would follow the example of Sir Robert Peel. When the corn laws were abolished in 1846 by the Imperial Parliament. Sir Robert Peel uttered some memorable words to which I will draw the attention of the hon. gentleman, Sir Robert Peel said at that time:

“I shall leave a name execrated I know by every monopolist who will maintain protection for his own individual benefit, but it may be that I shall leave a name sometimes breathed with expressions of good will in the abodes of those whose lot it is to labor and to earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow; when they shall recruit their exhausted strength with abundant and untaxed food, the sweeter, because it is in no longer leavened by a sense of injustice.”

Those noble words have not found any echo on the Treasury benches of this House for ten years, yet, Sir, it is better late than never. Now, Sir, I will answer to another objection which is made. It is said, and truly said, that we cannot make that treaty alone. It is said that we have to obtain the consent of the other contracting party, but I may say this that there are in the neighboring country some advocates of this proposition, and that we should not for a moment be discouraged if we meet with some difficulties, because we are assured that this cause which we now advocate will be beneficial to both countries and it ought to carry victory in the end. If we do not succeed as soon as we would like to, yet we will triumph in the end if we are like the men of the Corn Law League in England. If we work with patriotism for the good of this country, if we work with the same energy as men like the Cobdens, the Brights, the Villiers and others have worked when they decided they would have free trade in England; if we work as those men did we are sure to carry victory, and, Sir, if we do not carry victory to-day, and if our present efforts result only in a simple expression of opinion, yet it still be a step—a great step—in the right direction.

Mr. McNEILL moved the adjournment of the debate. Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 19th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Henry Corby, Esq., for the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Hastings.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 46) to amend the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Scarth.)

FOOD ADULTERATION ACT.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 47) to amend the Adulteration Act, chapter one hundred and seven of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: This alteration is chiefly in consequence of a ruling by Judge Dugas, of Montreal, that baking powder is not an article of food. Some baking powders are positively injurious, and prosecutions to prevent their sale cannot be successful without this amendment. It would also enable samples to be taken in wholesale stores of chicory, pepper dust, and other adulterants, and, perhaps, lead to preventing their sale. The object of this amendment is to qualify as analysts before the courts the members of the examining board who are appointed by the Government to examine as to the qualifications of applicants for the position of public analysts. The present examiners are Dr. Girdwood, Professor Marsan and the chief analyst, and it seems only reasonable that their position should in no respect be inferior to that of the candidates who may pass their examination. The assistants to the chief analyst appointed by the Government must undergo the same examination as the public analysts, and they are equally well qualified to appear in court and give evidence. This amendment authorises Council to appoint special collectors in addition to those indicated by the Act. The latter being generally resident where the samples are collected, are well known to vendors of food, &c., in the same place, and may not succeed in getting fair samples of the goods actually sold. Should Council appoint special inspectors, they would travel over such a wide area that they would not be readily recognisable. This alteration is for the purpose of effecting a division of labor in examining the various samples collected; for as drugs and fertilisers are so numerous and varied that it is impossible for any one analyst to keep himself informed regarding the composition and adulterations of all of them, and to be thoroughly practiced and skilful in their examination. New methods for this are being continually proposed and adopted, and new literature is continually being published regarding the various branches. If it were made possible for each analyst to confine his reading, his analyses and researches to one department of the science, he would become much more skilful and experienced in it than his fellows, and his word would have the greater value. There are eight public analysts, besides the chief analyst and his two assistants. This staff might be made much more efficient by each member of it having his attention confined to the examination of only a certain class of the substances referred to in the Act, and it is to make this possible that the amendment has been framed. There are many substances liable to adulteration which are not included under foods, drugs and fertilisers. Soap, soda and white lead

Mr. LAVERGNE.

may be mentioned as instances of such articles which might be subjected to inspection as soon as any Order in Council issued to that effect.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROCEDURE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 48) further to amend the law respecting Procedure in Criminal Cases. He said: Last Session an Act was passed making final the decisions of the courts of this country in criminal matters, and it has been considered expedient to define more exactly and precisely than was done by that Act that the provision pertains to appeals or petitions to Her Majesty in Council. The present Bill, therefore, merely amends the short Act adopted last Session by introducing these words:

No appeal shall be brought in any criminal case from any judgment or authority or order of any court in Canada to any Court of Appeal by which in the United Kingdom appeals or petitions to Her Majesty in Council may be heard.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LIABILITY OF CARRIERS BY WATER.

Mr. MADILL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 49) to amend the Act respecting the liability of Carriers by Water. He said: The Bill is one in the interests of the settlers on islands and coasts depending upon common carriers by water for mails, provisions and supplies. It is introduced for the purpose of preventing common carriers from refusing to carry the freights, provisions and supplies along the routes, and land passengers at the advertised rates, and imposing a penalty for any infraction of the rules or any discrimination against the settlers.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS REGARDING PUBLIC PAPERS.

Mr. TROW. Before the Orders of the Day are read, I wish to make a suggestion in reference to the unusual demands which are made throughout the country for copies of *Hansard*. I think there is scarcely any member of the House who has not received applications for copies of the *Debates* containing the interesting debate which is now in progress. I question whether there has been a debate since Confederation which has attracted more attention throughout the Dominion. The distributor has received communications from members of Congress and others in the United States, asking for copies of the *Debates*; and I think that while the type is standing, very reasonable terms could be made with the printer for an extra number of copies for distribution. The whole country is interested in this debate, and I hope the Minister who has charge of the matter will allow a few more thousand copies to be printed for circulation. It is utterly impossible to supply at present the number of people who are applying daily, not merely for the speeches on one side, but those on both sides. It might be well to have the whole of the speeches compiled at the close of the debate in pamphlet form.

Mr. EDGAR. I would like to enquire of the Government when some further papers, which seem to be exceedingly important in connection with the Fishery Treaty, are going to be brought before the House? I have in my hand what purports to be a copy of some papers which have been laid before the British Parliament by the British Government; and among them I find a very important document which I do not think this Parliament has seen yet. It is the instructions of Lord Salisbury to the commissioners. We have already had laid before the House the powers from the British Government to the plenipotentiaries; but I find there was issued on the same date, the 24th October

last, very important instructions from Lord Salisbury to the commissioners. You will remember that the powers which were laid before the House referred to the plenipotentiaries' dealings with "all or any questions relating to rights of fishery," "and any other questions which may arise which the respective plenipotentiaries may be authorised by their Government to consider and adjust." Now, there is nothing in the papers which have been so far laid before the House, to show that the plenipotentiaries were authorised to consider or adjust anything but the matters relating to the rights of the fisheries. However, I find from these instructions of Lord Salisbury that there were special powers given to the commissioners outside of the fishery question. Here is one clause of these instructions:

"Whilst I have judged it advisable thus, in the first place, to refer to the question of the fisheries of the Atlantic coast, it is not the wish of Her Majesty's Government that the discussions of the plenipotentiaries should necessarily be confined to that point alone; but full liberty is given to you to enter upon the consideration of any questions which may bear upon the issues involved, and to discuss and treat for any equivalents, whether by means of tariff concessions or otherwise, which the United States plenipotentiaries may be authorised to consider as a means of settlement."

Now, it must be apparent how very important this document is to the discussion of the very question which is now before Parliament, and I am sure it is a great slight cast upon this Parliament by the Government and those entrusted —

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish the hon. gentleman to limit himself to his question, stating what papers he wants and what importance these papers are for the conduct of the business of this House. I have already drawn the attention of hon. members to the fact that these questions ought not to be made the occasion of a speech, and I must see that the rule is respected.

Mr. EDGAR. I bow to your decision, Sir. I only wish to point out that whereas those matters have been laid before the English Parliament, they should at the earliest moment be laid before this House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman had limited himself to that remark, I would have answered him at once. The attention of the First Minister will be called to the hon. gentleman's remarks as soon as he comes in.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Trow) made recently a suggestion which I think we ought to carry out, with regard to a larger publication of this debate. There is no doubt a very large demand for further copies of the speeches in this debate on reciprocity. I do not know that the Government can do anything, but it would be well to call the attention of the Debates Committee to this matter, and suggest that they might see their way to have a larger number of copies printed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the hon. gentleman has said, this matter is not in the hands of the Government, and this Parliament had decided before that a certain number of the debates should be printed each day and distributed. The debate on this subject was not foreseen, and the House did, therefore, not see fit to order an additional number of copies. The debate has now gone on for three days, and I suppose a complete edition would be required. Of course, if the Printing Committee think proper to move in the matter, they may take it up at the next sitting.

Mr. TROW. I understand the type is not distributed, and, consequently, the whole debate can be put in print again at a very reasonable figure, which it could not be after the type is distributed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The attention of the Committee is called to it, and no doubt they will take the matter up.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With the kind permission of the hon. gentleman who moved the adjournment of the debate (Mr. McNeill), I wish to make a short personal explanation with reference to the charge brought against me by the hon. gentleman who followed me in this debate (Mr. Foster), concerning my action upon the resolution before the House. I had not the opportunity of hearing the speech of the hon. the Minister of Marine (Mr. Foster), as I was not in the House when it was delivered, nor did I see the report of his speech until Saturday. Otherwise I would have taken opportunity to make my explanation before this. In his remarks, the hon. gentleman charged me with having, in this House, advocated the resolution submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), although a few months ago I had denounced, in the most severe terms, the policy it embodies. The hon. gentleman made this charge, based on a quotation from a newspaper report, assuming the report to be correct, and argued from this that I could not be sincere or honest in the opinions I have expressed in this House. I desire to say that there is no foundation whatever for the charge made by the hon. gentleman. I desire to say that the remarks I made in this House in support of the resolution of my hon. friend for South Oxford, are not at all at variance with the position I took and the remarks I made before the Charlottetown Board of Trade.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in order if he is speaking to the amendment before the House, but otherwise he is not.

Mr. DAVIES. I am speaking with the kind permission of the hon. gentleman who moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. BOWELL. My hon. friend, Mr. McNeill, has no power to give that permission, and I maintain the hon. gentleman is not in order unless he is speaking to the amendment moved by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. DAVIES. It is a personal explanation I am making.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not. It is an answer to a speech delivered in reply to the hon. gentleman, and the hon. gentleman is now combatting the argument presented to this House by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. SPEAKER. These personal explanations are usually allowed, because they partake of the nature of questions of privilege. If an hon. member rises to deny that he made certain statements imputed to him during a debate, he is allowed to do so, but he ought to limit himself to a formal denial. He must not proceed to deliver a speech on the subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would have taken the opportunity, which is often taken by hon. gentlemen, of rising to make an explanation when the Orders of the Day were called, but I understood from your remarks, Sir, the other day that such was not considered to be the proper course; and I am not going to take up any time and my hon. friend has kindly given way to me.

Mr. McNEILL. I simply understood my hon. friend to say that he wished to make merely a personal explanation.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman is right. I desire simply to make a personal explanation that I had not previously the opportunity of making, with reference to the very serious charge brought up against me of inconsistency by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That hon. gentleman, quoting from a summary report of

the proceedings before the Charlottetown Board of Trade, which appeared in a Conservative paper, and in which I am set down as having said, that unrestricted reciprocity is impracticable and impossible, and that the Americans were not such arrant fools as to grant it, and taking this report as correct, proceeded to ask what weight, could be attached to any arguments I might use in this House in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, after that statement I had made before the Board of Trade of Charlottetown, a few months ago denouncing any such policy. The hon. gentleman said:

"Unrestricted reciprocity would differ from commercial union in this respect: that while under it there would be perfectly free trade—"

Mr. FOSTER. I never said that.

Mr. DAVIES. I am reading the quotation which the hon. gentleman read.

Mr. FOSTER. Why did you not say so?

Mr. DAVIES. That is what I intended to convey. I was reading the quotation on which the hon. gentleman based his statement:

"Unrestricted reciprocity would differ from commercial union in this respect: that while under it there would be perfectly free trade between the two countries, each country would retain the right to frame its own tariff as against the rest of the world. Canada, for instance, might have a 25 per cent. tariff, while that of the United States might be one of 35 per cent. The immediate consequence would be that imports to the United States, instead of being carried to the great ports of the United States, would be taken to the States by way of Montreal. To this the States, whose people are not arrant fools, would never consent. An unrestricted reciprocity, although it would suit us as well as commercial union, was, therefore, impracticable."

That was the quotation. Now, I did not make use of such language as is here reported. I used that language with a very strongly pronounced and distinct qualification, which was clearly understood when I stated it. The board of trade were discussing several proposals for obtaining free trade relations with the United States. Some were in favor of commercial union, and some in favor of the scheme known as unrestricted reciprocity. A portion expressed their desire to have the freest trade relations between Canada and the United States that could be obtained, similar to the freedom of trade which existed between State and State, so that there should be no custom houses on the border, and that not only the United States goods should be passed free, but that all goods, whether they were manufactured in Canada or in the United States or abroad, should be passed free. These same people wished also to retain, if possible, in the hands of Canada the right to maintain our tariff and to regulate it as we pleased. In answer to that, I told them that such a scheme of unrestricted reciprocity was impracticable and impossible, that if Canada retains a tariff of 25 per cent., and the United States a tariff of 35 per cent., and you have no custom houses between the two countries, the whole of the importations will naturally come into that part of the country which has the least tariff, and that the country to the south of us which has the higher tariff would not be such arrant fools as to assent to any such arrangement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That is cheered. That is common sense and plain fact, and what I said then I repeat in this House, and I say that the proposition which we have now before us is not that proposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Go on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hardly think, Mr. Speaker, that this interruption is quite fair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Go on.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I say that the proposition which is now before the House, made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), does not contain
Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

the only objection and the fatal objection which I then pointed out, and which I said would render the scheme impracticable, and I simply desire in closing to say that, before the Charlottetown Board of Trade, I moved a resolution at the close of the debate which shows pretty clearly what I intended, what I was understood to say, and what I did say, although, in the Conservative paper from which my hon. friend quotes, I am not as fully reported as I ought to have been. I moved:

"That this board warmly approves of reciprocal free trade with the United States on the broadest possible basis, including the abolition of the restriction on the coasting trade and the transfer of vessel property, and embracing the concession to the Americans of the common right with our fishermen to use our fisheries."

That was the statement I made there, and the statement which I repeat again.

Mr. FOSTER. I have only to thank the hon. gentleman for calling my attention to this, and for the lucid explanation he has made of his own words. I do not think it requires any more remarks from me.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other, (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending Trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1870 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

Mr. McNEILL. As I understand that many hon. members desire to take part in this debate, I shall endeavor to make the remarks I desire to make to the House as short as possible. In the first instance, I think we may all feel satisfied to know that, for once in the history of this Parliament at least, all parties in this House are agreed upon one point—the Liberal-Conservative party on this side of the House; the Rouge party, which I hope I may say without offence, is more particularly represented by the courteous and eloquent and able gentleman who leads the Opposition in this House; the Grit party, led by the hon. gentleman the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); the Parti-National, marshalled under the baton of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot); the Politico-Philosophical party, if I may so express it, of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills); the Insular party, so solid and firm in its allegiance to the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House (Mr. Davies); the party of Pure Political Principle, so worthily led by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar); the party of Detraction, of which, alas, the great leader fell in the general engagement of last year, but which is properly represented by his old supporter and lieutenant, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton); the party of Political Morality, that great party which two Sessions ago so many hon. members opposite sought to lead that I should not then have dared to discriminate among them, but which I think I may, without offence to any one else, say, is now in this House under the worthy command of the hon. member for Gleggarry (Mr. Purcell) and his not less distinguished friend the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook); and last, but not least, the great party of one, which my hon. friend, the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), delights

to call the Third party, but which I think most hon. members of this House would call the first party, because I am sure my hon. friend himself would admit that he, at all events, would call it a No. 1 party. We may congratulate ourselves that all these great parties are united upon one subject, are agreed upon one point, that it would be greatly to the advantage of Canada if we could obtain freer commercial relations, freer trade relations with the United States. For years past, the people of the United States have kept up a great tariff wall against us. Over and over again we have entreated them to take it down, and they have just as often refused. And why have they so refused? The hon. member who moved this resolution (Sir Richard Cartwright) has told us. He has told us that they so refused to take down that tariff wall because they wished to punish the people of Canada. He has told us so in these words—he repeated the same statement before this House—but this is what he said at Ingersoll:

“We know that the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 was abolished not so much because it was injurious to the United States, for on the whole both parties profited by it, as because they wanted to punish us for the sympathy some of us had displayed with the South during the rebellion.”

It is true that the people of Canada—and we would have supposed, perhaps, that they were within their rights in sympathising with whomsoever they pleased—it is true that the people of Canada did sympathise at that time with the weaker side, and I think it is a somewhat interesting little bit of information that we now have from the hon. gentleman who asks us to hand ourselves over, body and bones, to the tender mercies of those same people, that the people of Canada were deliberately punished by those people because they ventured to sympathise with the South in their struggle for independence, I think, Sir, that is a little bit of information which the voters of Canada may very well mark, learn and inwardly digest. But I believe the hon. gentleman is perfectly correct in his information. At the same time I wish to call attention to the fact that this is not the only reason why this great tariff wall has been upbuilt against us. It is not merely for the purpose of punishing the people of Canada; it is also for the purpose of coercing the people of Canada. It is a matter of history that this treaty was abrogated by the United States, this great tariff wall was raised up against the people of this country, for the purpose of coercing the people of Canada into annexation. Now, lest any hon. member on the other side of the House ventures to controvert that statement, I will take occasion to read from the utterance of the great apostle of this movement, Mr. Wiman, and you will see that he endorses what I have said. After alluding to the U. E. Loyalists, he says:

“I have alluded to them because there is a tendency in the American mind to feel that isolation and the refusal to admit Canada to the privileges of the market of the United States, will have the effect of forcing them into a humble position as applicants for a political alliance. Doubtless the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1868 was largely influenced by this consideration.”

Then, in answer, apparently, by anticipation, to observations which have since been put forward, by hon. gentlemen opposite, he goes on to say:

“But it had an effect entirely contrary—”

You will observe, these hon. gentlemen tell us that it is having that effect, and that so soon as we do away with trade restrictions, this annexation feeling, which they allege to exist in the country, will subside. He goes on:

“But it had an effect entirely contrary to that which was expected, and to-day there is not in the wide world a country more loyal in its sentiments than is Canada to British connection.”

Now, these are the statements of Mr. Wiman on that point, and I venture to think that it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the bearing of this fact upon the discussion which is now proceeding in this House. I think it is

essential that every hon. member in this House should bear in view the fact that this tariff has been imposed against the people of Canada by the United States, partly to punish them, and partly to coerce them into annexation. Mr. Wiman, as I have said, tells us that there are people in the United States who still hope to succeed in their attempt to coerce the people of Canada into annexation by these means, and hon. gentlemen opposite encourage these people in that opinion; hon. gentlemen opposite tell these people that if they only continue to maintain this tariff against the people of Canada, they will succeed in their end and object, and coerce us into annexation. We have heard that statement from almost every hon. member who has addressed this House during this debate. Mr. Speaker, I venture to think that the men of Canada are not made of such slight elements. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to bring this statement to the test of fact. I challenge them to take any constituency in the Province of Ontario—they may select a favorable occasion for the election—and bring out their candidate on the annexation platform, and try out the question before the people. No, Sir, they will not accept that challenge. But I do not want to be misunderstood; I do not want hon. gentlemen to think that I suggest to them to risk the loss of a seat in this honorable House by any such trial as this. No, what I propose to them is that they should select the most favorable constituency in Ontario, and endeavor to elect their candidate on the annexation platform for the high office of pound-keeper, and I venture to tell them that they cannot do it and they know it well.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who is talking annexation?

Mr. McNEILL. But it would seem that hon. gentlemen are desirous of educating their party up to the annexation standpoint. Every speech that has been delivered from that side of the House heretofore, in this debate, bears upon the face of it, the signs and tokens of such a desire.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is not so.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says it is not so. The hon. gentleman who moved this resolution told the people of Canada that Great Britain was but little able to help them; he told us that Great Britain was isolated, friendless and alone. Sir, I do not intend to discuss that question with the hon. gentleman now, it is rather a large issue. But I will do the hon. gentleman the justice to say that I believe he was fully persuaded of the accuracy of what he said, or he would not have made that statement. Well, all I have to observe on the subject is that his having made that statement, believing it to be true, shows that he has given very superficial consideration to the subject. What did the hon. gentleman tell us next? He told us that the people of Canada were under no obligation to England. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if the people of Canada do not owe to Great Britain their existence to-day as a great and free people. I would like to ask him if they do not owe all their rights and privileges as freemen to Great Britain. But, Sir, I will not answer the hon. gentleman in any words of my own; I will answer him in the words of a Canadian whose name, I am ashamed to say, at the present moment, I forget:

“Britain bore us in her flank,
Britain nursed us at our birth,
Britain reared us to our rank,
Mid the nations of the earth.”

“In the hour of fear and dread,
In the gathering of the storm,
Britain raised above our head,
Her broad shield and stalwart arm.”

“Stand, Canadians, firmly stand,
Round the flag of fatherland!”

But, Sir, I prefer to leave the statement of the hon. gentleman to be determined upon by the great universal conscience of

the people of Canada. And then having so far paved the way the hon. gentleman went a step forward and he told us that we would be better off if we cast in our lot with the people of the United States. That was not anything in the nature of a proposition for annexation—Oh, no! nothing of the kind; that was not leading up to annexation, as the hon. gentleman says; but he told us that, nevertheless. He took care, however, Mr. Speaker, to guard himself against the indignation of the people of this country by immediately adding that he did not want to cast in his lot with the people of the United States. My hon. friend who addressed the House a moment ago, if I mistake not, had some enthusiastic utterances in his speech somewhat tending in the same direction; and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had a passage in his speech in which he drew a glowing picture of what would happen when the two British peoples of this continent were united together. That has nothing to do with annexation either. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) told us that for his part he thought it would make little difference on which side of the line a man happened to reside, for the people were one and the same. And that also has nothing at all to do with annexation. The hon. gentleman who spoke last in the debate, the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne) drew attention to the fact, and seemed to dwell with special unction upon it, that Washington was on this side of the Atlantic and that London was on the other side of the Atlantic, and he said that the people of Canada might think that perhaps the nearer metropolis was the more convenient of the two. But he, Mr. Speaker, like the hon. gentleman who led this debate, took care to guard himself immediately by saying that he hoped they would not do anything of the kind. Now, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I do not wish to be understood as alleging that any of these gentlemen desire annexation; but I do wish distinctly to say, that their speeches show that they are well aware, and they are pressed down with the consciousness that if we adopt the policy which they suggest, we run an enormous risk of annexation, and they endeavor to minimise the evils of annexation which they know in their hearts the vast, the overwhelming majority of their own supporters utterly disapprove. But Sir, if there be any direct proof of the statement I have just made required, I have it here. My hon. friend who addressed the House with such eloquence on Friday night referred to this statement, but I wish, with the kind permission of the House, to read again the ominous words addressed by the hon. member for South Oxford to the people of Ingersoll last October. He said:

"There is no doubt whatever in my mind, also, that we cannot overlook the risk that does undoubtedly arise, that increased commercial intercourse with the United States may strengthen the hands of those who desire to see our political system absorbed in theirs."

And he further goes on to say:

"I have no hesitation in saying, frankly, that if the United States are willing to deal with us on equitable terms the advantages to both countries, and especially to us, are so great that scarcely any sacrifice is too severe to secure them. I am as averse as any man can be to annexation, or to resign our political independence, but I cannot shut my eyes to the facts. We have greatly misused our advantages, we have been foolish in our expenditures, we have no means of satisfying the just demands of large portions of the Dominion, except through such an arrangement as commercial union."

You see, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman at that time used the expression "commercial union" as synonymous with that of unrestricted reciprocity. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we have got the situation clear. This is just where we stand, and the people have for some time suspected it. This tariff is kept up against the people of this country, partly to punish them for daring to sympathise with the South in their struggle for independence, partly to coerce them into annexation, and the hon. gentle-

Mr. McNEILL.

man opposite who moved this resolution has himself told us that we run an enormous risk if we adopt his own policy of putting into the hands of the United States the power to coerce us into annexation. That, I say, is just where we stand, and the people of the country have suspected it for some time. Now, Sir, they are fully agreed with Mr. Mowat, the Premier of this Province, when he says that British connection has been for Canada unmixed good; but they are not at all sure that the immersion of 5,000,000 of the people of Canada in 55,000,000 or 60,000,000 of the people of the United States would mean anything else than the submersion, the hopeless and absolute submersion of Canadian interests, and they are at the same time perfectly satisfied that for very many reasons indeed it would be anything in the world but unmixed good. And, therefore, they do not sympathise with this movement to the degree in which we have been informed they do by hon. gentlemen opposite. But there is another reason why they do not sympathise with this movement. They are weak enough to have some respect for that altogether illogical and indefensible thing called sentiment, and they carry that weakness so far as actually to prefer their own country to the United States, and to prefer the members of their own family to foreigners, all of which is pure sentiment and, therefore, foolishness; but we must simply take matters as we find them. The people of Canada are, in my opinion, growing very suspicious indeed of this movement which has so strangely been inaugurated by persons in the United States, a new and entirely unheard-of movement on their part, urging Canada to enter into closer trade relations with them—I say they look upon that movement with some degree of suspicion, because they found that in the first shape it took that of commercial union—that has now been abandoned by hon. gentlemen opposite and repudiated by them—the people found that it was, in point of fact, simply a thinly disguised attempt upon the part of those persons in the United States to accomplish, by "slyly climbing into the branches," what the people of the United States have themselves told us they had failed to accomplish by violently shaking the tree: in other words, Sir, they have come to the conclusion that this movement in favor of commercial union was simply an attempt on the part of the people of the United States to obtain the mastery and control of our trade, commerce and finances. Therefore, while they have always been ready and while they are ready now, as the Statute-book shows, to enter into arrangements pointing towards more intimate commercial dealings with the people of the United States, they look upon this particular movement in favor of it with a very great deal of suspicion indeed, having already as they conceive discovered under it a dangerous conspiracy against the commercial and the political independence of Canada. Now, Sir, the people of Canada are, I believe, perfectly ready to enter into a fair bargain with the people of the United States for reciprocal trading relations with them, but I think they are very unwilling to enter into a bargain with the people of the United States which shall be an unfair bargain for Canada, and they are still more unwilling to enter into an arrangement which shall be dictated exclusively by the people of the United States, and the terms and conditions of which shall be arranged exclusively for the benefit of that people. The last bargain of this kind which we had with the United States was, it seems to me, a pretty fair bargain for them. My hon. friend told us on Friday night that that bargain resulted to them in a balance of trade to the extent of more than \$20,000,000. Those figures which my hon. friend quoted were the American figures, but the figures given by the Hon. George Brown were not "twenty millions and a little over" but ninety-five millions and a half. The Hon. George Brown maintained that the United States had had the advantage in that bargain to the extent of \$95,500,000. Now, the probability is that the truth in this case, as

usual, is to be found in the mean between those extremes. But, at all events, I think we must see that that was a pretty fair bargain for the people of the United States. They had a pretty good share of whatever was to be gained by that transaction, and so much was it so, that we find that the people of Nova Scotia and the people of New Brunswick considered that the United States had got very much the better of that bargain, and they complained of its pressing upon themselves unduly. Now, then, what do we find to-day? We find that the people of the United States tell us plainly that they will not enter into any such arrangement with us again; they tell us plainly that that bargain was far too favorable for us, and that it was not favorable enough for them. I think that the people of Canada, at all events, have got pretty fair warning, and that warning from the people of the United States themselves, who tell us that the bargain which gave them an advantage to the extent of from twenty to ninety-five millions of dollars was not nearly favorable enough for them and was far too favorable for us. It seems to me, therefore, that the people of Canada may very readily see that if they are to have closer trade relations with the United States they must expect to pay pretty dear for their whistle. But, Sir, we are told that there is one class of the people of Canada who are to be enormously benefited by the bargain. The bargain calls upon us to give up our protective policy. The people of Canada require protection against the United States just as much as the people of the United States ever required protection against England. No people ever required protection for their young industries more than the people of Canada do to-day, but we are told that we are to give that protection up as a portion of the bargain. We are told that at least one class of the community will benefit, and that class the one to which I have had the honor to belong ever since I came to Canada, sixteen years ago—the farming class; and more especially the Ontario farmers are, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, to be benefited by this arrangement. Now, Sir, if I am not wearying the House, if I am not taking up too much time I would—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. McNEILL—I would just like to investigate for a moment the statement that the Ontario farmer is to be so enormously benefited by free interchange of farming produce with the people of the United States. Before I do so I will say, with the permission of the House, just one word in reference to the Canadian farmers generally. We have heard a great deal from the other side of the House about the desperate condition of indigence to which the Ontario farmers have been reduced, and in support of that assertion we have heard a great deal of the alleged fact that farming lands in Canada have deteriorated in value. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make one observation with regard to that argument, and that is, that it is entirely beside the question. The mere fact that the values of farming lands have deteriorated, has nothing whatever to do with the question. It is perfectly well known, Sir, that owing to the vastly increased area of land throughout the world which has recently been brought under cultivation, and owing to the enormously increased means of communication, and the facilities for carrying the goods of the farm to the farming markets of the world, those markets have been overstocked in comparison to the condition in which they were a very few years ago. And, Sir, it is apparent that by reason of this there has been a depreciation in farming values just as, under similar circumstances, there would be a depreciation in manufacturing values; and when hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that in Canada we have in this matter the experience of all the rest of the world, I should like to know what it proves. It does not advance their case one iota. In

this connection, Sir, we must remember that the farming lands of free trade England have depreciated to such an extent in the same time that the depreciation in the value of the farming lands of Canada—if there be any—is absolutely comparatively nothing. Although, in England we should have expected that the very opposite would be the case, because the supply of land is so limited and the demand is so great there. If hon. gentlemen wish to advance their case, if they want to make a point in this connection they must go on to show that the depreciation in value of Canadian lands has been greater in proportion than the depreciation in the other farming lands of the world, and they must show further that the farmer of Canada is in a worse position than the farmer in other parts of the world. It is very well known, Sir, to every hon. member of this House, that they have made no such attempt. It is very well known, to every hon. member of this House, that they have not attempted to grapple with the facts and figures adduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, and laid before the country by him some time ago, and adduced by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, and by my hon. friend who moved the address—facts and figures which prove conclusively and irrefutably that the condition of the farmer of Canada is vastly better, vastly more sound, than that of his neighbor in the United States. And, Sir, when we remember what the condition of the farmer is in free trade England, the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite becomes simply laughable, for the condition of the English farmer is pitiable in the extreme. But, Sir, to return to the point from which I diverted, what would the Ontario farmer gain, and what would he give, if we had a free exchange of farm products with the people of the United States? In the first place, Sir, I may say that when the people of the United States ask us to open our markets to them, and to expose our producers—I now speak of manufacturers and farmers alike—to all the weight and strain of competition with the accumulated wealth and resources of the fifty-five or sixty millions of people in the United States, they ask us, Sir, to do what, under similar circumstances, they never would have done themselves. They ask us to pursue a policy the very reverse of that which they have themselves pursued with such conspicuous success. And, Sir, if we had this free trade with the United States, the first thing that would stare the Ontario farmer in the face would be the fact that he had lost his home market by the closing down of our manufactories; and I think the Ontario farmer will begin now to see the value of the home market, from the statements that have been made with regard to the value of the home market in the United States—a home market which has been built up by the adoption of the very policy there which we have urged should be adopted here. But I was about to ask, what would the Ontario farmer gain, and what would he give? In the first place, Sir, we should have free entry for three of our staple products—our horses, our sheep and our barley. Those are the three principal products for which we should obtain a better market in the United States. And what should we give, Sir, in return? We should give to the people of the United States a free entry into our markets for their wheat, their coarse grains, their western corn, and their western pork. Now, I should like to ask hon. members if it is so very clear that the Ontario farmer would gain a great deal by that transaction? They had free entry for their wheat before, and I wonder if hon. members of this House have realised exactly what that amounted to. I confess I did not do so until I commenced to study the figures; but what I found in them positively startled me, Mr. Speaker. I found that during the five years immediately preceding the introduction of the National Policy we had imported into Canada from the United States, for home consumption, \$31,000,000 worth of their wheat, whereas during the last five years, since the National Policy has been introduced, we imported only some

\$1,100,000 worth. In other words, the Ontario farmer has had the difference, \$33,000,000, paid into his pocket for his own wheat sold in his own market, and he has thereby at the least saved the cost of transporting that wheat to the sea-board and then taking it across the Atlantic. And, Sir, if hon. members will only study the prices of wheat in Chicago and in Toronto respectively, they will find that the Ontario farmer gained a great deal more than that. But that is not all, I find, referring to the same periods, that in the last five years compared with the previous five years the Ontario farmer has had the advantage, so far as coarse grains and other breadstuffs are concerned, to the extent of \$11,000,000. And, Sir, if we remember that, during those five years immediately preceding the National Policy, the quantity of coarse grains consumed in this country was very small indeed, compared with that which is consumed in the feeding of stock to-day, we shall see that this represents in a very small degree the advantage we have gained in this respect from the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen will remember the way in which the price of oats used to be brought down with a rush by the sending of American cheap oats into our market. And those who grew peas for sale a few years immediately preceding the introduction of the National Policy and immediately after, will know that the price of peas advanced under that policy very much indeed. And now, Sir, what about western pork? We all know that the market of the Canadian farmer for his pork was, prior to the introduction of the National Policy, depressed to the last degree. In one of those terrible years, 1878 or 1879, I knew very well an Ontario farmer who had to sell his pork for \$2.50 per hundred. Now, free trade in farm produce means the free entry into our markets of western pork, and I want to know whether the destruction of the home market for pork will in any degree be compensated to the Ontario farmer by the greatly advanced price that he is going to obtain for those early spring chickens, you know, which he is to rear in the snows of January and February, to compete in the New York market with the fowls raised in the warmer latitudes of the United States. Now, Sir, just let us see the avalanche which hangs over the home market for Canadian pork to-day. The year before last, according to the last figures I have got, they exported, of bacon, \$25,000,000; of ham, \$5,250,000; of fresh pork, \$4,400,000, and of salt pork, \$20,750,000 worth. That points to a competition which the Ontario farmer may expect to meet when we have free trade in farm produce. And, Sir, he will have something more; he will have the advantage of seeing our markets flooded with oleomargarine, and butterine and bogus butter, and bogus butter oil. He will have these to his heart's content, to compete with the genuine butter manufactured by the wives, daughters and sisters of our Canadian farmers. More than that, he will have to compete in his own market with the cheaply-fed, with the corn-fed cattle of the United States; and more than that, he will find, in order to assist him in that competition, that his own cattle will be scheduled with the cattle of the United States and excluded from the markets of the mother country. Now, I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that if the trade in farm produce would be to the advantage of the Ontario farmer—and I do not say that it might not—at all events, it would by no means be an unmixed blessing; and I think they will further agree with me when I say that if, for the privilege of introducing the produce of our farms into his market, we give the American the privilege of introducing the produce of his farm into ours, we shall have given him a very fair equivalent. Now, the question that the people of Canada have to ask themselves is: are they prepared to give a great deal more? The policy proposed to us demands that we shall give a great deal more. It demands that we shall admit American manufactures free; and that, in the opinion

Mr. McNEILL.

of the enormous majority of the manufacturers of this country, who are best able to judge, means practically, to a great extent, the annihilation of the manufacturing industries of this country, and the consequent destruction of the home market of the Ontario farmer. Are you prepared to throw that into the bargain too? But that is not the bargain, because we have to give something more; we have to lose seven millions of dollars directly, and millions of dollars indirectly, and we have to throw that into the bargain too. But that does not even yet represent the bargain. We have to do more, Sir; we have to give up the right to regulate our own tariff to suit our own needs; and the needs of a young country like Canada in that respect are, as we have been taught by the people of the United States themselves, very different indeed from the needs of an old-established and wealthy community like theirs. It is demanded of us that we shall exactly assimilate our tariff to theirs, and that, by their own admission, would be incalculably to the injury of a young country like Canada. We may ask, who is to regulate the tariff when changes require to be made? The hon. the Minister of the Interior has told us. The Americans themselves have told us through their newspapers, that their tariff is to be regulated by Congress; but I will waive that argument, and I will assume that they give us some kind of fair play and some representation in the body which is to regulate that tariff. What will that representation be? They are fifty-five or sixty million people, and we are five million people. If they should give us representation according to our population, in what condition would we be when those questions arise, which conflicting interests would certainly cause to arise, between the one party and the other? I say we should be in a helpless and hopeless condition of impotence and humiliation; we should be obliged to take whatever our good masters were kind enough to dole out to us. We have to throw that into the bargain, too. Sir, it is no bargain; it is national degradation and abject surrender. I say that, under such circumstances, our position would be absolutely unendurable; with our own hands we should have placed their heels upon our necks, and with our own suffrages we should have voted away our own independence. But that is not yet the bargain. We are told that, in order to carry out the terms of this precious contract, we must also discriminate in favor of American goods against the goods of the mother country: in other words, we are to sacrifice our sentiments and throw that sacrifice into the bargain, too. We are to cast down—aye, in scorn and derision to cast down—the impulses of the noblest element of humanity. Strike out sentiment from the nature of man, and, Sir, you at once dethrone and degrade him to the level of the brute creation. Where is the dividing line to be found, if it is not at sentiment? It is not at appetite, it is not at instinct, it is not even at reason. It is only to be found in the appreciation of the ethically beautiful, the great and the good. There alone is to be found the argument from nature for the existence of the human soul. There alone is to be found the argument from nature for our hopes of immortality. What, Sir, I would ask are these thoughts too deep for words which vainly beat about like sweet imprisoned birds in the dark cottage they inhabit? In the most sublime passage in English literature, the great master has compared these unutterable yearnings to the music of the spheres. He makes Lorenzo say:

“ Look how the floor of Heaven
Is thick inlaid with patines of bright gold.
There is not the smallest orb which thou behold'st,
But in his motion like an angel sings,
Still choiring to the young-eyed cherubim;
But, whilst this muddy vesture of decay
Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it.—

I would ask, what is that divine harmony? Is it sheer, unadulterated greed of gain? What is a good, a true, a noble

man? Is he not a man who is actuated by good, and true, and noble sentiments and who lives up to them? The sentiment of Canada speaks out trumpet-tongued against the policy that is proposed to us by the hon. gentleman, and we are coolly requested to degrade, and to depress, and to stifle the highest impulses of our people, in order that that precious policy may be carried into effect. But, Sir, no. Why, we are told that is not the case. We are told, forsooth, that it will be to the advantage of the mother country to run the risk of the disruption of her Empire, because at some day—God only knows when—the people of Canada will become vastly better customers of hers than they ever were before. Well, all I can say with regard to that is, that the people of Canada are customers of the mother country to the extent per head of the population of \$3.84, and the people of the United States are customers of the mother country to the extent of \$1.83 per head of their population; and hon. gentlemen can decide the force of the suggestion made by hon. gentlemen opposite for themselves. But, for my own part, speaking for myself, I say that this is “the most unkindest cut of all,” for it simply amounts to an attempt to betray the mother country with a kiss. But I would ask, why it is that we are called upon to commit this deed of imperishable infamy? The hon. gentleman gives you a reason. He tells you it is because we are broken, bankrupt, and going head over heels to destruction. Fortunately, the people of Canada can decide that question for themselves, without reference either to the hon. gentleman who makes the assertion or to any hon. member on this side of the House. They can decide that question for themselves by reference to men whose business it is to study the financial status of nations; men who do not care three straws whether it is the Hon. Edward Blake, or Mr. Laurier, or Sir Richard Cartwright, or Sir John A. Macdonald who has control of the destinies of this country; men who look at this from a purely business point of view; men who look at this matter with the cold, calculating eye of the man of the world who is trying to make money out of it. And what is their verdict? What is the verdict of the financiers of the world on this matter? Their verdict is, that the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. They not only do not agree with the hon. gentleman, but they say that the very reverse of what the hon. gentleman has said is the fact, and they back their opinion with their money, by lending us their money on terms which are much more favorable than those on which money was ever lent to Canada before. But we have another reason offered why we should follow out this precious policy, and what is it? I have referred to it once before, but I think it ought to be referred to in this House. This is the reason given to us by Mr. Wiman why we should adopt this policy. He says:

“When one recalls the 5,000 miles of coast line fishing privileges possessed by Canada, the limitless forests of timber, greatly needed by the United States, the exhaustless hills of iron ore, the copper, nickel and other minerals, the mountains of phosphates, the miles and miles of coal in close proximity to eastern manufacturing centres and western needs, the infinite variety of riches which God in His Providence has placed in these regions for the good of all mankind; and when one recalls that for the most part these are lying silent, dormant and dead, it needs only to turn and look into the earnest faces of the great nation on the borders of Canada to realise that the good Providence has also provided a people whose high mission it is to take these vast riches and most gratefully enjoy His bounty.”

That is the reason given to us by Mr. Wiman. Sir, the policy of the Liberal Conservative party, under the leadership of the right hon. gentleman who has made the name of Canada famous throughout the world, has been a policy of construction, a policy of building up, a policy of binding together. The right hon. gentleman has sought to provide the people of Canada with the means of developing the vast resources of their country; the right hon. gentleman has sought also to soothe local jealousies, and to

assuage old-time animosities; he has sought to teach the people of this country that the interests of races, and creeds, and industries, and classes, and Provinces are first and foremost of all Canadian interests; he has sought, in short, to build up a great Canadian nationality in North America, a nationality which shall at the same time be as truly and as thoroughly an integral part of the great British nation as the Welsh, or the Irish, or the Scotch, or the English nationality is. Surely that is a great and noble policy. Surely every true Canadian ought to strive to help it on. And the chief corner-stone of that policy has been the provision by which it is attempted to arrange that the Canadian manufacturer, the Canadian farmer—that Canadian industry, in fact, shall have the benefit of its own Canadian market; the provision that seeks to arrange, so far as possible at least, that the money which is paid for goods consumed in Canada shall not be conveyed out of Canada to the impoverishment of the country, but, as far as possible, shall remain in the country, to be re-invested in native industry and still further develop the resources of the country. Unrestricted reciprocity means blotting out, as with a sponge, all we have gained under that policy; it means, in the opinion of many men best able to judge, the transference of the commerce and the trade of the cities of Canada to the cities of the United States; it means the domination of our trade and commerce by the United States, the loss of our commercial and of our financial independence, and, in short, the subjugation of Canada by that people. And it means more still. It means, in my opinion at least, without one shadow or shade of doubt, the severance of those ties which unite us to the mother country and bind our Empire together. I would ask the French Canadian members of this House if they are prepared to support such a policy as that, if they think, that, under the new condition of things which would grow up under that policy, their own peculiar rights and privileges would be so very much more secure than they are to-day; and of the members of this House, irrespective of race, or class, or creed—aye, or of party too—I would ask, are you prepared to hold your grip upon your own Canada and to continue to develop her vast latent resources with the same courage and energy in the future as you have displayed in the past, and which in the last few years has won for you the admiration—yes, I may say without exaggeration, the wonder—of the civilised world? Are you prepared to join hands with those whose high policy it is to build up a Canadian nationality in North America, and at the same time to preserve and, if possible, consolidate the world-wide Empire to which we are heirs? Are you prepared, in the future as in the past, to take your stand, in sunshine and through storm, by the old land and the old flag, or, on the other hand, are you prepared to cast in your lot with those who, in the columns of their newspaper press, are, day by day, writing down British institutions, and deliberately and scandalously misrepresenting all that England does?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; never!

Mr. McNEILL. Are you prepared, at their instance, and by their advice, in craven fear, at the very moment of splendid victory, to surrender to the pressure of a policy which Canada has not only so long successfully resisted, but which, with native iron-energy and genius, she has converted into an instrument for her own good? Are you prepared, at the very moment when victory folds her pinions upon your banners, to haul down the flag of Canadian nationality and of Imperial fame and power? Are you prepared, at the instance of these men and by their advice, to lend a helping hand in the dismemberment of your own Empire?

Several hon. MEMBERS. Never, never!

Mr. McNEILL. Are you prepared even to risk it, as the hon. gentleman tells us you must do if you adopt his policy? Are the Commons of Canada prepared to do all this or to risk all this in order that the great nation on your southern border may, in the simple and graphic words of Mr. Wiman:

"Take—"

"Take," Mr. Speaker,—

"—the vast riches of our own native land, and most gratefully enjoy them."

What the Commons of Canada will do, Sir, I am well assured, and if hon. gentlemen opposite, not content with that verdict, dare to do as they now propose, dare to submit to the judgment of the people of this country a policy so unworthy, so suicidal and so base, right sure am I that from every city and town, from every hamlet and county, they will have for answer, swift and clear:

"Confound their politics;
Frustrate their knavish tricks;
On thee our hopes we fix,
God save the Queen."

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, the principle involved in the resolution now under the consideration of this House is so far-reaching in its character, and fraught with such tremendous interests to the future welfare of this country, that I do not feel inclined to let it go to a division without asking the attention of the House for a very short time while I offer a few observations on the subject. I feel under a considerable difficulty at rising to speak at this period of the debate, because the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me from this side of the Chamber, have submitted to the consideration of the House and the country a proposition so broad, so statesmanlike, in the interests of this country, that the Chinese-wall-of-protection party on the other side, eloquent and argumentative as their speeches have been, from their own standpoint, have been wholly unable to gainsay the position we have taken. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken from the commencement of this debate, on our side of the House, have submitted a proposition, and have proclaimed correctly the condition of this country to be such, and its financial position such, as call for the immediate consideration of this Parliament, and the consideration of the people outside of it. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen, in the early part of this debate, quoted speeches which had been made by hon. gentlemen on this side on previous occasions. They endeavored to make out that some hon. gentlemen on this side had been inconsistent in their utterances, and that the policy which they advocate now was not in accordance with the policy which they had advocated, individually, on other occasions. One of those gentlemen, my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), has answered for himself to-day. He has shown this House that his speech, taken in its plain and literal meaning, from beginning to end, was not capable of the interpretation which the hon. Minister of Marine chose to put upon it. And I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen will endeavor, before this debate is over, to make quotations from observations of mine. I hope they will do so. However, I may spare them the necessity of that, Mr. Speaker, because I intend to give this House, before I resume my seat, the benefit, if benefit it may be, of the opinions which I have expressed with regard to our relations with the United States for a very considerable number of years past. Now, Sir, we have, in this present position, an entirely new departure. We have here a question which has never yet been formally submitted to the consideration of the people. It has been an abstract question; it has been one which people's minds may have dwelt on, but it has never been deliberately submitted for the consideration of the people. And how are we met? We are met with the cry that it is disloyal to

Mr. McNEILL.

the old country. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat indulged us with that cry to a considerable extent, and closed his speech by an appeal to the sentimental aspect of this question, and stating the strength of that sentiment in the hearts of the people of Canada to-day. Sir, I agree with the hon. gentleman that there is a great deal in sentiment. I agree with the hon. gentleman that great deeds and great sufferings have been undergone for the sake of mere sentiment. But, Sir, if sentiment stands between us and our necessities to-day, our duty to Canada points to the course we should take in the interests of Canada. Sir, sitting here as one of the representatives of this Dominion, I am prepared, for my part, to say, let us consider the interests of Canada first. That, Mr. Speaker, has been the policy of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, that has been the policy of the right hon. gentleman in times gone by.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is now.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). That was the policy laid down by the right hon. gentleman in that Minute of Council quoted by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) the other day, when the right hon. gentleman declared that the only way to make the people of Canada contented in their present position was to make them prosperous; and no one knew better than he did that if there was prosperity in this country from one end to the other, the people were satisfied and contented with their political position. But, as has been shown, if the true interests of a country were suffering, if the people saw on the other side of the line a market which would take all of their surplus productions, if they saw that market closed by a Chinese wall against them, in consequence of the action of this Government, then I say that the time would come for the people of Canada to look around and make overtures, as this resolution invites us to make, to the large, friendly, and powerful people to the south, and ask them if some *modus vivendi* may not be arrived at whereby we two English-speaking races on this continent may be able to exchange our products to our mutual advantage. I say, at the outset of this discussion, that I am glad to hear hon. gentlemen on the other side pointing out all the disadvantages that are going to arise to the Dominion under the operation of such an Act. I am glad to hear that for this reason: because the friends of this measure—and we have friends on the other side of the border—will be able to show the people of the United States that there is at least a division of opinion on this side of the border. If there was only one view of the question taken in this Chamber, if every member in the House and every man in the country would cordially accept the views advanced by the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, why, the friends of that measure, and I believe they are growing in the United States, would not have the advantage of pointing out there was a division of opinion on the other side of the border as well. I hold that this is a matter which, while largely in the interests of Canada, is largely in the interests of the people of the United States as well. It is to their interest—

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES. An hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." Does the hon. gentleman, in any of his dealings with his fellow-man, expect to have all the advantage on his own side? Why, is it a policy that no far-reaching statesmanship ever for one moment contemplates or desires. We desire, if we go to the United States, to say to them: Here we come offering you a trade which is to your advantage to accept, and which during the time you had it under the operation of the Reciprocity Treaty proved to be such, and now with our enlarged commercial system, our increased number of railways, our increased population in Canada—

and in the United States as well—we believe it will be a measure for our mutual benefit, and so, come, let us trade together. Why, the Minister of Finance when at Washington the other day made this proposition. I regret he is not here. How do we now know that the Minister of Finance did not make a proposal similar to that called for in the resolution before the House? We know he proposed a resolution there in the interests of extended commerce; and now we find a resolution brought down here under the direction of the leader of this House calling for a Chinese-wall policy of protection against the United States. Well, Sir, it appears to me that if the Minister of Finance were here to-day he would have either to explain his policy, or the leader of the Government would have to explain his. We seem to have a Mikado and Tycoon in this matter, and I would like to hear whether the policy of the Tycoon at Washington can be reconciled with the policy of the Mikado in the House of Commons to-day. The hon. gentleman who resumed his seat a few moments ago said that the Americans were trying to coerce us in consequence of the hostile position we assumed during the Southern War. The hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, thought he was right in the evidence he offered; but if the hon. gentleman had occupied a seat in this House from 1874 to 1878, during the time the National Policy was first discussed in this Chamber, and subsequently over the country, the hon. gentleman would have remembered the speeches made by his leader, by the Finance Minister, by every Tory member in this House, to the effect that we are going to teach the United States their position. We were not going to allow them to have the advantage of our market, we were not going to allow them to make this a slaughter market for their products, and we were going to impose a tariff and a National Policy against the United States which was going to bring the United States to their senses in a very short time. I contend that those utterances of our public men on that occasion in this House, and afterwards in the country, did more than any other line of policy ever adopted, more than the National Policy itself, to embitter the public sentiment of the United States, the minds of the leading statesmen in Congress, against the people of this country who were gulled by such an utterance as that. And when, unfortunately for the interests of Canada, the Government came into power and had an opportunity to carry out their policy, they carried it out to the fullest extent; they carried it out with the boast that they were going to reduce our imports and trade with the United States, they were going to increase our trade with Great Britain and were going to teach the United States the fact that we could get along without them. The absurdity of that was seen from the beginning, the absurdity of that has been felt by every business man, and by every farmer, and by every man who has any acquaintance with the position of affairs in this country. We are living alongside of the people of the United States who want what we have to sell; they take, and they are the only people who will take, and who can take, what we have to dispose of, and we have to send them our products minus the duty which was imposed in consequence of the threatenings of the Tory party of this country. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, indulged occasionally in poetical quotations. I followed him with a great deal of interest, and if he had confined himself to poetical quotations I am sure, in many respects, his statements would have been more accurate and more interesting to the House. The hon. gentleman indulged in a quotation from an unknown author, and as if to show how easy it was to descend from the sublime to the ridiculous, he first came down to the level of pork, and then by two or three steps at once, to oleomargarine. I thought, Sir, that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue must have apprehended what the hon. gentleman was going to say when he walked over and took his seat alongside of

him during the discussion; and if the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue could have only had the opportunity of giving him a wink and a caution, he would have said: "My good friend do not touch oleomargarine because, remember, that only a few years ago I brought in a Bill to enable oleomargarine to be imported and manufactured in this country." It was only on account of this strong feeling in this House that on motion of my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson) who sits beside me, the permission of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue was changed so as to prevent its manufacture and introduction into this country. Leaving aside the hon. gentleman's conclusion with regard to our duty and our loyalty towards England, and I would not have a great deal to answer. But, Sir, I would ask the hon. gentleman for one moment to refer back to the Journals of the House in 1867, and he will find that the party which he follows to-day, and the leader which he serves under to-day, who was leader of the House and Government on that occasion, in the very first Address from the Throne, which he put into the mouth of the Governor General to deliver to this Parliament, he caused it to contain these words: "I congratulate you on the legislative sanction which has been given by the Imperial Parliament to the Act of Union under the provisions of which we are now assembled and which has laid the foundation of a new nationality." What does a "new nationality" mean, Mr. Speaker? Does it not mean the severance from the old country, and could it mean anything else? A "new nationality" meant nothing less. It meant the independence which those gentlemen had been speaking about, during the whole political campaign that preceded the Act of Union, from every hustings in the Dominion of Canada, when public men stated publicly, that when we had attained our present position henceforth we were going to assume the duties and the aspect of a new country. I repeat again that on the very first occasion on which this House met after Confederation the hon. the leader of the Government put into the mouth of the Governor General those memorable words that "we inaugurated a new nationality." That, Sir, was the object of the Union, as stated at its very inception. The hon. gentleman who spoke so eloquently, with regard to our duty towards the old country, would do well I think, Sir, if he would ask his hon. colleagues to explain their meaning, when, at the very first opportunity they had of meeting the representatives of Canada under the new system of government, they announced to them, as the policy of the Administration, that they were going to adopt a new nationality. Sir, it ill becomes any of those gentlemen to endeavor to brand hon. members on this side of the House, and to argue that we are endeavoring to lead the people away from the old country. They themselves were the first; their leader, their Government, and the leader of the present Government was the first to indicate to the people of this country at large that we had made up our minds to adopt a new nationality, which meant severance from the old country. Now, Sir, what did the hon. gentleman, with regard to this question, say? In addition to the charges they make against us of being unfair to the country, he said that we have not been able to prove that this policy would be of advantage to our farmers, our fishermen, and our various industries. Now, Sir, this question, as I said before, a very few years ago, was not in the position which it is to-day. We were not aware then what the position of the question would be in the United States. To-day, what do we see? We see a broad invitation from that distinguished man Mr. Bayard, the American Secretary of State, to Sir Charles Tupper, asking him to "come and discuss the questions in a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations between the two Empires." That invitation is the same as coming from the head of the Government, and, indeed, we had previously received almost a similar invitation from the head of the Government himself. This

coming from the Premier, so to say, of the United States—the leader of the Cabinet, was an emphatic declaration on the part of the people of the United States, so far as the Government were concerned, that, in their judgment, the time had arrived when this question could be properly considered with Canada. Sir Charles Tupper, the hon. the Minister of Finance, who has since been in Washington, made a most cordial reply to this invitation. He did not intimate any desire on the part of Canada not to enter into the relations, but he says: "I entirely agree in your statement that we both seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement and that there is but one way to procure it, and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries." Here, Sir, we have then the whole case before us. We have since seen a resolution introduced into Congress by Mr. Butterworth and, subsequently, by Mr. Hitt, and we have seen the public expression of opinion from public men in the United States with regard to this measure, and we believe to-day that they are watching with a great deal of interest the discussions that take place in this House. The hon. gentleman has quoted occasionally from Mr. Wiman. Now, Mr. Wiman, I have no doubt, has given considerable attention to this question, and Mr. Wiman's idea would be quite in accord with the policy now under consideration here. He says:

"The second plan of unrestricted reciprocity to which in your letters you referred would be a most admirable arrangement, and next to the old Reciprocity Treaty would be most acceptable no doubt throughout Canada. It is as you say that the extension of the plan as laid down in the Treaty of 1874, urged by General Grant on the part of the United States, and by the Honorable George Brown on the part of Canada. Had this negotiation been successful no Act in General Grant's Administration would have paralleled it in importance and beneficial results to the United States; while this consummation as a result of Mr. Brown's efforts would have added a lustre to a name already famous in Canada that would have been international in its scope."

Then, Sir, he goes on to say:

"The conclusion, therefore, is that while the first plan in the foregoing list—the old Reciprocity Treaty—is impossible, the second that of unrestricted reciprocity is possible only by the early and prompt action of the Canadian Government, speaking on behalf of the people, and making at once the necessary propositions from which the knowledge of the fact, I believe, could be promptly carried through in view of the agitation and interest which has been excited on the question here. If no such action is taken by the representatives of the Canadian Government it is impossible to conceive that the American Congress could be induced to initiate a move of this limited character."

Now, Sir, you will find by this that Mr. Wiman, who has given a great deal of attention to this subject, had come to the conclusion that unrestricted reciprocity, such as we are advocating to-day, was entirely in accordance with the sentiment in the United States and would find acceptance there. This question of our relations with the United States as I have said before has been considered at various places and has been spoken to by myself, and as I may be misquoted, or partially quoted by the hon. gentlemen who follow me, I will read what I said in the House last year while that question was under consideration:

"In regard to the treaty I think it very undesirable that here or elsewhere any expressions of opinion should be given as to the great desirability or necessity of a treaty with the United States. Shortly after the treaty expired there was a meeting held at the Chamber of Commerce, Halifax, when a resolution was moved calling on the Government to take immediate steps to renew it. On that occasion I said I thought that while it was well known throughout this country that our people were anxious for a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty on equal terms, it was not wise or judicious that we should publish to the world from every commercial standpoint the opinions we entertained on that subject. I am aware this expression of mine was quoted against me on a recent political occasion in my own Province, but I expressed it there in the same sense in which I would express it here, because I believe the Government, recognising their responsibility in dealing with a matter of such importance, would be freer to act on behalf of our country if there was not brought to bear from the other side expressions of opinion from our own people that we could not live or prosper without trade relations with that country."

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

I took the precaution of adopting that policy for this very reason: I did not wish to say anything that might be used against us by those in the United States who are opposed to a reciprocity treaty with us, in any future negotiations which might take place. I remember very well the speeches which were delivered in this House, on the Washington Treaty, by the hon. leader of the Government and the hon. Minister of Finance. I remember those hon. gentlemen standing in their places and pointing out the great advantages that we were gaining under that treaty—pointing out that under it we were gaining everything and giving up nothing; and the speeches of those hon. gentlemen were quoted entirely in the American case submitted to the Halifax Commission. And while I did not suppose that my speeches would have so much importance in the eyes of the public as the speeches of gentlemen who occupy the high position those hon. gentlemen occupied at that time, and still occupy, I was unwilling that any member of this House should make use of any language which American negotiators might throw up against us whenever we came to negotiate with them. Shortly after that I was interviewed by the *Boston Globe*, which was very anxious to know what we, in Nova Scotia, thought in regard to this matter. In that interview I said:

"I was a member of a government, and belong to a party that has always desired the closest commercial relations with the United States, and I do not hesitate to say that, if our party came into power to-morrow, our first object would be, so far as consistent with our financial obligations, to place our trade relations with our neighbors across the border on the freest and broadest basis possible. I do not believe in commercial union. Neither country, I believe, would agree to it; but if the tariff of both countries could be reconsidered I think a way would be found by which we might trade with our neighbors, who are our natural customers, on a much more liberal and extended basis than we do at present. I believe that a great deal of bad feeling was engendered in the minds of the people of the United States, and in the minds of her leading statesmen, by the constant cry that was kept up by the Tory party of the Dominion during the time that the Liberal Government was in power, that they (the Tories) by pursuing a policy of retaliation would force trade concessions from the Americans. The Liberals of this country never desired such a policy. They desired the freest trade relations consistent with revenue requirements, believing that the more intimate our commercial intercourse was the better feeling it would engender among the population of the two countries."

"We cannot forget that we have a large interest in the New England States particularly. Their factories are operated largely by Nova Scotians, their fishing fleet is largely manned by our own hardy sons, and the number of people from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island who have made their homes in their towns and villages it would be difficult to ascertain."

I was also interviewed by the *Chicago Times*, which reported the interview as follows:—

"Hon. A. G. Jones, M.P., largely engaged in the West Indies and fish trades, has been watching with considerable interest the discussion of the question in the United States. Public opinion in Canada would be likely to shape itself in response to action that may be taken in the United States. The people of the Maritime Provinces would favor reciprocity in the limited sense, or a broader measure like commercial union, if that is found practicable. 'Our commercial interests are with the United States, and not with Canada,' Mr. Jones said. 'We have no binding trade interests between the east and west of Canada, and are ready to extend our commercial relations with any country that will take our products.' If the United States Government were disposed to favor unrestricted reciprocity with Canada, Mr. Jones thinks no great difficulty would be experienced in adjusting details of the arrangement to the satisfaction of both parties. It is argued that free trade with the United States would be discrimination against the mother country, but Mr. Jones believes no opposition need be feared from that quarter. England knows that the surest way to make Canada contented with her political status as a portion of the Empire is to make her people prosperous. That would undoubtedly be the case under unrestricted free trade with the United States. 'I look on the proposition with moderate favor,' Mr. Jones said, in conclusion, 'and am prepared to discuss it for the best interests of the country. It has not yet been made a party question.'"

Now, Sir, these are the opinions which I have expressed on this measure up to the present time, and therefore I feel perfectly free to-day in coming here and giving my allegiance to the policy set forth in the statements I have read. But, Sir, we have heard from hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House—and they have endeavored to propagate the idea in their papers—that the policy of the Liberal

party to-day, the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, means direct taxation, the withdrawal of Provincial subsidies, the withdrawal of subsidies to various railways in the country. Sir, I take entire and immediate exception to that statement. There is no such plank in the platform of the Liberal party to-day; there is no necessity for any of these results in the arrangement we advocate for the approval of this country. We must come here and discuss this question in a fair and honest spirit, neither overstating nor understating the case, and I am prepared to say that we should probably lose a small amount of revenue under such an arrangement; but we should be able to economise in certain unnecessary expenses to the extent of a few millions. And, then, Sir, above all, instead of having our people in the condition we find them in to-day from one end of this Dominion to the other, instead of finding their resources crippled, their energies hampered, their farms mortgaged, and looking with hopelessness to the future, we should have a contented and prosperous people, a people with money in their pockets, and we know what it means when people have money in their pockets, for they spend it, and the very man who spends one dollar to-day, would, under such a condition of affairs, be able to spend three or four dollars to-morrow. Therefore, I look without the slightest apprehension to the change involved in the proposition before the House. If it involved anything approaching direct taxation, I should say, stay your hand; for I should say that this country could not under any system of government adopt direct taxation. Although it might be the most economical, if people understood it, they have not been educated up to the great economical fact that direct taxation would be the cheapest system they could adopt. And, therefore, you have to accept public opinion as it is. No party in this country would stand twenty-four hours, if they went to the people with direct taxation on their banners.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I am glad to hear hon. gentlemen opposite agree with me. Therefore, I take this exception at the outset, because I deny most emphatically that any such result can possibly be involved in the adoption of the policy which we recommend to-day. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman may say that it would be unfair to the country to discriminate against her with regard to the United States. Why, is it not equally unfair to discriminate against the British manufacturer, in so far as the principle and the sentiment are concerned, in favor of the Canadian manufacturer? There is discrimination against the British manufacturer. His goods cannot come in owing to it, and if they do not come in under one condition of affairs, they will not under another; and so far as the logic and the sense is concerned, it is just as unfair for this Government, under the National Policy, to discriminate against the English manufacturer, by high protective duties, in favor of the people of Canada, as it would be under other circumstances to discriminate against him in favor of the people of the United States. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the other night dealt at considerable length upon the advantages of our inter-provincial trade, which has arisen out of our present political condition. To fortify his opinion, the hon. gentleman quoted an observation made by the Attorney General of Nova Scotia. I thought, as the hon. gentleman made that quotation, he might have had sufficient respect for himself, as a member of the Dominion Government, to have avoided the sneer he indulged in when speaking of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, who is not here to answer for himself, by saying that he was a man who had made a great deal of noise about himself the last two or three years. If the hon. gentleman were to meet the Attorney General for Nova Scotia in debate, I have no doubt the Attorney General would be

able to hold his own, and in his absence it is not very statesmanlike on the part of a member of this Government to attempt to belittle a member of the Local Government. Had the hon. gentleman quoted the Hon. Mr. Longley fairly, he would have had this advantage: that I would not be in a position to make the retort which it is in my power to make to-day. We very often find hon. gentlemen opposite making quotations from the speeches of hon. gentlemen on this side, without giving us the entire quotation, but only giving us that portion, which taken by itself, bears out the impression they endeavor to create. They are careful not to give the fair and literal meaning of what was said. Now, what did Mr. Longley say at the banquet at Boston? He said:

"God and nature never destined that Nova Scotia and Ontario should trade together. We trade with Ontario, to be sure. Their drummers permeate our country, and sell, \$10,000,000 of goods annually, and we pay for them almost wholly in hard cash. Where do we get the money? We get it from the people of the United States."

Now, if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had finished the quotation by giving us that part of it, he would have done Mr. Longley the justice, to which Mr. Longley was entitled. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that a large trade had been growing up between the east and the west. Let us see in what that trade consists. He says there is a large amount of sugar brought over the Intercolonial Railway. Well, there is, I admit, a very considerable quantity of sugar coming over the Intercolonial Railway, but when we find every year an annual deficiency of \$100,000 to \$200,000 in the working of the Intercolonial Railway, when we see \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 charged yearly as capital account to the Intercolonial Railway, half of which should go to current expenses, I ask, is it any great advantage after all to force this trade at the expense it involves. The hon. gentleman says that coal is brought over the Intercolonial Railway. Coal is brought from a certain county represented by the hon. the Minister of Finance, and we have the statement, in reply to my enquiry, and which the hon. the Minister of Railways had the frankness to put in his annual report, as explaining increased expenditure and diminished receipts, we have the statement that every pound of that coal carried over the Intercolonial Railway was carried at a dead loss. Is that the way to promote trade in this country, by making such a sacrifice? Hon. gentlemen, familiar with this business, are aware that when we come to put a rate of three-tenths of a cent per mile on coal, that involves a loss to the country of a very extensive character. I have been told by gentlemen familiar with the business, and whom I consider as high authority, that about three-quarters of a cent per mile is the minimum rate in the United States, which, it is considered, will compensate for working expenses; so that when we come to cutting that rate down to three-tenths of a cent per mile, it is forcing trade at a very heavy expense, which the taxpayers have to bear. The hon. gentleman says that about three-quarters of a million barrels of flour are carried over the railway. There again the National Policy comes into play. If we were clear of the National Policy to-day, we would not require to carry flour over the Intercolonial Railway at a loss, because I suppose it hardly pays—at all events it does not more than pay—running expenses. What would we do without the National Policy? Why our national trade is with the United States; our little fishing vessels could, in twenty-four hours, take the product of their industry and toil to the United States; if we had access to those markets, and exchange them for flour, which they would bring back free of duty and land at our own doors. Having got rid of what the late Hon. Joseph Howe called "the curse of a Canadian corn law," like the corn law which the people of England got rid of half a century ago, the people of the Maritime Provinces would not to-day

be paying 50 cents more for their flour than they would if all the restrictions imposed by the National Policy were swept away, and they had free access to the markets of the United States. I say there is not a single article which we get from Ontario, or which Ontario or Quebec gets from the Lower Provinces, that could not be got on much more favorable terms if it were permitted by the operation of the tariff. There is not a single article that we get from the Upper Provinces that we could not get better from England or the United States, if the tariff permitted us, or if we were back in the condition we were in the happy days gone by. Hon. gentlemen say that a trade is being built up, but they are forcing it at frightful expense; and I say, emphatically, that a time in the history of this country will come when different opinions will prevail, when the people will see that their interests do not lie in the policy which is advocated to-day. When that time does come, there will be a fearful retribution and a shaking of dry bones amongst those manufactures which are fostered by the policy of to-day. The Liberal party would be unworthy of its standing in this country, unworthy of its principles and its traditions, if it did not, when it had the opportunity, wipe away the condition of affairs which I have pointed out, under which the present Government are forcing trade one way, and that at an expense to the country and at a great cost and burden to the consumers. We find that, in addition to being prevented from getting articles from our neighbors, and from the old country, which we desire to get, as a whole, under the operation of this tariff, for the benefit of a few manufacturers who can subscribe large sums for election expenses, we pay very much larger sums for everything we consume than we should do under other circumstances. Gentlemen here and elsewhere have pointed out, and have taken advantage of the country in this respect, that, as they say, for the last three or four years the people should consider how cheap sugar has been, how cheap cottons have been, how cheap other articles have been during that time. We do not deny that these articles have been cheap during the last three or four years, but they have been cheap all the world over. The over-productions have been immense. The over-production of sugar has been enormous, and the improvement in machinery and the increase of mills has brought the cotton industry down to the finest possible point. But we lose all the advantage of this. Prices have gone down of late, and we have not had the advantage of it; and why? Because we are cursed by a policy which takes 25 per cent., 30 per cent., 40 and 50 per cent. out of us for the benefit of the manufacturers in order that they may have more money to subscribe for their party. I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman ask what more did the taxpayers pay to-day than they did before the National Policy? I will only take one article. If the Minister of Marine had been at the meeting of the Combines Committee the other day, he would have heard a question and an answer given there which would have satisfied him, I think, that we pay more at least than we would under other circumstances. The question was asked of one of the sugar dealers: How much does granulated sugar cost in England? His answer was, 16s. 6d. per 112 lbs. He was asked what that was a pound, and the answer was 3½ cents. He was asked what was the price in Montreal from the refiners to-day, and the reply was 6½ cents per pound. Only in that one article of sugar there is a difference of 3½ cents per pound, and that principle permeates every manufactured article, every article that every man is obliged to consume and requires for the use of his family in this country. Imagine what 3½ cents per pound of sugar means. It means from \$7.50 to \$8 a barrel. In the production of a refinery like the Canada Refinery in Montreal of 1,000 barrels a day, the gain to them and the loss to us is \$7,500 per day. If you take that principle and apply it to

Mr. Jones (Halifax).

every manufactured article in this country, hon. gentlemen can easily see that the argument adduced by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) the other day, pointing out the increased cost of living under these circumstances, was amply justified. But that is not all. The difficulty under the present condition of affairs is this: We have certain articles to dispose of wherewith we purchase our needed requirements. The farmer has his wheat and his grain, his horses and sheep, and the various articles that he cultivates and raises; the fisherman, after his hard toil, has his fish, and the lumberman has his lumber; but where does it all go? It goes to the United States, and, when it goes there, to the only market which will take it, it is met with this heavy duty, which they have to take off the product of their industry, and they have that much less when they come back to Nova Scotia with which to buy all these articles which are protected, which are raised up here for the benefit of the manufacturers, but which those people cannot do without. They cannot buy in the United States. They can only take their product there, no matter what it may be or how small it may be, and bring back the price here and invest it in articles such as this sugar at \$7.50 a barrel more than it should be. Is there any wonder that there is a mortgage of 43 per cent. on the farms of Ontario? The farmers of this country have been living, but they have not been prospering, and they have hardly known what was the matter with them, but they are realising now the condition of affairs which has taken from them the legitimate product of their industry; and I venture to say that there is a fearful reckoning coming in the near future, when these men realise the impression that they were getting these articles cheap and that they could not be produced any cheaper. I remember when the Postmaster General delivered a speech in his own county, when I had the honor of meeting him on an occasion which, I am sorry to say, did not have the desired effect. He was pointing out to his people there that the cause of all this cheap sugar, and cheap cotton, and cheap iron was the National Policy, was because the duties were so high, was because they had taken the duties up from 15 per cent. under our régime to 25 and 30 per cent. There was a little country lad sitting up in the gallery, and he said: "Well, Mr. McLellan, double the duties again, and we will get them just so much cheaper." It was a reasonable answer, and just such a one as the hon. gentleman might have expected.

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

After Recess.

Mr. JONES. When the House rose I was endeavoring to show that there had been a certain amount of inter-colonial trade as the result of Confederation, but it had been forced at a cost which was detrimental to the best interests of the country. I shall now proceed to deal with a statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who said that we had failed to show that the National Policy had injured the interests of the fishermen and the miners. I will take our coal interests in the first place, and I do not know that I could produce to this House a better or a higher authority than Mr. Lithgow, of Halifax, a gentleman who is accepted in Nova Scotia as the mouthpiece of the coal interest in that Province. Now, when the duties were imposed on foreign coal, accompanied by the increase in the tariff, Mr. Lithgow took a correct view of the situation, according to my view, and, I think, according to the views of reasonable business men. But I will let Mr. Lithgow speak for himself. Writing on this subject at that very time, he said:

"Anyone acquainted with the wants of a colliery in Nova Scotia will tell you that the new tariff about doubles the duties payable under

the old tariff, and that the duties now imposed on colliery plant and supplies average more than the duty levied on imported coal and coke. When I think how the National Policy proposed to foster our mining interests, of Mr. Tilley's proposing to impose such a duty as would give to home industry the home market, and then think of what it and he have done for the coal mines, I—well—better not write my feelings lest the Philistines rejoice. My conviction is the Cape Breton collieries are much worse off under the new than under the old tariff. They cannot now get any more for their coal; they cannot now put their coal into Ontario; they have now to pay twice as much duty as before. Messrs Redpath & Drummond, I will venture to say, make more profit within one year under the new tariff than all the Cape Breton collieries will under ten years, aye, or fifty years' protection the new tariff affords them. The Spring Hill and Pictou collieries, by means of subsidies, in the way of low railway freights, will be able to send coal into Canada, but the Cape Breton collieries, which cannot be thus favored, are in a worse position than before.'

Mr. TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman tell me the date of that letter, 1879?

Mr. JONES. Yes, I suppose it was shortly after 1879. Since then we have put 10 cents on coal more than in 1879. But if Mr. Lithgow, who, I repeat, was considered a good authority at that time, says that the duties now imposed on colliery plant and supplies average more than the duty levied on coal and coke, it is evident that 10 cents will not benefit them to any appreciable extent. Then again, since that time the duty on anthracite has been removed, which has placed them still further in an unfavorable position. Then, Sir, take the Londonderry mines. The Londonderry mines, in the county of Colchester, were established under a Nova Scotia 10 per cent. tariff. They manufactured iron there for many years. They were fairly successful for a certain time, but the moment we came into Confederation, and all these heavy duties and charges were imposed, the result was that that mine, to my great regret, became embarrassed, and it passed into the hands of a large company. It went on from year to year, and finally became bankrupt again. A year or two ago it passed into the hands of a second or third company, and I hope sincerely with better success. Still, the past history of that undertaking will serve to show how those interests have been benefited in Nova Scotia. So, if the hon. gentleman did not understand how the National Policy had failed to benefit our fishermen, I think he is hardly the man who should be at the head of that important department. And if he cannot see how the absence from freedom of exchange and from liberty to dispose of the products of their fisheries in the only market that requires them, and how, handicapped with heavy duties, these people have to send their produce to that market, at no matter what cost, I think the hon. gentleman has lived a good many years in vain. I see it was stated recently by Mr. Wiman, at a banquet in Montreal, and I have not seen his statement questioned, though I have not had the time myself to verify it from public documents, that from the expiration of the first Reciprocity Treaty, down to the present moment, the products of Canada have paid 100 million dollars into the American Treasury. Now, Sir, is it any wonder that the farmers and other interests of this country are suffering if, during that time, such a large amount has been paid by them on the products of their industry, and while they have been compelled to use that market as the only one open to them? The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) told us the other night, that the farms valued at \$300,000,000 were mortgaged to the extent of \$275,000,000, on an average 43 per cent., and 6 per cent. interest on the mortgages imposes an annual obligation of \$16,500,000. I say, Sir, this is a most startling statement. I regret that it cannot be questioned. I should have been delighted to have heard some hon. gentleman opposite show that the hon. member for Huron had overstated his case. When that hon. gentleman produced these figures, taken from the official documents of the country, and when no hon. gentleman opposite, up to the present time, has been able to contradict that statement, I say that we are brought face to face with a condition of affairs in

this country which is of a most startling character. If the farmers of that fine Province of Ontario, with its excellent climate, have been brought, after so many years under the National Policy, to the verge of bankruptcy, as described by the hon. member for Huron, I say the time has arrived when every well-wisher of this country, with a sincere desire of benefiting that large interest, should endeavor to discover some means of amelioration, whereby the products and industries of that large class of our people may in some way be relieved. Sir, if that statement is borne out, as I have no doubt it will be, by the realities of their position, the farmers of Ontario have the matter in their own hands; and I have full confidence that when this matter comes to be presented to them, and when they see on the other side of the line a market for their produce, in which it will bring as much as American produce itself—because our produce is a small affair compared with the productions of that great country, as was shown by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the other night—I say I have confidence that when the farmers of Ontario come to discuss this matter in their own homes, and over their own firesides, they will, at no very distant day, take it into their own hands and teach these Chinese-wall-protection-men on the other side of the House, these men who want to build up "rings" and foster "combines" that wring from the farmers their very last cent—I say I have confidence enough in the intelligence of the farmers of Ontario and of the Dominion at large to believe that these men will be taught a lesson that will be of a very surprising character. The policy and extravagance of our Government, which has taken on an average for the last ten years from eight to ten millions of dollars out of the people more than the actual necessities required, has been another important factor in this question. We were told, in 1878, by Sir Leonard Tilley in St. John, by the Finance Minister, and by the leader of the present Government, that we were spending too much money when we spent \$23,000,000. The people were told that if they turned out the Government and replaced the Conservatives in power, they would be able to administer the affairs of the Government for a smaller amount. And what have we seen? When the people took hon. gentleman opposite at their word and placed them in power, the annual expenditure went up year by year by leaps and bounds until he has reached nearly \$40,000,000 during the past year. We have now before us Estimates for \$35,000,000, which, no doubt, will be increased by the Supplementary Estimates to \$38,000,000 and probably \$40,000,000. I say hon. gentlemen opposite have taken from eight to ten millions more out of the consumers of the country than the necessities of the case required, and when you come to add that amount to the \$100,000,000 which have been taken out of the producers by payments on products sent to the United States, I repeat, is it a wonder that the farmers of Ontario are driven to the money-lenders for their daily wants? Is it any wonder that the farmers and fishermen, and in fact those engaged in every industry in Canada, except a few bloated manufacturers and combines, are laboring at the present moment under such severe depression? Badly as we are off undoubtedly, in the Maritime Provinces I am happy to say that I do not think the farmers there are in the same bad position.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I say I do not think they are, for this reason: We have a variety of resources in the Province of Nova Scotia, which, perhaps, no other Province in the Dominion possesses. We have not only our farming industry, but we have our fishing, and coal, and lumbering, and shipping industries, and our farmers are all, to a certain extent, more or less interested in one or more of those industries. Then, again, we have in parts of the Province of Nova Scotia a very large fruit industry which has grown up

with the old country, and which has brought hundreds of thousands of dollars into our Province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

M. JONES (Halifax). Yes. What has the National Policy to do with that? Those products are not consumed in Canada. When Providence, in its wisdom, has given us good crops in these directions, where do we find our markets? We find them in England or in the United States; and, therefore, it is that I believe the farmers in Nova Scotia are not in the same position to the same extent as are farmers in Ontario. They have lived, but they have not prospered. There is a great difference between making a daily living, comfortable though it may be, and prospering, as honest, and industrious, and hard working, and intelligent men should. In a country like ours the farmers should not only live but they should prosper, and if you take from them by placing heavy taxes on the products of their industry, while they live they cannot make any accumulations for their old age. These may not see the direct effect, and many a man is, day by day, wondering why he does not do better, and why the present times are so different to the old times when we had reciprocity with the United States. The farmer raises as many potatoes and as many cattle, he catches more fish, and yet he is compelled to ask himself the question, after a year's hard toil is over: Why are we in a different position to-day from what we were during the time the Reciprocity Treaty was in operation? The result is obvious. During reciprocity he had access to the American market, and everything rushed to that market. Our potatoes found a market in the States—there is no other market for them. The potatoes of Prince Edward Island, which is one of their chief crops, found a market there—there is no other market for them. At the present moment those potatoes are taxed 15 cents a bushel. If you estimate that an acre will produce from 200 bushels to 400 bushels, you will find, taking the lowest calculation, 200 bushels, that the duty or incumbrance placed on every acre of land cultivated in potatoes in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, amounts to \$30. Sweep away the present tariff and give us unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and what would be the result? Why, our farming industry and our farm lands would go up with a bound; every man and every farmer would know that he could put in a crop and cultivate his land, because that large country alongside of us afforded a boundless market for his enterprise. He would know that that country could take whatever he had to dispose of, and his farm would immediately improve to the extent of \$30 per acre. Take the farmers of Ontario. It is not very far out of the way to say that Ontario farms do not produce over eighteen bushels of wheat to the acre, on the average, say twenty bushels if you like. The whole value of one acre of wheat in Ontario would not amount to as much as a farmer in Nova Scotia, or Prince Edward Island, or New Brunswick, would save on the duty on potatoes sent to the United States. It must always be remembered that we have no other market for those products. Canada, as we call it in the Lower Provinces, for we call it Canada still and always will, takes no part of our products; it takes nothing from the Lower Provinces in the shape of natural products for it has its own. The West Indies take our potatoes only to a very small extent, only a few cargoes, nothing in proportion to the annual product. They don't go to England, because England sends them out, sometimes, to the United States themselves; and here we are alongside of the markets that want them, and we send them there, send them no matter what the duty may be. I do not like to repeat that here, as it might be repeated against our case when argued elsewhere, but I do repeat here, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of our farmers

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

that if the duty was 30 cents a bushel, and it only gave the farmers of the Maritime Provinces 5 cents a bushel, or even 2 cents a bushel, they are compelled to send their goods to this market. Under such a condition of affairs, when it is a matter of life or death to them, I say, Sir, with all the responsibility that belongs to the statement, that there is only one issue before us down there and that is either reciprocity or repeal. I say, Sir, that Nova Scotia when we had an opportunity and untrammelled by all the influence, and corrupt influence of a corrupt Government—I say, Sir, when we had a legitimate expression of public opinion in Nova Scotia, and when we went before the people of Nova Scotia under a proper Franchise Act, not being controlled by returning officers or corrupt revising barristers, the honest opinion of the people of Nova Scotia was in favor of repeal. If there is anything that is going to make them contented with the Union to-day, it is to make them feel that the people here, who are responsible for the policy of the country at the present momentous time, are laboring to secure them a market which will open to them a channel by which they may realise the fruits of their industry. I say, and I repeat it again, that there is only one course open to them, and I say it here as I have said it before in my own county and elsewhere, there is only one question for us in the Maritime Provinces to-day—that is reciprocity or repeal. If you do not choose to labor to give us unrestricted reciprocity with the United States that feeling of repeal which is latent to-day will spring up again in all its force.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). It is dead long ago.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear."

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). He said repeal was dead and buried long ago.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). It is dead.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman will find out in his own county, if he ventures to follow his party to the extent which his approval would appear to indicate; he will find, if he goes to the electors of Nova Scotia at no distant date, what the public sentiment is on that particular point. I listened to the hon. gentleman from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) this afternoon, when he referred to this question. He taunted us to go to the country and obtain an expression of opinion on the policy we advocate. Sir, we are not in a position to go to the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What I say, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not in a position to advise or control a dissolution of this House, but, Sir, the hon. gentleman and his friends are in that position, and let them dare to go to the country; let them if they dare go to the country on this question of unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish for one moment to explain to the hon. gentleman. I did not suggest he ought to go to the country in that sense. I suggested he ought to take a favorable opportunity for holding an election for the office of poundkeeper upon the annexation platform.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I suppose the hon. gentleman, under those circumstances, is prepared to be the candidate. I say, Sir, when the hon. gentleman who is challenging this side of the House with temerity and desired us to open a constituency and try the question of unrestricted reciprocity, that one constituency would do no good. Let him and his friends dissolve this House and go to the country, and then we will see a corporal's guard, scarcely, of those honorable, patriotic gentlemen who are willing to suffer for their country but do not seem disposed to die for their country. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Cardwell

(Mr. White) said that Montreal and Toronto were very prosperous. I am glad to hear it, and it is only natural that it should be so. I am glad to hear it, I repeat, as I am always glad to hear of any part of the Dominion or any other place being prosperous. But, Sir, it is very easy of explanation. We know that since this Government has been in power, within the last ten years, they have added within a fraction of one hundred million dollars to the gross public debt of this country. We know that they have taken from eighty to one hundred million dollars more than they ought to have done out of the taxpayers of this country by the iniquitous National Policy. We know, Sir, that those two large sums of money going into circulation, and that Montreal and Toronto being the centres of commerce in the east and west of the old Provinces of Canada, must naturally have a great share of the advantage. We know, Sir, that those large centres of commerce attract the largest amount of capital, and the property which had been distributed through the Dominion, by means of those expenditures of from one hundred and eighty to two hundred million dollars, has borne its fruit and those cities have been advanced. They have been advanced in no other way; they have been advanced at the cost of the whole of the rest of the Dominion; and just as long as those large cities go on and prosper in this way the rural districts will suffer to that extent. But, Sir, have they improved as much as it would appear from this statement. I notice that, at a public meeting of the Board of Trade called at Montreal the other day, Mr. Drummond, that eminent sugar refiner of Montreal, who is the president, delivered an address, which I think the hon. gentlemen opposite would find very instructive if they read it. The speech was with reference to the Government assuming the debt of the Harbor Commission in Montreal. I do not propose offering an opinion upon the assumption of that debt, but I will say this much, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been a much more legitimate appropriation of the public funds of this country to cheapen the harbor in Montreal and reduce the expense attending the imports and exports of that large centre of commerce, than to have given the large sum of money they did give to a member of their administration to build up a rival railway to the Intercolonial, which is owned by the Government of the country. Now, Sir, what did Mr. Drummond say?

"In opening the meeting he spoke in a manner that was little short of mutinous to his friends at Ottawa. Hitherto, he said, the impression had prevailed that Montreal would come out all right, no matter what happened; but now there was no use mincing matters, and it must be stated openly that this city had arrived at a crisis in its history. The charges in the harbor of Montreal were three or four times as great as those in the port of New York, and whilst the exports of the country had gone on increasing enormously during the last ten years the trade of Montreal had remained almost stationary. Montrealers had for years been amusing themselves in discussing plans for remedying the evil, but nothing really had been done, and, to-day, they were forced to acknowledge that Montreal was not in a position to compete with American ports. Outward exports were taking the route by way of New York, because carriage alone was charged and all dues were abolished. This was not a Montreal question, but a national question, and it was gratifying to find that over one hundred members of the House of Commons had pledged their support to it."

It evidently seemed that they had done a little log-rolling around the House, and had secured the promised support of one hundred members of the House of Commons,—

"The time had arrived for plain speaking. The port of Montreal was hastening with rapid strides to a condition of bankruptcy."

This is one of the cities which has been so highly favored by the National Policy. And Mr. Drummond continues:

"The income of the harbor commissioners was not sufficient to carry on the ordinary routine work of the port, and the inevitable result of bankruptcy or repudiation was close at hand, unless the Government took immediate action."

Now, whether Mr. Drummond was right or wrong, that statement on the face of it does not convey the *couleur de*

rose aspect of the prosperity of Montreal, which hon. gentlemen on the other side seem so desirous to make out. Hon. gentlemen have stated during this debate that this policy was going to injure the manufacturers. I need not go into that branch of the question, because my hon. friends who preceded me have dealt with that question in such an exhaustive manner that it is completely unanswerable. Let me take one or two illustrations. It is evident, if the public prints can be relied on, that the Ontario manufacturers are not all of that opinion. We have seen from day to day statements made by Ontario manufacturers that they are not apprehensive of the result of unrestricted reciprocity; and these are men with a knowledge of their business, with ample capacity and industry. I say that wherever a manufactory was established under proper management previous to the introduction of the National Policy, it has succeeded, if not to the great extent of late years, to a sufficient extent to yield a fair return on the capital invested. My hon. friend the other night quoted also Mr. Gibson, one of the oldest and most enterprising business men of the Province of New Brunswick, who has built up a large cotton mill in that Province. He was interviewed on this question, and what was his answer? He said: "So far from my dreading unrestricted reciprocity, or apprehending any difficulty in connection with my industry from it, I should feel gratified because it would open up to me a market of 65,000,000 people, instead of 4,500,000 as at present;" and Mr. Gibson is a man whose judgment as a business man is relied on more than that of almost any other man in the Province of New Brunswick, and, I may say, in the Province of Nova Scotia as well. He was able to gauge the condition of his Province so well that, when the question was put to him, he was ready to answer at once and emphatically that, so far from his apprehending anything disadvantageous to his cotton industry, unrestricted reciprocity was just what he desired to see carried into effect. Then, I am informed by an hon. member of this House that, the other day, one of the proprietors of the new sugar refinery to be built in Montreal, in conversation, said: "We are putting in all our machinery of the most improved pattern, and are building our refinery according to the most improved methods, and if the unrestricted policy prevails, and we have a market in the United States, then, instead of having our market overcrowded every little while, we shall be able to compete successfully in all the border and western States with the American refiners." Does anyone doubt a statement like that? Why should not our refineries in the Lower Provinces, and in Montreal as well, be able to do a large portion of the business in the American border States? Our climate is good, our labor is cheap, our coal is cheap, and we have capital for our enterprises, and instead of these large refining industries every little while being brought to a dead stop by orders from the head centre, or being limited in their production by orders to produce only so many barrels a day, so that a great many men are thrown out of employment—instead of having that condition of affairs, which will grow worse with the advent of another refinery to compete with them in the market, all these things would be changed, and they would have a constant market which would enable them to keep their enterprises going and give ample employment to their men all the year round. That is a consideration which may not have occurred to those less familiar than I am with that branch of trade. The refining industry of this country would be one of the first to reap the advantage of unrestricted reciprocity. I have said that we have cheap labor. Can anyone doubt that after the exposure made in the city of Quebec, the other day, before the Labor Commission? I noticed by a paper published here that the last statement made there gave the startling fact that mill hands in the city of Quebec could only get 35 cents a day, and that women were laboring in the match factories of Quebec

for 15 cents a day. Is it any wonder that the people emigrate to the United States? Is it any wonder that these people should be dissatisfied? Why, one of our Nova Scotian or Canadian girls, who goes to the United States as a domestic servant, is able to earn from \$14 to \$20 a month with her board, while a poor girl in the Province of Quebec, who, perhaps, cannot leave her home, is laboring there for \$3.50 a month and paying her board. If there is anything to show that we would be able to compete in the matter of labor with the people of the United States, it would be that startling fact which was revealed before the Labor Commission the other day. Now, Sir, I will give you a statement with regard to the general condition of affairs in the Province of Nova Scotia, made in a letter written by a gentleman in Halifax, who worked as hard as any man in that city to defeat me in 1878, and succeeded. This gentleman has more small properties in the city of Halifax, and controls more investments, than any other man in that city to-day. I refer to Mr. James Thompson. Some one having stated that the value of property would not decrease in Halifax, Mr. Thompson wrote as follows:—

"I saw in the report of a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce a few days since that one of the merchants of this city had asserted that the real estate of the Province had increased at least 50 per cent. since Confederation. I was somewhat surprised at the statement, and am anxious to know from what sources the facts are derived which would warrant such a conclusion.

"Some years since I took the trouble to get the amount of the assessment rolls of some of the counties of this Province, and arrived at an entirely opposite conclusion. Taking four leading counties, representing the four of our leading industries—Cape Breton as representing the coal mining interest; Antigonish as representing the farming interest; Hants as representing the ship-building interest, and Queen's as representing the lumbering interest, and we will find that the assessment rolls amounted in 1863 to \$11,316,000, while in 1884—at the time he was writing—they had decreased to less than \$3,000,000."

That is the effect it had with us, and since that time I may say that, so far from having improved in value, their value has become less and less from day to day, until, in the city of Halifax, at least, it is almost impossible to sell property at all. I notice in a St. John paper to-day the advertisements of property to be disposed of at public auction, and the auctioneer puts at the foot of the advertisements this notice: "Any bid will be accepted that will more than pay for the taxes and the water rates." Well, we have had a large amount of property sold for taxes in Halifax. At one time last year, there were some two hundred or three hundred properties advertised for sale under the sheriff's hammer, and on one occasion a valuable wharf property, which had a few years ago been sold for \$40,000, only realised just one half that amount. You can go through the streets of Halifax, from one end of the city to the other, and I do not hesitate to say that, on enquiry, you will find that since our free trade with the United States was put an end to, the value of property in the city of Halifax has fallen more than 50 per cent. A condition of affairs equally disastrous exists in other parts of the Provinces. Now, I come to the fishermen. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries must be very unqualified to fill the position he holds, if he does not know more about the interests of our fishermen and the way unrestricted reciprocity would benefit them than he was disposed to admit the other night. Perhaps the hon. gentleman in the receipt of his \$7,000 a year, hardly understands the hardships and toil which our fishermen go through from year to year. Is he aware that, at one or two o'clock in the morning, these men rise from their beds, light their candles, cook their frugal meals, and go out in their small boats miles from the land, encountering heavy weather, in cold and rainy seasons, and come back in the afternoon with the product of their day's labor—may be a few barrels of mackerel or herring or a few quintals of codfish? What are they to do with their harvest? These men know when they catch the mackerel, that their

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

only market is in the United States; they know that only a few of the fish go to the West Indies; they know that every mackerel caught along the Atlantic coast, in the Province of Nova Scotia, of a valuable character—what we call our fat mackerel—must go to the United States, even if the duty were \$10 a barrel. These fish do not go to the old Provinces of Canada, they do not go to England, they cannot go to the West Indies, because being fat they will not keep in that hot climate; so that every barrel of mackerel, no matter what the duty may be, and no matter if it brings only a net return of one or two dollars a barrel, must go to the United States or be thrown overboard or allowed to rot. I hold in my hand the statement of a vessel which, in 1885, the year after the Reciprocity Treaty was terminated, landed 800 barrels of mackerel in the port of Boston. That may seem a large amount to any one not familiar with the question, and it is a large amount, far above the average. These men, under ordinary circumstances, would have been able to realise a very fair return, but when they went to the United States and had to pay the duty of \$2 a barrel, what was the result? From their hard labor, from the 15th June to the 30th October, in rain and shine, in calm and storm, exposed to all the inclemency of that boisterous Atlantic coast, these hardy fishermen only realised, after all that long, hard summer's toil and labor, the paltry sum of \$30 a piece. Can such a condition of affairs be allowed to exist while a remedy is possible? Can such a condition of affairs be allowed to remain, if there is within sight a possible arrangement which will open a market to the product of these hardy men? The Government would be unworthy of the position they occupy if they did not strain every effort, if they did not use every possible influence to open this market. I am not sanguine that we are going to convince any hon. gentleman on the other side. I know how strong is their party allegiance, I know that they will follow their leader, and that we cannot expect to convert them; but I know that we have an intelligent constituency behind every one of them, and it is to those men we are appealing. It is to the intelligent constituencies that we are addressing our observations to-day, and it is possible that some Robert Peel may come out from the ranks of the Tory party to carry a great measure as that illustrious statesman did the great measure of the abolition of the corn laws of England. It may be that some shaft, some argument, may go forth, which will reach the hearts and the convictions of some leader on that side, who, when he sees the momentous interests involved in a trade with 65,000,000 people alongside of us, and sees that by his efforts he may forward a scheme which is going to make two great peoples to a certain extent one, which is going to allay a great deal of the acrimony and disputes which have prevailed for years past, which is going to do a service and not a disservice to the old country, who, when he realises that England and America are the two greatest countries, and may together bid defiance to the world, and that a peaceful alliance with the United States in our trade relations, and a peaceful settlement of the Irish question, which, I am proud to say I have always advocated, and which I believe to be nearer accomplishment to-day than it ever was at any time in the history of that country,—are now, more than ever, desirable,—who, when he sees the immediate possibility of bringing these two great nations together in peaceful alliance and harmonious working, a great Anglo-Saxon race, will not be untrue to his own judgment, will not be faithless to his duty, and allow his prejudices to control him, but will give this matter the consideration we have a right to expect from every hon. gentleman here. What is the position of these fishermen to-day? \$500,000 per year is what the fishermen of this country, under the present policy of restriction, pay to the revenue of the United States; that is when they have a

fair catch. All that would be changed, and the \$500,000 would go into the pockets of our own fishermen.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

M. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says no, but he is not sufficiently familiar, possibly, with that branch of the subject to know. As pointed out by the hon. member for Norfolk the other day, that, while we catch a certain quantity of fish, the Americans catch a much larger quantity. The price of these articles is settled by what the Americans produce themselves; and the quantity which we send, which is small to them but great to us, will go there and will not affect the price in their market, and we will obtain the same value. Does anyone suppose that the fishing industry of this country is to remain in the position we find it to-day? Does any hon. member desire that it shall always be kept in the same condition, that there shall be no further development of that great industry which a benign Providence has placed within our reach? What is the use of developing it to any further extent if we have no market? What is the use of our people making efforts to build new vessels, to send out new crews and to catch more fish, if we have no market for them? The market of the United States is the only market we can ever look to, to successfully develop, to any extent, that great fishing industry along our shores. Looking at its position to-day, it is a matter of life or death to them down on the shore. One hon. gentleman quoted a statement from the Halifax Chamber of Commerce to show that the fishing industry was fairly profitable. What was said was not very committal one way or the other. They said that the prices were low in the early part of the season, but that, as they had advanced considerably later in the season, the result of the year's fishery had been fairly successful. How was that brought about? If the hon. gentleman had known this fact, perhaps he would not have given this the prominence he did. In the early part of the season fish were very low. Then we found that we had hardly a good catch. That was not, however, the important factor. The fisheries in St. Pierre-Miquelon, which had been so much reduced the previous year, in spite of the ruinous bounty of 10 francs per quintal, were still further reduced, and they did not send out one-half of the number they sent out the previous year, and so reduced the catch of the previous season. The catch in Newfoundland was short, and it was almost a failure in Labrador; and then came the news that the great Norwegian fishery, one of the largest in the world, counted by millions, had been a failure to a very great extent. When all this was known in the consuming markets of Europe and elsewhere, of course there was an advance in fish, and our men to that extent realised an advantage; but we cannot hope to expect, and we do not desire to see any such condition of affairs again. However, if it had not been for that condition of affairs, had it not been for the failure in all these places to which I have referred, the fishing interest in Nova Scotia would have been a very poor affair last year. But what had it been for the few years previous? If the hon. gentleman had been really interested in that question, he would have known that in the three previous years, instead of that industry being productive at all, the men had barely made a living. Prices were so low, while the catches were large, and the United States markets were closed to them, that our own people, as well as those in Newfoundland, reduced their outfit and their catches as well. But, give us access to the United States market, give us access to the fifty or sixty millions of people alongside of us, then our fishing industry, with the millions and millions which are involved in it, would go forward with leaps and bounds, and there would be such an increase in that branch of commerce as would give wealth to that part of the country. The hon. gentleman asked us what was a natural market? And he said that France, if nearness was to

be considered, was a more natural market for England than some of the distant places with which England had much greater commercial relations. The hon. gentleman might have stated his case with equal force if he had given us the whole condition of affairs, if he had stated that there were only two countries in the world with which England had greater trade relations than with the French nation alongside of her, and those are India and the United States. India, with its millions of people, must be and naturally will be for a very long time the greatest market that England possesses, and the United States, that Anglo-Saxon country, is the next greatest consumer of her products; but the French nation, alongside of her, was also valuable to her, as \$250,000,000 were taken by the French during the year, according to the public records, and, although the hon. gentleman may not think that a very large amount, I consider it sufficient to establish the fact that, but for the immediate proximity of France to England, but for the free trade policy, inaugurated to some extent by Mr. Cobden and subsequently carried out, to a certain extent, introducing better trade relations between those countries, it would not have amounted to the large sum it did. I would like the hon. the Minister of Marine to go along our coast when he visits Halifax next year, instead of allowing his gunboat to go down the shore electioneering in the county of Shelburne, instead of sending her down there to sound along every little harbor in the county of Shelburne, but of course not to make promises. Oh, no; we have the word of the gallant member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), that he made no promises; I do not say he did, but I say that, when he went down on board that Dominion gunboat, with the Dominion flag flying over his head, and the so-called engineer going into every port along that coast and sounding, and saying this would be a nice place for a wharf, and that would be a nice place for a breakwater, and you must require a lighthouse here—I do not say he made any promises, but the inference would be natural. If the Minister of Marine, instead of allowing his navy to be employed in that way, would go along our coasts himself and judge of all these questions, I think he would be in a much better position to give an opinion. He would find there one thing. He would find that our hardy fishermen are leaving us and going to the United States, as I am sorry to say. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) would say that sentiment should keep them at home and let them starve. Sentiment is very strong, but a man cannot live on sentiment alone, and, when these hardy fishermen go out in one of our own vessels and fish by the side of an American vessel, and the American vessel takes 1,000 quintals of fish, and our vessel takes 1,000 quintals of fish, and our own men are on board that American vessel and go into an American port, and get 50 cents a quintal more than the man who lands his fish in Nova Scotia, I say that sentiment will stand a very short time against such an argument as that. I know, from my own experience, that a large number of vessels last season were prevented from going into the fishery because they could not obtain the crews, because the men had all gone to the United States. Go down to the Island of Cape Breton. My hon. friends from Cape Breton here will bear me out—

Gen. LAURIE. Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman confirms my statement, as I knew he would from his frankness. But I say, go down to the Island of Cape Breton, and there you will find that almost all the population, a large number of people there who used to be engaged in our shore fishery, have gone to the United States.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I know better, for I am engaged in that business myself. Years ago we used to have tens of

thousands of valuable shore fish brought to the Halifax market and exported all over the world; that branch of commerce, as far as regards the shore fishery, is a thing of the past. Those men have gone banking, under the new condition of affairs; and when they found that our fishing vessels could not fish on as favorable terms as the Americans, they emigrated to the States and engaged on board American vessels. When they go there they make acquaintances, acquaintance leads to friendship, friendship leads to settlement, and settlement generally leads to marriage, and the United States reaps the advantage we lose from their industry. This operation has been repeated from year to year, as the years roll round. Now, Sir, the National Policy was started, if I remember rightly—I do not wish to misrepresent the Government—with four objects. The first was to encourage manufactures, second to increase our trade with England, third to reduce our trade with the United States, and fourth to secure reciprocity. Now, let us examine for one moment how far these objects have been secured. Take the manufactures first. Certain manufactures, no doubt, have been established in certain parts of the Dominion, and certain manufacturers have made large sums of money. There were large manufactures before the National Policy, which yielded a fair return. Take the city of Halifax, which I represent—what did the National Policy lead to there? I venture to say that, so far as the Province of Nova Scotia is concerned, the operation of the National Policy has been a curse instead of a blessing. What do we see with reference to the Halifax sugar refinery; \$400,000 were put in that refinery. It went on for a year or two, but it lost all its capital, and owed the bank \$250,000 besides. The bank sold out the property to the present proprietors, minus \$100,000 which they lost; therefore there was just half a million dollars lost in the Halifax sugar refinery since it started. What it may do in the future I do not know, I only hope it may have a successful career. Then, again, you take the sugar refinery across the harbor. It was built by English capitalists at a cost of \$700,000, and was one of the most thorough refineries in the country. It ran about twelve months and then failed. It was taken over by the bondholders for less than \$300,000, and is now starting under their management. Therefore, taking these two operations alone, I show you most conclusively—no man can gainsay it—that in the city of Halifax alone, there has been one million dollars wasted, lost to the capitalists of that country—let alone the cotton factory in Halifax, the stock of which would not bring 50 cents in the market to-day, costing \$350,000. That is the beneficent effect of the National Policy so far as we are concerned. Well, Sir, have they increased our trade with England, and diminished it with the United States, as they promised? We find that our exports to England, in 1878, were \$45,941,000; in 1887, they amounted to \$44,571,000, or \$1,369,693 less in 1887 than in 1878. Then, take our exports to the United States. We were not going to do any more business with the United States, remember; we were going to teach them a lesson and build up a Chinese wall. Our exports to the United States in 1878 amounted to \$25,244,898; in 1887, to \$37,660,199, or an increase of \$12,415,000 during that time. Then take the aggregate. In 1878, the aggregate with Great Britain was \$83,372,279; in 1887, \$89,534,079, or a gain of \$6,162,760. Then take the United States. The aggregate trade in 1878 was \$73,876,437; in 1887, \$82,767,265 or a gain of \$8,890,728. Therefore, in this respect you will see that so far from the National Policy increasing our commercial relations with England, it has reduced them; and so far from decreasing our trade with the United States it has increased it; in these two respects it has been a total failure. Now, Sir, what we want below, as I said before, is free access to our customers across the line. We are here 4½ millions of people, speaking the same language, as has often been observed, with the same natural tendencies for trade, with

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

the same industry, I hope, and with the same capability for business, I believe. I say, Sir, that if you can bring these two countries into closer commercial relations, and by some arrangement acceptable to the people of the United States, entered into at this favorable moment, when the people of the United States seem to be considering this question, if the Government can make a proposal to them which will bring about such a change as I have indicated, then I think we shall be fortunate indeed. We want, moreover, in any arrangement made the coasting trade free to us from the Atlantic to San Francisco. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, what effect it would have upon the great ship-building interests of the Lower Provinces, of the Province of Quebec, and, of course, of the western Provinces as well. We are naturally situated for ship-building all along the Atlantic coast. There is not a harbor along that long coast line, there is not a creek on the eastern or western shores but where you will see small vessels, and vessels of very considerable tonnage, being built year by year. They can be built more economically with us than in the United States, because the wood is at our hands, and they are built by our own people largely during the season when there is no other employment or occupation. Imagine, I say, if you throw open to the people of the Maritime Provinces that great boon, the right to buy American ships or to sell our vessels in their market, what an impetus it would give along our sea coast. The Americans cannot compete with us as regards the cost of vessels. I repeat that their wood is more expensive, and there is a difference in values of about twenty-five or thirty per cent. This has always given us a certain advantage in our fishing outfits and enterprises, and if we had access to their markets, from Maine to California, it would open up a wide field for our sailors and fishermen, of which they would immediately take advantage, and we would see hundreds of vessels built along our coast for employment in the coasting trade of the United States. In all this matter there is no one question greater than this: reciprocal coasting trade and reciprocal registration of vessels. I listened the other night, with a good deal of amusement, to a quotation made by the Minister of the Interior from a speech or document purporting to be written or spoken by the late lamented Hon. George Brown. I thought that if dead men's bones could rattle in their graves, or if a voice could come to us from the tombs, what maledictions would we hear from that old Reformer, that any utterance of his should ever be construed into an approval of the monstrous policy under which this country is laboring at the present moment. That old Reformer who devoted his whole life to freeing commerce from its shackles, to securing for us free trade, and to promoting the good of his fellow man, would have been the last man to have countenanced such a policy, and he would have scorned the idea that any sentiment that he ever uttered, or any word he ever wrote, could be brought forward in support of the policy of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. No, he lived in different times under different circumstances. He lived in times when commerce was free; when it was not necessary for a householder to go hat in hand to ask a "combine" if he might buy so many pounds of sugar. He did not live in a time when a housemaid on going to a grocery store had to ask most humbly from the "ring," "combine," or guild, or whatever they call it, whether she might buy a bottle of pickles. He did not live in a time when a boy on going to a store had humbly to ask permission to buy a box of matches valued at two cents. All these are natural consequences of "combines" and guilds. Does any man suppose the Hon. George Brown would approve any such conditions and the imposition of such burdens on the trade and commerce of the country? No; he lived in different times. He lived in times such as are indicated by Tennyson when describing the glorious reign of her present Majesty; he said:

" And statesmen at her council met
Who knew the seasons when to take
Occasion by the hand, and make
The bounds of freedom wider yet."

We in this matter are bound to go forward, and this question has come to stay. We are bound to carry it to a successful conclusion. It may not be this year or next year, but within a few years the hon. gentlemen opposite will remember what I am telling them to-night, that public opinion in this country will not sustain the action which they are going to adopt, that public opinion will be in harmony with the sentiments proposed by the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and the policy embodied in the resolution of the hon. member from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). We are going to make this the great question of the country for some time to come. We believe the people will approve our efforts; we believe, when they are educated, they will see the vital importance it is going to be to every industry in which they are concerned, and they will come to our assistance. We are going into the battle, and we are going to inscribe on our banners as the watchword, as the motto, as the text of the Liberal party, these noble sentiments, echoed by the Secretary of State for the American Union, Mr. Bayard, who, when writing to a friend a short time ago, said: "Providence has made us neighbors, let wisdom make us friends." Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I beg to move the following amendment to the amendment:—

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that, during the continuance of any such arrangement, the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. TUPPER (Picton). I was somewhat surprised, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, after a statement made with such assurance and with such exultation by the hon. gentleman who has led the other side in this debate, that from the Maritime Provinces especially should come a wail for unrestricted reciprocity. I was somewhat surprised, I say, Mr. Speaker, under those circumstances that when a question said to be exciting such an amount of interest among the business people of the Maritime Provinces was brought before us by a gentleman old in politics, a gentleman well acquainted with political strategy, a member representing his party from the Province of Nova Scotia, to see him travelling back to the dusty journals of this House for 1867, in order to attempt to bring arguments to bear against the Liberal-Conservative party on a charge of having been at one time disloyal to the interests of the Empire. It struck me as a curious commentary upon the boasted strength of their principles, initiated in bringing the main resolution before this House, that an hon. gentleman holding the position that the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Jones) the senior member from his county does, that he thought it necessary, and thought it wise, to labor, and hopelessly labor for some minutes before the Parliament of Canada with an argument so puerile and so weak. The hon. gentleman devoted some time to calling the attention of the House to what his contention actually was, that contention being that the language which he quoted from the mouth of Lord Elgin, representing the Crown in this country, conveyed sentiments traitorous to the Crown and sentiments at variance to the sentiment which brought about the connection of this country with the mother country, and which serves to this day to maintain that connection. It seems strange to me that the hon. gentleman had not read a little more diligently the journals of 1867, since he turned his attention to old and ancient literature, because on page 248 of the same volume he would have found that that Parliament by him thought

to be so disloyal, by him thought to be so in favor of sentiments of independence from the mother country, had resolved:

"That in the opinion of this House the interests as well of the British Empire as of the Dominion and of the several Provinces of which it is composed will be best promoted by the maintenance and consolidation of the existing Union, and that this House confidently trusts that due attention to the interests of the people of the whole Dominion and a wise and judicious course of legislation will result in the general acceptance of the Union to the inhabitants of the Dominion and conduce to the well-being and harmony of the whole country."

In support of that resolution he would have found the names of gentlemen whom I hope it is not unparliamentary to mention by name, and which I do for convenience sake, the names of Cartwright, Mackenzie and Mills—landmarks that perhaps might have induced him to steer clear of a point such as the one he had raised. I think the hon. gentlemen in this House will have been amazed when they reflect that before six o'clock the arguments of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) were so few, that the arguments of the hon. gentleman were so weak, that up to that time he had hardly reached the resolution, and hon. gentleman will be just as surprised that a gentleman occupying the prominent position that he does in mercantile business in the Province of Nova Scotia, and dealing as he said himself every day in the fish market, selling fish and buying fish, that that hon. gentleman, acquainted as he is with all the different branches of trade, and knowing the circumstances of our trade in that Province, has not attempted to deal with the resolution before the House. So far as he touched the question of reciprocity he argued for a long time (and most of the members of the House agreed with him) in favor of the Treaty of 1854. He went on to show that the interchange of articles mentioned and enumerated in that Treaty had been beneficial to both countries alike, and that in the Maritime Provinces there was a strong wish for the renewal of that interchange. No man to-day attempts to gainsay that statement. But when for a moment the hon. gentleman did allude to the resolution before the House he showed, as strongly as he could show, the strength of the position of this side of the House on that question. Then he said if this contemplated move, this contemplated turn of affairs, "change of front" I think he called it, meant direct taxation, that he for one would call "stay your hand." Yet he had the direct statement made by his leader in this debate, he had a long and able argument before him to show that direct taxation was not such a terrible thing. He had before him the unmistakable utterances of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that direct taxation would ensue from the passage of this resolution.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. TUPPER (Picton). I quote his words to do him justice:

"Can they afford for the sake of gaining advantages amounting from fifteen to thirty millions to submit to a direct taxation of two millions or three millions temporarily. I should say if the necessity existed the people would cheerfully submit to the impost."

Mr. CHARLTON. Notwithstanding, I distinctly said that it was my belief direct taxation would not be resorted to.

Mr. TUPPER (Picton). We have had the expression of the belief of those hon. gentlemen oftentimes before. We have also the experience between 1874 and 1879 that no calculation ever made by the financial leader of that party, in reference to either the revenue or taxation, was ever borne out by the facts, and that no prophecies ever made by him at any one time were ever verified by our experience in those sad and troublesome years. It did amuse me to-night, and I am sure it amused hon. gentlemen in this House generally, to hear some of the sentiments enunciated by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). He apparently, to use an old phrase, came "cringingly" up to

one issue that stared him in the face, and that was that he had to take back a great many sentiments and a great many principles propounded by him in public in his own Province, and in this House, and in the Chamber of Commerce of the city he represents. He knew, and therefore feared that those utterances would be brought against him, and he pretended to go over the whole of them, stating some of them, and endeavoring to follow his leader by spurning and treating with contempt any charge of inconsistency. But it did amuse me, Mr. Speaker, and it somewhat pleased me as a Canadian, to hear the hon. gentleman, who, within this House, last Session, indignantly denied that he was a Canadian in any other sense than by an Act of Parliament which he abused and which he villified, declare to-night, after his leader from Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) that he was going to follow the banner that had upon it the inscription "Let us consider the interests of Canada first," and not only so, Mr. Speaker, but I remember that this hon. gentleman fought under a banner only a year ago—hardly a year ago—which had inscribed upon it "Nova Scotia for the Nova Scotians against Canada for the Canadians"; under a banner upon which was inscribed the words "Don't forget that repeal means reciprocity; only by repeal can we get reciprocity," and yet he adds to this new banner which he flaunts in the air to-day the words "reciprocity or repeal," thus reversing all of the mottoes and every old standard in that respect. No one can blame him. His leader in this debate, the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has boldly announced that there is a complete change of face, and that his party are to a unit upon the principle to which they were diametrically opposed a short time ago. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in all earnestness, and I ask through you the people of this country, whether hon. gentlemen in this House representing the interests of Canada, representing the interests of their constituents, can so glibly go behind a record? I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if it is merely a charge of inconsistency with which they are now met? In my opinion the position of the Liberal party, as announced in this House and in this debate, is of a far more serious character than that which they suppose. They cannot go behind the record in that manner. They cannot say that what they thought a few years ago or a year ago can be all upset now. The hon. member for South Oxford said he would not waste time over charges of inconsistency. I say that the charges standing against him to-day, brought in this debate and still unanswered, are charges of a gross breach of faith on the part of the great political party for which he speaks—charges of a violation of distinct and emphatic pledges made by the leaders of his party all over the country more than a year ago to capital and labor, which have embarked so much in this country under those pledges. From 1867 almost down to 1887 every capitalist and laborer in Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, had the right to believe that both political parties in the country were pledged to reciprocity in the natural products of the two countries, and no other. Not only by the statements of their leader at Malvern, but by resolutions moved in this House, it is clear that both parties in this Parliament had pledged to the manufacturing interests that their money was safe.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou.) An hon. gentleman says "no," but he in his position is bound to say "no" to any proposition propounded by us in this debate. Hon. gentlemen opposite are in a desperate position, and they are safe to say "no" when their late leader is on the other of the ocean. But that leader, when he said he spoke not only for himself, but for the party he represented, and especially for Sir Richard Cartwright—for he named him—that leader pledged his

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou.)

party not to play the bull in the China shop if they were returned to power at the last election; but you have never seen more furious bulls than the hon. gentlemen who have attacked the manufacturers and the vested interests of this country. They speak as if these men alone are guilty of these horrible combinations in trade, although they know that guilds have invaded other countries than Canada, even England, the mother of free trade. But it is a serious charge which I bring against these hon. gentlemen, and it cannot be answered in a flippant manner, but must be squarely met; and I will ask the House to listen to some proofs which I will adduce in support of it. We had an admitted organ of the Liberal party in 1880 using this language:

"What is the main promise of those who wish to detach the Dominion from Great Britain in order to make the country a preserve for Yankee manufacturers, who are totally unable to compete with British manufactures on fair terms? That the producers of our raw exports may gain free admission to a market of 50,000,000 people. The inference which it is hoped that ignorant people will draw is that the whole American people would straightway wish to purchase Canadian produce if a Zollverein were established. But free admission to the markets of California, Oregon, Nevada, Idaho, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Kansas, Missouri, Kentucky, Arkansas, and dozens of other States would cause about as much Canadian produce to be sold there as could be sold to the inhabitants of the moon. Of the 50,000,000 people assumed to exist in the United States how many live in a locality to trade with Canada? Parts of the half-dozen States lying east of longitude 96° and between parallels of latitude 40° and 45° contain the people with whom we are asked to form a commercial union, taking their manufactures at exorbitant prices. One little corner of the 'market of 50,000,000 people' is offered to Canadians as the price of their national extinction! Men who advocate a base surrender of their country for money do not cease to be disgusting though they become also ridiculous when it is evident they are duped by their own sordid imagination."

I am reading from the *Toronto Globe*. Again on June 8, that paper said:

"Who can name any great staple that does not command as high a price in England as in the United States? The American farmer gets no more for his grain than his Canadian competitor, as is evident from the fact that both send their produce to the English market. It may be said that Canadian barley would rise in price if admitted free to the American market. How long would the enhanced price be continued? Only till a greater breadth of Canadian soil was devoted to raising the grain."

Then, again, the same paper said:

"The average yearly value of fish exports from Canada during the seven years between the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty and the fiscal operation of the Treaty of Washington, from 1867 to 1873, was \$4,003,375, of which \$1,137,839 worth was imported into the United States, and \$2,865,535 worth was absorbed by other markets. Thus, under a tariff meant to be prohibitive, 28 per cent. was marketed in the United States, and 72 per cent. in other countries. In the six years which have transpired since the removal of duties under the Washington Treaty, from 1874 to 1879, these exports have averaged \$5,971,867, of which \$1,720,156 worth was imported into the United States, and \$4,251,731 worth found other markets. The percentage to the United States was a trifle over 28, and that to other countries was a fraction over 71. Whilst the annual increase of fish trade during this latter period average \$1,958,512, only \$582,317 worth represents exports to the United States, the business with other markets having increased to the extent of \$1,386,196 yearly average."

It went on to show that the Americans paid any duty which they placed upon Canadian fish. That was the position of the organ at that time, and it is perfectly reasonable for hon. gentlemen to claim that they are not on every occasion, perhaps not on any occasion, to be held bound by the utterances of that paper. But, as I can show, that paper voiced not only the opinions of the party, but of the country in that most unmistakable manner. The senior member for Halifax has admitted that he has made statements contrary in spirit to the arguments he now advances, and he does not hesitate to tell us that his political morality is of that high order that, under the exigencies of the case, he felt that it was justifiable that we should deceive the Americans—it was not right that we should stand up in the face of day and tell the truth about the state of trade in Canada, we had to mark carefully the effect any utterances of ours would have on the Americans; and he fulminated

charges against the leader of the Government and other men in the Cabinet, because in discussing grave questions in this House they had given expression to their thoughts. And this political moralist confesses as much as that he has supported the statements I have made; but whether he confesses it or not, I will show from the record that it is impossible for him to gainsay the fact. For instance, when the Washington Treaty was before the House—and I may say that this extract as well as some others the hon. gentleman took care not to read—the hon. gentleman said:

"He felt as a representative from Nova Scotia that, however anxious he might be for the establishment of reciprocal trade relations with the United States on fair terms, he was not willing to give the United States everything that we had to offer as an inducement to reciprocity. If we gave them permission to fish in our waters we put them in competition with our own fishermen."

Again, the hon. gentleman said, when a resolution on this subject was before the Chamber of Commerce:

"That the Chambers of Commerce at Halifax unite with the Board of Trade in St. John in requesting the Dominion Government to take prompt and effective steps to arrange a reciprocity treaty with the United States and to make efforts to secure advantageous trade relations with the Spanish and British West Indian Islands."

The hon. gentleman, then a prominent member of that board, and previously a member of the Dominion Government, used the following language:—

"He thought that too strong an expression of opinion might injure our prospects. He believed in the maxim: never be too anxious to make a trade. In speaking at a public meeting he referred to reciprocity in the West Indies. That was the larger and more important question."

And yet, Sir, you heard to-night the hon. gentleman declare in loud, stentorian tones, that the American market is the only market for those poor fishermen who lit their lamps and went out to sea in their little boats in early morning. To-day he tells us that the American market is the only one for those fishermen, but he did not hesitate on a former occasion, when it suited his purpose, to tell the Chamber of Commerce in the city where he lives, that to obtain control of the West Indian market was the important question for the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. Again he is reported, in his own organ, the *Halifax Chronicle* to have said:

"Hon. A. G. Jones said he had come to listen rather than to take part in the discussion, but thought it was well to be careful how we proceeded in this matter. The cause might be injured by being too strong in expression. There was an old adage that it was not well to be too anxious for a bargain. No person believed in reciprocity more than he, but he thought the exercise of caution might be the wisest course, that was all. He found that no one in the Dominion objected to a reciprocity treaty with the United States on fair terms."

What was the hon. gentleman's object, may I ask to-night, in indulging in the strong expressions he made use of as to the absolute dependence of the Maritime Provinces in the United States markets? What was his object in taking this stand to-night, and calling on us to appear in an abject manner before a rich and powerful country which has in view many ambitions and far reaching projects. It was not well, he said, before the Chamber of Commerce, to be too anxious, but we should take a wiser course. He then found that no one in the Dominion objected to a reciprocity treaty on fair terms, and we have utterances by the hundred of a similar character from hon. gentlemen opposite up to the very time when, as now, it seemed probable that we would have reciprocity ultimately, that we would have a reciprocal tariff on fair terms; up to the time when all this seemed possible, as it does now, you had all these hon. gentlemen, all over the country, declaring this was not a political question, declaring that we were all one on the question of reciprocity with the United States. But the change of base to-day is sudden. It comes after a general election, when that party, driven to desperation, are now hunt-

ing daily for a policy, and almost daily proposing a new one. "For ways that are dark and tricks that are vain," that party has proved itself most peculiar. The hon. gentleman tells us to-night he did not believe in commercial union. He read from his scrap book, what he said to some gentlemen who visited him in his store at Halifax. That hon. gentleman, as we all know, has a considerable influence with the *Halifax Morning Chronicle*, which is supposed to be the exponent of his views. He has told us: "I do not believe in commercial union, and neither party would, I believe, agree to it"; but his organ, the *Halifax Chronicle*, did not hesitate, time and again, to use language, which I would not like to use in reference to the hon. gentleman, when it said that "the Canadian who opposes commercial union is a natural-born sneak and coward." We know, and I must mention it in justice to the writer of these lines in the *Chronicle*, that an hon. gentleman on the back benches had the temerity, was plucky enough, to introduce a resolution, going the whole length of the opinions of an hon. member who is more pliable, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), a resolution going straight for commercial union. How did hon. gentlemen opposite treat this man, who, according to the *Halifax Chronicle*, was not a natural-born sneak and coward. They told him to withdraw his resolution, and go in for that sentiment which the organ of the senior member for Halifax has characterised as that of a natural-born sneak and coward. Language of that kind from the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite is, I think, unfair, and on their behalf I repudiate it! I do not think it is fair criticism! Now, we had a very important utterance from the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who spoke at some length on reciprocity the other day, and who indulged in many arguments which are quite tenable by hon. members on this side, in vindicating the old Reciprocity Treaty, and dilating on the advantages which the people of the Island derived under it of sending their potatoes and other articles where they pleased. That hon. gentleman representing the maritime contingent in 1885, in this House, on the Liberal side, moulded together all these expressions of opinion, blended together these different views from the different Chambers of Commerce throughout Canada in favor of the old Reciprocity Treaty, and I would bring before the House the language the hon. gentleman used, in support of the point I am endeavoring to make. He alluded to the resolution of the Chamber of Commerce which I have read, spoke of the desirability of a renewal of the Treaty of 1854, and strongly favored making the fisheries a basis and measure for further commercial relations, concluding an interesting speech and able argument with the following resolution:—

"In view of the early termination of the fisheries articles of the Treaty of Washington, this House is of opinion that negotiations should be opened with the United States of America, as well for the renewal of reciprocal relations accorded by that treaty to American citizens and British subjects respectively, as for the opening up of additional reciprocal trade relations between Canada and the United States, and that in the conduct of such negotiations Canada should be directly represented."

He cited, as I have said, the strong opinion in the Maritime Provinces in favor of a renewal of the old Reciprocity Treaty; and later on, the ex-leader of hon. gentlemen opposite, speaking for the whole party, stated that the policy of his party was the policy of a tariff for revenue purposes only. He contended that he was consistent, inasmuch as it was no new departure, because this Government, through its extravagance, had made it necessary to raise a certain sum per year, and he could not see for the life of him, having studied the matter in every aspect, how that tariff could be materially interfered with, and he pledged his party at Malvern, as strongly as any statement of his could pledge it, that even if his party came into power, he would not play the bull in the China shop, but would respect vested interests and only abolish the duty

on coal and cornmeal. I ask again, how is it, after these pledges to the people, after this declaration of policy, not only from the mouths of the statesmen of that party, but by their resolutions in this House, they should propose now this entirely new departure, as it is declared to be by the senior member for Halifax. The question of the tariff and of reciprocity was threshed out, as many others raised in this debate have been threshed out, by the people at the polls; and they understood, no matter how loud demagogues might rant, that we could stand by the National Policy and at the same time stand by the interests of those concerned in the natural products of the country, and that we could, with the consent of the people and with their desire, as soon as possible, obtain reciprocity in natural products with the United States. As a Canadian, I blushed to hear the hon. gentleman who opened this debate take the position, in support of his resolution, to induce the people of this country to favor unrestricted reciprocity, that this country was in a state of retrogression, and that our position was not satisfactory. He told us, it is true, that great economic changes had taken place. He attempted to justify this change of base, not by argument, but by the statement that it was due to great economic changes, and that, therefore, the charge of inconsistency was a weak one; but he alluded to the economic changes which took place between 1867 and 1877; he alluded to none, he could cite no such changes between 1887 and 1888, and 1887 is the time when these pledges were put solemnly before the people. Unlike Mr. Wiman and Mr. Butterworth, who have shown much more skill in managing this question and who are endeavoring to persuade some of our countrymen to get into the position into which the American manufacturers wish them to get, he argued by the hour to show that we were going metaphorically to the dogs in Canada and that the people would be benefited by any change. I deny, and I deny emphatically, that the country is retrograding, and no hon. gentleman has been able to maintain that position by any statistics which have been laid before us. We have been told with what skill some gentlemen can manipulate statistics, and that you can prove anything by statistics. So you can. It depends on the honesty with which you use them. I will not weary this House by showing the credit side in contrast to the side of the account which those hon. gentlemen have placed before the people, to sicken them, to take the heart from them, to fill them with despondency and despair, and to make them feel that any change would be a change for the better. I will call before the House some hon. gentlemen occupying official positions in this country, I will call before the House as witnesses hon. gentlemen from one end of the country to the other whose position cannot be questioned, statesmen occupying distinguished positions in this country, and I will cite their statements as to the condition of Canada. The testimony which I can produce is such as will bring pride in the heart of any honest Canadian or any true lover of his country. I will begin by a gentleman whose praises are often sung by hon. gentlemen, I will begin by citing the language of Mr. Mowat, the Premier of Ontario, who is, I take it, in full accord with these gentlemen in their political schemes and who would do anything, I take it, that he could do, in any justifiable manner, to enable them to obtain power; but, when he met the happy Canadians in another part of this country on that day in last July, which seems to be such a black and dark day to hon. gentlemen opposite only in this debate, that hon. gentleman was able to say, and to say truthfully:

"If they compared their Dominion with the United States, they would find that they had nothing to be ashamed of. (Hear, hear) A comparison of the statistics of both countries for the past half century would show that the percentage in every department was greater in Canada than it is, on the aggregate, in the United States; and as Canada had prospered in the past, so she would in the future."

Mr. TUPPER (Picton).

Would you have heard the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House using language of this kind in this debate without thinking that there was mutiny in the ranks? Would you not have thought that any hon. gentleman who used that language must have gone behind the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and must be advocating, as he is, some scheme different from that of the leader. Allusion has been made to another gentleman, the Minister of Education of the Province of Ontario, a well-informed man, an able man, a man who is proud of his country, a man with Canadian pluck and Canadian vim, and a man who is enabled to look at Canadian affairs with hope and to take a good view of what has taken place in the past and of what is probable for the future. That hon. gentleman, whom I had the pleasure of meeting a short time ago, uttered then the same sentiments as those which I quote. They have been alluded to before, but this evening I am bringing forward the words of gentlemen who occupy a position in this country which I have not, gentlemen whose words cannot be confuted by hon. gentleman opposite. This hon. gentleman, who sat for a long time in the House of Commons, and who is now in an important position in the Government of Ontario, was called face to face with Mr. Chamberlain during the short stay which that gentleman made in Canada, and, like all Canadians who are proud of their country, he was able to make a good showing for Canada, and was able to tell that distinguished gentleman from England that—

"It is Canadian enterprise that has made this country. It is a great deal to have done that. Had he seen it fifty or forty or, perhaps, thirty-five years ago, or thirty years ago, when our forests were unbroken, when our industries were undeveloped, and when we had scarcely a mile of railway, he would have said that not even the most enthusiastic and sanguine expectations could have hoped for a condition of national prosperity such as we have in Canada to-day."

He also said:

"There is abroad a spirit—"

Is it a spirit of despair, as the hon. gentleman would tell us, a loss of national hope and a feeling of dependency upon our neighbors? Not so. He says:

"There is abroad a spirit of enterprise which only waits the natural growth and development of ordinary opportunities and time to produce results which we can scarcely dare even to imagine in case we should be charged with exaggeration or perhaps something worse. There are \$174,000,000 in our savings banks, and of paid-up capital of our railways there are \$623,000,000. We possess all the advantages of civilization, and are surrounded by all those influences which tend to make up a peaceful, happy and contented people. I am glad he has seen these things, for it has sometimes struck intelligent Canadians, when they have been visiting the old country, that among Englishmen—though not of course, among those of Birmingham (laughter)—there exists very erroneous ideas with regard to the civilisation and comforts and happiness of the Canadian people."

And that is the language used in 1888, by a leader among the gentlemen who stand up here and sing, as the hon. gentleman who spoke last sang, mournful ditties in reference to the condition of our people. So in advocating this commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity, or anything which may get our necks under the yoke of American manufacturers, Canada is referred to by the gentleman who has promoted it so much, in a pamphlet which is called Commercial Pamphlet No. 4, in which he takes issue with these hon. gentlemen:

"By a uniform tariff against all nations, she has shown her real and complete commercial independence, and under this condition has made a progress and attained a position of which every Canadian has good reason to be proud."

Now, why do they not, like men, come and face the issue and discuss it on the merits, and not occupy the time of this Chamber and the time of this country by abusing our country, by minimising its resources, by telling us everything is going wrong? Why do they not come up like men, as Mr. Wiman has done, and as I believe, as far as I have seen, Mr. Butterworth has done, and tell us plainly that the reason why we should join our destiny with that

of the United States is not on account of our poverty but on account of our strength, and that, as enterprising men who have built up industries here, as Mr. Wiman says, and have built up a position which should bring pride to every Canadian heart, we will be benefited by joining our destinies with theirs, and marching on in the same line with them, of united prosperity. I could respect the arguments of the Liberal party in that line, but, instead of that, they take up the whole time by keeping as far away from that resolution, as far away from the particulars of that resolution, as far away from the tariff that would be framed under that resolution, as far away from the condition of the revenue which would result under that resolution as possible, and by talking to us about our miserable and wretched state. They know, Mr. Speaker, that their position is unsound, and is opposed to the latest utterances of any of them when speaking without strong feeling of partisanship. Now, I have cited some evidence; and I would recall, too, the eloquent language of the late leader of that party, a gentleman now regaining health, I hope, on the other side of the world. That hon. gentleman was able to speak in the most elegant language at Edinburgh, when he met an old colleague of Mr. Chamberlain's. He told Mr. Gladstone, and was able to boast in Edinburgh, of the magnificent strides in the path of progress made by his native Province of Ontario. He used language that I wish to God we could hear oftener from him and from his colleagues in this House. It is the language used on this side of the House, it is language that would give hope to the young men of this country, and would spur us on to greater endeavors in the future. The hon. gentleman who leads in this debate, on the other side of the House, when he went to England to borrow money, when he asked the English capitalists to invest their money in this country, did not harangue them in the style, or upon the facts or matter, that he has done on this occasion. Every hon. gentleman is familiar with the bright side of the shield that was shown then, and the honest side, as well. I have given you, Mr. Speaker, some testimony that I think ought to carry weight as to the condition of affairs in this country, and to prove that the position taken by the hon. gentleman is unsound. I wish to quote, also, the language of the hon. member for South Oxford when he sat on this side of the House in 1818, on an occasion when he visited the Maritime Provinces. I am not now dealing with the childish charge of inconsistency. In citing language previously used by the hon. gentlemen opposite inconsistent with the language used by them in this debate, I cite it for the purpose of the argument contained therein, and I cite it for the purpose of proving the insincerity of this movement. At Halifax, on August 19, 1878, when, as every one knows, and as no one has denied, the condition of affairs in Canada was far worse than it is to-day, when hon. gentlemen were apologising, so to speak, all over the country for the condition of affairs, this hon. gentleman, who now tells us that there is retrogression and that the country is getting into a frightful condition, used this language:

"These men who tell you that it is impossible to exist as a commercial people unless you have reciprocity might as well tell the United States that if they want to drive you into the Union all they have to do is to refuse you reciprocity for a certain number of years longer, which is the very best way that can be adopted of inducing the American people to enter into commercial relations with us. For my part I will deny that we are dependent upon them in one way or another. No Canadian statesman can do a worse service than to spread that idea among a great number of his fellow-countrymen."

What is the hon. gentleman doing now, Mr. Speaker? Driven, as I say, desperate by the serious reversals which he has met with at the hands of the people, kept out of office for so long a time, after having changed his political faith in order to obtain office, that hon. gentleman is now pursuing a course which he said no Canadian statesman worthy of the name would pursue, and so affect a portion

of his fellow-country men. Well, we were particularly referred to the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman seemed doubtful whether he could convince the splendid yeomanry of this Province, of whom I now speak, with whom I have had the pleasure of conversing, and whose condition I have examined, he seemed doubtful whether he could convince them that they were in this dependent, this abject, this poverty-stricken condition. But with that contempt for the Maritime Provinces which seems, in this debate, to have characterised the utterances to which I am about to allude, he turned around and said he expected to hear something from the Maritime Provinces. He expected to hear a wail of woe sounded from that quarter. Yet I will do my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) the credit for saying that he rather turned the table on his leader for the nonce. He told him that down in the Maritime Provinces the farmers—if I do not misrepresent his language—were not so badly off; it was the mortgaged-ridden farmer of Ontario that was suffering, and so his leader might turn his attention to his neighbors and not treat the Maritime Provinces with contempt. I think I can fancy the reason of the sincerity of the hon. member for Halifax. I think I know why he did not talk about the drying up of the cities by the sea. That is a great phrase in the mouths of the Reform leaders in the east, that we are drying up in the Maritime Provinces, that we are not as rich as we used to be, that real property has gone down, that assessment is low, &c. I think I know why the hon. gentleman drove slowly over the ground; I think he had read the words put into the mouth of His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia, at the opening of the present Session, where, in his own allies in Nova Scotia politics, now snugly ensconced in office, stated that they were happy down by the sea, and that things were not going wrong. This is the language of the hon. gentleman's friend and ally, Mr. Fielding, put into the mouth of His Honor on the 23rd of February, 1888:

"1. In welcoming you to the scene of your legislative duties, I am glad to be able to congratulate you on the fair measure of prosperity enjoyed by our Province during the past year. While in some quarters exceptional conditions have operated unfavorably, as a rule the labors of our people, in the various branches of industry, have been remunerative, and there has been an improvement in business which, it is hoped, will continue.

"2. I have particular pleasure in calling attention to the activity that prevailed in mining, an industry of great importance not only because of the capital and labor engaged in it, but also because of its value as a contributor to our provincial revenues."

The hon. gentleman touched a little on another subject, the effect of reciprocity on the coal trade, that branch of trade that brings to the coffers of the Provincial Treasury such a large proportion of its revenue. The hon. gentleman knows that there are members in this House from the coal regions of Nova Scotia, that could meet him upon any ground such as that which he took, only for the moment, from Mr. Lithgow. And *en passant* I may say that I was surprised, that I was amazed, at that hon. gentleman's attempting such a weak thing, at his laying himself open to the emphatic answer that he did. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman who formerly represented Digby in this House (Mr. Vail) read this old letter of 1879 from Mr. Lithgow, and yet he was answered in this House, and the hon. gentleman must have known what the answer was, that Mr. Lithgow took it all back after experience. Mr. Lithgow prophesied that the duty on coal would be of no advantage, he wrote as the hon. gentleman said he did, but he was honest enough, and sensible enough, after experience, to take back every word that he penned in that letter; and he sent it to the press, but that is not kept in the scrap book of the hon. gentleman opposite. They do not keep the bright side of the shield now-a-days, they have turned that away in hopes that it will rust. Now, the hon. gentleman ought to know that the statistics of his Province are against him, if he attempted to stand up

here and asperse too heavily the fair fame and commercial position of the Province of Nova Scotia. He knows well enough that he and I had to pay, as taxpayers, for the publication of a document issued after the so-called repeal victory, when these men—I won't say demagogues; perhaps it is not fair—but the word might be justifiable when these men had the hardihood to go all over the Province from one end to the other, and talk about Nova Scotia as Ontario members here have not hesitated to talk about Ontario. Those hon. gentlemen when they found themselves in responsible positions holding the seals of office, ambitious for a good record and a good showing while public affairs were under their control, published at the expense of the people of Nova Scotia an official document to be circulated broadcast in the British Isles. And what did they tell us of the condition of that country long years after the abrogation of reciprocity, twenty years after Confederation, twenty years after the time when we were threatened with commercial annihilation? These so-called anti-confederates, these so-called repealers, these so-called secessionists, these so-called annexationists, were induced to confess to the world that everything in the Province of Nova Scotia was lovely, that any man who had brains, that any farmer who had industry could obtain in a short time a livelihood, impossible to get, where? In the mother country alone? No, but in the American Union as well. They issued a document, a copy of which I hold in my hand; it was issued by the Government of Nova Scotia in 1885, and it gives the names of the members of the Government. I wish to quote from it somewhat at length to show the hollow hypocrisy of the party that has taken part of the colors of our party, and patched up a new flag at this time of day. I wish to quote from this document also to bear out what I have said. At page 16 we are told:

"There are plenty of farms already under cultivation which may be bought at very reasonable rates, and any practical farmer with a small capital may at once possess a good and comfortable home."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). I am glad the hon. gentleman is pleased.

"And by energy, industry and enterprise may make for himself a fortune and position in Nova Scotia in a few years, such as he could not obtain in a lifetime in Great Britain."

Here we come to the poor workingman that hon. gentlemen opposite are so fond of commiserating, and I suppose the fisherman is included. The report says "he gets very well paid in Nova Scotia,"—and this is twenty years after the abrogation of reciprocity, and several years after the introduction of the accursed National Policy to which the hon. gentleman has so eloquently referred. On page 37—I like to stick to the record, and especially to the record of the hon. gentleman—this is the statement:

"By moderate industry the owner of such a place can rear his family, on better food probably than he could give them in England, with the same expenditure of capital and labor. And that is about all the average Nova Scotia farmer attempts. He does not knuckle down to his work in the severely continuous style that is practically compulsory in England and Scotland."

The hon. gentleman tells us the farmer barely lives; but he does live, and when the hon. gentleman's friends were clothed with the responsibility of office they did not hesitate to say that the farmer does not knuckle down to work as the farmers in other countries do. The report continues:

"If he had a reasonable rent to pay, as well as a living to earn, he would be compelled to work harder, to cultivate less superficially, to loiter less around the country store, to do less riding in his buggy, to get his woman folk to make more butter and less pastry, and in short by dint of having to make a struggle to escape eviction and bankruptcy he would often land himself into a state of comparative affluence. But there is not much hope of any such result from the average Nova Scotian farmer."

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou).

The Government add that this description is furnished by Mr. Imrie; they add the following foot note:

"Mr. Imrie's description of the average Nova Scotian farmer is pretty nearly correct, but in every county in the Province there are farmers who are pretty considerably above the average, who have placed themselves and their families in more than comfortable circumstances, and have by their industry and attention to business acquired considerable wealth. Such men are second to none in intelligence and standing in the Province."

What condition of affairs does my hon. friend now expect? Is he looking for some Utopia where a farmer can obtain more than that, where by honesty and industry he can obtain more than a comfortable living in Nova Scotia? Is he to roll in wealth without working; or what is the condition of affairs to which the hon. gentleman would prefer we should bring the people of the country? Next, as regards shipping. That hon. gentleman attempted to teach me, as one of the inhabitants of Nova Scotia, some years ago, by his long speeches that American shipping under the tariff of the United States and under their shipping regulations was being swept off the sea, the condition of trade in the United States and the condition of labor there was frightful to behold. But the Government of the day in Nova Scotia, in sympathy with, perhaps in council with the hon. gentleman, but at all events the Government of the Liberal party in Nova Scotia, said in 1866, in this report at page 17:

"Nova Scotia owns more shipping in proportion to the population than any other country, and our vessels do a larger proportion of the carrying trade of the world."

Mr. WELSH. When is that?

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou). In 1866.

Mr. WELSH. How is it now?

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou).

"They may be found in every port of the habitable globe, loading and discharging cargoes on our own and foreign account."

I knew the hon. gentleman would contradict me, but I did hope he would not contradict the official organs and publications of his own party. Well, then, it is not unreasonable for me to suppose that the hon. gentleman had some reason for passing lightly over the condition of affairs in Nova Scotia in supporting the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. I wish to complain of a habit in which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), indulges as a representative statesman of this country. The comparison which the hon. gentleman makes between the condition of affairs in Canada and the United States is unfair to Canada and unworthy of him. I say that no comparison he has made has been fair—he has never acted as any reasonable man would expect him to act, when making a comparison. He compares our condition with the condition of the United States when they have sixty millions of people, at a time when they have startled the world by the leaps and bounds by which they have gone forward in the path of progress, at a time when they have reduced their national debt almost one-half, at a time when everything in that country so far as matters affect us are definitely settled. He compares our condition at a time when in the States all secession is gone, not at a time when, as in Canada, small politicians are endeavoring to set Province against Province. I say if the hon. gentleman were fair, if he had the courage of his convictions, if he were strong in the faith he preaches to this House and the country, he would compare our condition with that of the United States when they had four or five millions of people and not when they have fifty or sixty millions. We may not live—perhaps we may—to see sixty millions of people in this country; but there are many men who have looked into this matter, whose views can be accepted, who have not hesitated to say that, judging from our past progress, our future will be even greater than that of our neighbors to the south. Let me give you, Mr. Speaker, a few statistics, not

many, to show and to explain the unfairness of this argument. For instance, he speaks of the frightful and alarming reductions in our aggregate trade, and he takes for his illustration two years. He takes the year 1873 and he takes the year 1887. He calls attention to the fact that our aggregate trade has dropped from \$217,000,000 in 1873 down to \$202,000,000 in 1887, and he tells us that is an alarming state of affairs and that we must ponder over it. Well this so-called reduction being admitted, I must remark that he did not tell us the other side of the story. When that hon. gentleman took charge of affairs in 1875, when he refused to adopt the National Policy, when he attempted to hold our markets with a 17½ per cent. reduction against the American competitor, the retrogression began. In 1875 it dropped to \$200,000,000, and in 1876, when that hon. gentleman was in power, to \$175,000,000, and in 1879 to \$153,000,000. That hon. gentleman, as an ex-Finance Minister of the country, standing here to explain honestly, and candidly, and fairly our financial condition, tells the House and tells the country that we are in an alarming state, and that there was an alarming reduction in the volume of trade. I will read you when, in 1878, this reduction was going on most rapidly, the statement made by that hon. gentleman vindicating the position of Canada, glorying in the position and boasting of our commercial strength, but he told the House then something different to what he tells it now. He told the House that these were not alarming features, although the volume of trade was being reduced. When he made his finance statement in 1875 he did not hesitate to say:

"It is not necessary for me to spend any further time in reviewing the volume of our exports and imports."

It had dropped then below the figure at which it now stands.

"I do not consider that it is any proof that a country like ours is retrograding in any way because there is a check to the exports. Many authorities who are entitled to great respect are inclined to think that we have rather overstepped the mark in our progress in this direction."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this shows the inconsistency and insincerity of the hon. gentleman advancing an argument like that as compared with what he advances to-day. I shall ask the House to bear with me while I vindicate the position of our country as compared with the United States. I compare the total trade, the volume of trade, as the hon. gentleman calls it, of the United States, when they had a population of 17,000,000, with the condition of affairs and the volume of trade in Canada, when we have five million. In 1840, the aggregate trade of the United States, amounted to \$239,000,000 or about \$14 per head of the population. In 1850 it still amounted to \$14 per head of the inhabitants, who numbered then 23,000,000. We have seen that, in Canada, during the year 1887, when the hon. gentleman says the volume of trade has decreased so alarmingly, that it amounts to \$202,000,000 on the figures which he gives, and that this represents \$10 per head for every Canadian in this country from one end of it to another. I say the purpose seems to me suspicious when an hon. gentleman of that gentleman's ability stoops to an argument so unfair, and an argument so directed against the position and against the reputation of his own country. Then about the exodus. How he delighted, and how every year he seems to delight, over the exodus which he says is taking place from the older Provinces to the west or to the western States. And he thinks that those features are alarming. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have his colleagues on record with utterances on this point which will give us hope. We have, for instance, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), when it was his business—it was his pleasure, I hope—to sound a different note in Canada, and when he did not think it was necessary to rouse sectional feeling, and to talk about the desire of the Provinces to get away from Confederation. He came as Minister of Militia

to Halifax in 1878 to render an account of his stewardship; he came and he admitted the exodus from Canada, which is admitted by all sides and cannot be gainsaid, at a time when the people were leaving the country in large numbers. The Minister of Militia said:—

"Why, we find those very people clamoring to get back to Canada. What is the reason for this? It is because those men, attracted for a time by the high wages offered in the States, now find themselves utterly without the means of support, and are desirous to come back to this country of Canada—this wretched country of Canada."

We have, fortunately, statistics giving the condition of our friends on the other side of the line. Taking the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island, and comparing them with the older Provinces of Canada—Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island—the statistics show that according to the census of 1830–31 there was a population of 1,953,717; in 1881 4,010,206, showing an increase in 50 years of 2,056,309; whereas the figures for the older Provinces of Canada show, in 1830 and 1831, 1,065,215; under the last census 4,141,424, showing an increase of 3,076,209, as against 2,000,000 in the States I have mentioned. Now, Mr. Speaker, one is almost forced when the argument, as far as the statistics are concerned, shows different results, to think that the figures have been made to suit a purpose. It reminds me of the story of the judge long ago, who, in dealing with a case before him, asked the counsel to explain where this land was situated in reference to which there was a dispute. One counsel said: "My Lord we lie on this side" (pointing to one place), and the other counsel said: "And we, my Lord, lie on this," and the judge wanted to know what on earth he could do in the matter. The debate has shown that figures can be used in reference to the condition of the country in very false lights. For what purpose did those gentlemen ransack their brains and devote their ingenuity in a most unfair manner to try and show that a deplorable state of things exists in favor of a country which we all ought to try and advance in every way possible. Now, the hon. gentleman came to the question of inter-provincial trade, and as the Minister of Marine has devoted considerable attention to that I do not propose to go very closely into it, but I again appeal to the record. I again ask the House to take some proof, in support of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that an inter-provincial trade exists. My friend from the Maritime Provinces will say that there is less inter-provincial trade existing to-day than existed in 1878. Mr. Power, in his address to the electors of Halifax in 1878, said that the quantities of furniture, machinery, &c., sent into those Provinces from the upper Provinces were such that if the tariff be increased, as the Conservative leaders proposed and as would be the case if the Conservatives were returned to power, those Provinces would be flooded with Canadian manufactures of every description. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) in the same year, when referring to Nova Scotia being the slaughter market for Canada, speaking to the people of Nova Scotia, said:

"But where does the competition come from in regard to Nova Scotia manufacturers of which I regret to say we have not more?"

They were in a bad state in those days—

"It comes almost exclusively from the old Provinces of Canada."

Then you will see, Mr. Speaker, that the grievances of the hon. gentleman's allies in Nova Scotia are not against manufacturers as manufacturers, but against manufacturers as Canadian manufacturers, since Canadian manufacturers come from the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The party opposite is welcome to an ally of that description. The hon. gentleman endorsed the statement of Mr. Longley that even under the present condition of affairs those dried up Provinces, those Provinces dependent on the United States could get \$10,000,000 from the States every year to send to Quebec and Ontario for those manu-

factures. Well, this is a happy condition of affairs, and there is nothing to complain of in that. The hon. gentlemen want the money from the United States and the hon. member from Halifax says they can get it. Then he tells us that this trade, which he is forced to admit does exist, is not a natural trade, but a trade forced over the Intercolonial Railway at great cost to the people of Canada. Now, I will answer the hon. gentleman by a letter he wrote a short time ago, in which he insisted that instead of that being a cause for complaint, these ruinous rates of the Intercolonial Railway were actually too high and ought to be lowered. Only a year or two ago, he wrote to the press, saying :

"We did indeed complain of the rate on sugar being too high, both for us and for them, as has been abundantly proved during this winter, when all the sugar for Montreal, instead of being landed here, as heretofore, has, by the unwise and narrow policy of the Dominion Government, been diverted to New York."

I call the attention of the House to his particular reference to the rates on sugar and coal :

"The Intercolonial was built to promote and accommodate the industries of the country, and to facilitate inter-communication at the lowest possible rates. It was never expected to pay as an investment any more than the canals of the west expected to pay interest on their cost—and my complaint is that the rates have always been too high, and that the department have not carried out the object for which the road was constructed."

He says again :

"I repeat my contention, therefore, that the rates of sugar are and always have been too high, both for the Montreal refiners and for us as well."

The rate was then 18 cents—

"I am not disposed to find fault with the Government for making this reduction in tolls, as I think it wise policy that, so far as possible, our public works should be made the hand-maid of commerce, and on the same grounds the rates on the Intercolonial Railway should be very considerably reduced so that the object for which the road was constructed may be carried out and all parts of the Dominion receive the advantage of it in that way."

Could inconsistency go further? Now, on the question of fish the hon. gentleman, as was natural, dilated. He endeavored to persuade this House—and he based the statement on his reputation as a dealer in that article—that we pay the duty on fish, and from that argument the House was called to follow him through the rest of his argument to show that we pay the duties on the other articles we export to the United States. Well, Sir, the day was when the hon. gentleman would have spurned that proposition, inconsistent as it is with the teaching of every teacher of Free Trade. The day was when he did advocate a very different theory—the true Free Trade theory, that the Americans paid the duty on what they bought from us. In August, 1878, when the senior member for Halifax was not the free lance he is now, ready to fire a shot at his own allies if by it he can gain an advantage in the Lower Provinces, when he was not ready to join any movement in the hope of getting his party into power—that hon. gentleman, holding an official position, at a time when his utterances were weighed more carefully than they are now, did not hesitate to tell an audience in Halifax that :

"Fish are sent to the United States and the West Indies, and are not affected in their value in any way by any regulation that may be imposed here or elsewhere."

I might go on quoting from the language of the hon. gentleman. Time was when he found it necessary to oppose a measure of reciprocity with the United States—to oppose the Government for obtaining the concession of free fish from the United States. To-night we hear a great deal from him about the advantages of free fish in the American market; we are told that the poor fishermen pay the duty to the American Government, and what a boom it would be to them to have it taken off. But the hon. gentleman opposed a measure to take the duty off in 1872, when he belittled the whole Washington Treaty and all the advantages that Canada was gaining under it, as many
Mr. TUPPER (Pictou.)

members of the opposite party have done, as the hon. member for North Norfolk did as late as 1878, when his own friends were charged with not having done much in that direction. The senior member for Halifax at that time said: "He had found that under the Reciprocity Treaty, only seven per cent. more of our fish went to the United States than when the duty was imposed," and he said the paltry amount given to Canada only amounted, in the year which he took for the computation, to the small sum of \$94,000 on the quantity exported. But an hon. gentleman in this House, who holds perhaps a more important position in his party, who does not fight them in his own Province, or abuse or vilify them when he turns his back on them and leaves Ottawa—the hon. member for Queen's, who is an authority on fish, who played an important part in the negotiations at Halifax and there obtained some knowledge that he should now impart to the minds of those hon. gentlemen who are so fierce about the advantages of free fish—that hon. gentleman, in my hearing a few years ago, when speaking on another subject, said :

"I am not going into the great question of who pays the duty on the mackerel, the consumer or the producer. The general question has been debated very often in this House, and it is not applicable to this peculiar business. The question in this case depends simply on whether or not the home production at the time is equal to the home demand * * * I acknowledge that in some years we have to pay the duty to some extent, and I am now speaking, mark you, of only one species of fish, mackerel, for which the Americans give us our sole market, but ordinarily we do not pay the duty because they do not catch enough off their own coast to supply the demands, and the price goes up sufficiently to induce us to supply the deficiency."

And mark my words, if these hon. gentlemen discuss the new treaty, that has been laid on the Table, you will hear them talk about the exhaustion of the fisheries on the American coasts, and then we shall be able to form the conclusion who pays the duty. It is true, the hon. member for Queen's only referred to mackerel, but the hon. gentleman who buys fish every day and makes his money out of them, did not hesitate to oppose the Washington Treaty, and to tell this House as a merchant that it was of no advantage to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. I do not intend to say whether he is right or wrong; I am not taking that line; I am exposing—and I believe I have succeeded by the proofs I advanced—the hypocrisy of the party, which in this eleventh hour, in its desperate position, has nailed those false colors to its mast. Hon. gentlemen opposite have expressed their love for the American manufacturers, and if we adopt their ideas of what they consider beneficial for the American manufacturers, and give up what we consider beneficial for the Canadian manufacturers, then we will go in and enjoy the benefits of this union, which some call commercial union and others unrestricted reciprocity; we will adopt some change or any change, so long as it will excite a popular feeling which will bring hon. gentlemen from that side of the House to this. The real design of our American friends is shown by the language of the advocate to which allusion has often been made. What did Mr. Butterworth say in the United States? Did he go through that country like a demagogue, telling them they were all going to ruin, that protection had ruined their shipping and their farming industry, and that trade combinations all over that country necessitated a radical change? No, and this is, indeed, a curious coalition which has been forced between Mr. Butterworth, an out-and-out protectionist, and these men who have been haranguing all over the country in favor of free trade. Mr. Butterworth is consistent. He declares himself to be a protectionist, he says he is always an American, and not one of those men who one day talks of tariff for revenue only and another about free trade, and again hold out the policy of unrestricted reciprocity. He says, I believe in protection; I believe the time is not ripe when we can safely meet the manufacturers of Great Britain in another mar-

ket; I believe if we can gain the Canadian market, we can sell there our surplus products and manufactures, and we can relieve the congested state of our markets at the expense of the Canadians. Of course this is my language.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman wishes, I will give him Mr. Butterworth's own words. In a letter which he addresses to all the members of Congress, he uses the following language with reference to Canada:—

"The location of her great highways of traffic, lakes, canals, rivers, railways, open up to us at once an exhaustless supply of raw material, and a constantly growing market for our manufactured surplus."

Does the hon. gentleman doubt the statement that I made? We are to be a slaughter market for the surplus manufactures of the United States—

"While correcting the inequalities in our tariff, we can, at the same time, remove from the trade and commerce of our people every restriction and burdensome tax which is not essential to the proper protection of our home industries, or necessary for the collection of needed public revenue."

"I see it stated in some of the public journals that in case the proposed arrangement is consummated, foreign goods will pour through Canada into the United States. Whether goods were entered at a Canadian port, or in the United States, would be of no consequence, since the tariff would be the same on both sides of the line."

My hon. friend says he knows they will insist on that, but that is not contemplated in the motion. What he said at Charlottetown, he contends, is all right, but he was referring to a tariff, as against other countries other than the United States, being at our will and pleasure, and to expect they would have unrestricted reciprocity with us under this state of affairs was to suppose the Americans were arrant fools. But Mr. Butterworth is no arrant fool. He says that the Americans shall hold our markets in the hollow of their hands and slaughter their goods as they please, from one end of Canada to the other. Our people have had a sample already of the slaughtering business that went on before 1878, and it will take more than the arguments and ingenuity of hon. gentlemen opposite to make them forget how our trade then suffered. Mr. Butterworth proceeds to give his record:

"I am a protectionist; but we will agree that protection properly deals with the unequal conditions which exist in the field of competition as between our manufactures and those of the old world. Those conditions, relating in the main to the cost of labor, and being so largely in favor of the plants of Europe, manufacturers there are in certain lines of trade enabled, in the absence of the influence of our protective system, to control the markets at our very doors. But this reason has no possible application to competition with Canada; and the reason ceasing, the rule ceases with it."

Not contempt, mark you, when they talk of competition with the manufactures of Great Britain. No, they fear competition with the manufactures of Great Britain, but they only feel contempt when speaking of competition with Canadian manufactures. That is their opinion of the stage at which our industries have advanced; they have no fear of competition with us. Are hon. gentlemen opposite prepared to fellow in the wake of a man whose designs are admitted, who is honest in his attacks against Canadian independence if you like, or Canadian commercial independence. Let us now deal with the other apostle of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, or anything that will ultimately lead to annexation. Mr. Wiman has put himself on record. Mr. Wiman says, as giving us some idea of what is contemplated when this consummation is brought about:

"The productions of Canada are so insignificant as compared with the total products of the United States that for many years they would not enter into competition to any serious extent with American products."

What a grand thing for our farmers! We were told by the ex-leader of the Opposition, when the National Policy was introduced, that it would bring about a few years of prosperity. The people took him at his word and adopted the

policy which has since brought us continued prosperity; and to-day the opponents of the National Policy now bring forward a policy which will bring about the consummation they appear to desire, when we will be able no longer to enter into competition with the American producer or manufacturer, with any hope of success. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) told us in grand and forcible language of the magnificent condition of our American neighbors. He dilated upon the fact that they were the best fed, the best living, and the best clad people in the world. Well, was it by cringing for reciprocal relations with other countries that those people became rich, happy and prosperous. Was it reciprocal free trade that gave them their present comfort, independence and wealth? Was it by fawning and cringing at the feet of other nations and asking for help, that they became rich and prosperous? Or was it not by the adoption of the policy, which has been proved to be so successful with them, that we adopted ourselves and have followed in their wake ever since. But a new incentive is given for a change of policy. We are told that reciprocal trade will rid us of monopolies and combines. That, Sir, is very good clap-trap. I have no wish to use that term offensively, but it does seem ridiculous that men in their sober senses, in an enlightened country like this, can argue that, under unrestricted reciprocity, combines and monopolies would be out of the question. Why every one knows that monopolies exist in England, and the United States, as well as in Canada; and every one would rather, if he is to be subject to a monopoly, that he should be subjected to one that invests its capital in Canada rather than be one which expends all its means in a foreign country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to bring before the House an issue which has been fought out long ago, and which has nothing to do with the question under discussion, the issue of the National Policy. That is beside the question, in my opinion, entirely. Hon. gentlemen opposite ought to know that at one time the great Paisley works of Scotland held the monopoly of the thread trade in the United States. The Americans placed a duty on thread, the consequence of which was that the Paisleys were compelled to start works of the same character as their works in Scotland in the United States, involving the investment of a large amount of capital in the State of New Jersey, in order to retain control of the American trade, and the result was that the Americans got their thread cheaper than they ever did before, and American labor was solely employed in its manufacture. The same cause has had the same effect in this country in other articles. The tobacco duty killed a New York monopoly which had control of our trade. The McAlpin manufactory had a large amount of capital invested in New York in the manufacture of tobacco which they sold in our market. The duties were raised. The result was a transfer of half of the establishment with some 500 hands, who are now busy in the city of Toronto. Does any hon. gentleman suppose that Toronto and Canada did not get the benefit of this transfer, and so it would be totally undone with this unrestricted reciprocity? And this is only one instance out of many which I might adduce. Do you suppose that the factory would remain in Toronto, that the taxpayers of that city would be helped by that industry or by any similar industry in that case? Certainly not. They would go back to the place whence they came; they would go back to the large centres, so as to be near, as hon. gentlemen say, the largest markets; and so they would control our market just as the anthracite coal miners are controlling Ontario since the duty was, I may say, at the request of all sides, removed from anthracite coal. It illustrates the strength of the National Policy when the coal owners of Nova Scotia could afford to have that duty taken off, and I have not heard that they have made any complaint on that score, but it has strengthened the

National Policy in the minds of many when the result of taking off that duty has been, not the reduction of the price of coal, but the inclusion of Ontario in the district of Buffalo, and the increase in the price of coal. Knowing the effect of these rings, they want to rope in every Province under the power of these rings in the United States. They are against Canadian combinations, if you like, but they are in favor of American combinations to any extent. When I heard the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) tell us, as the eloquent and able gentleman from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) mentioned to the House to-day, that we owed little to old England, that old England had not done much for us Canadians on this side of the Atlantic, and that we had to look out for ourselves—that is virtually what he told us—irrespective of the interests of the mother country, and yet wind up by telling us that no one was to accuse him of disloyalty, and reminded us that he was a Privy Councillor, that he was a sworn adviser of the Queen and had been a member of the Government, and that he was as loyal now as he was then, I was reminded very much of an old story in reference to a counsel in an Ontario court, who was pleading and was advocating the cause of his client as best he could, though he was not endowed with a superabundance of ability. One of our American friends from Ogdensburg was present in the court, which I think was held at Prescott, and he asked: "Who is that fellow?" He was told: "That is a Queen's counsel." He said: "Do you call that kind of a man a Queen's counsel? Then, from the bottom of my heart, and from my inmost soul, I say for the first time in my life, God save the Queen." And so may Canadians say under such circumstances as I have referred to, God save the Queen. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) let the cat out of the bag, I think. He told us that we ought not to say very much because Sir Charles Tupper had gone as far as the hon. gentleman wished to go, and it did not lie in our mouths to take any position antagonistic to this resolution on that account. That proves the position which I take, it exposes the hypocrisy of this movement, it shows that there is no sincerity in it, but that it is a mere political trick brought to the attention of the country; but is it desirable that we should seek to have a second slap in the face in the same year? Everyone knows that that correspondence bears but one sensible interpretation. It is in the hands of everyone, and can be understood by everyone who can read, and whether Sir Charles Tupper, or the Liberal-Conservative party, or the Government, wanted the freest and most unrestricted reciprocity or not, the statement was made there formally and diplomatically, and was made to a gentleman who, as they say, had asked that we should treat on a commercial plan, it was made as broadly as any hon. gentleman could desire, and that offer was met with more than a point blank refusal, as these hon. gentlemen say, with more than a statement, as they say, that they had not power to treat. They have talked a great deal about a letter which was written by Mr. Bayard in May, and they make a great deal of the fact that Mr. Bayard did not come to that commission armed, as he said he would be, with the power to treat in relation to this matter. What is the responsibility resting on this Government as to Mr. Bayard's instructions, or Mr. Bayard's action, or Mr. Bayard's commission? The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) read to-day the instructions which were given to the British plenipotentiaries to go as far as they now desire this Government to go. The offers which were made by this Government show that they were authorised to make the broadest offers for commercial privileges.

Mr. MILLS. (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. "Hear, hear." They made a proposition to treat in the broadest manner. That is there in writing, and nothing could be plainer.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou).

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then it was not treason.

Mr. TUPPER. The interruption of the hon. gentleman does not affect my argument that, no matter what their intention was as to the tariff which would be ultimately drawn, or as to the manner in which the industries of the country were to be ultimately affected, they put the proposition in plain, bold Anglo-Saxon: Will you make a trade arrangement with Canada—any trade arrangement, if you like; we are ready to receive a proposition, we now make a proposition that we arrive at an understanding on reciprocal trade. No language could be plainer in order to carry out that idea, and what was the answer? Not that they were not then authorised, but a distinct, unequivocal refusal. I see hon. gentlemen shaking their heads; perhaps I do not understand the Queen's English. I will read the letter, after I have given the purport of it, which is not only that they were not authorised to enter into that arrangement, not only that they would not accept the proposal, but that they would not ask for power to consider it, that they would not ask for the necessary instructions or the necessary power to enable them to consider it.

Mr. LAURIER. They say they are prepared to renew the proposals they made before, in the letter of the 27th November, which is kept back.

Mr. TUPPER. I am referring to the official reply.

Mr. LAURIER. That is in the official reply.

Mr. TUPPER. I am not referring to the correspondence which preceded it.

Mr. LAURIER. That is in the official reply.

Mr. TUPPER. This is the official reply:

"While continuing their proposal—"

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER. My hon. friends seemed to be ignorant of that when they were discussing the matter, and now they want to have added to that the contents of a proposal of a certain date. Surely they are not so barren of argument, surely they are not so weak in their contention, as to add to the letter of Mr. Bayard, and to force the people of Canada to suppose that we have refused to consider a proposal which is not before the people, and is not in writing. What does the hon. gentleman mean by saying that this refers to a proposal made before that date?

Mr. LAURIER. He says distinctly that the American proposal was made on the 27th November, and that the proposal of the British plenipotentiaries was made on the 4th December, and then that there was a reply on the 7th December, and that is kept back.

Mr. TUPPER. Then the hon. gentleman wishes the people to imagine that that proposal was what he thinks it was. Is it not a little hasty on their part to ask the House to vote want of confidence in the Government because they imagine—and we know that they have imagined very curious things—that a certain proposal was made? What form of denial does the hon. gentleman want? Does he charge this Government now with suppressing a document relating to trade? Does he charge this Government now with doing a dishonorable, a foul, a cowardly act? Does he seek to bring his party to vote on a charge like that? I ask the hon. gentleman does he make that insinuation?

Mr. LAURIER. I made no insinuation of any kind. The papers have not been laid before us. But I say the hon. gentleman has no right to say that they made such an offer of unrestricted trade, when it is proven that the American plenipotentiaries made an offer which was refused by the Canadian commissioners.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has been told time and again that the whole proposal in relation to

trade was now on the Table of the House, and the paper which the hon. member for Picou has just read is to this effect: while renewing our proposals of such a date we decline to consider any trade negotiations relating to the fisheries.

Mr. LAURIER. Surely the hon. gentleman does not mean to say that we have the proposals of the American commissioners? We have the proposals of the British commissioners, and nothing more.

Mr. THOMPSON. I mean to say that the hon. gentleman was told time and again that Sir Charles Tupper had asked the consent of the American plenipotentiaries and of Sir Lionel West, to lay on the Table of the House everything relating to proposals looking for trade relations between the two countries, and he has done so; and it is disingenuous then to contend that the proposal that is referred to here, but which is not before the House, has any relation to trade at all.

Mr. TUPPER. I am glad I brought this subject up. I am glad now to know upon what material the hon. gentleman is acting when he makes this sudden change of base upon an entire supposition that has no foundation in fact. If he does not take the statement made by the Canadian representative, perhaps he may be able to believe Mr. Angell, one of the American commissioners, who makes a statement in entire accordance with the statement just made, that that proposition was refused absolutely. If my hon. friend had allowed me to continue, I think I could have satisfied him that no matter what theory might exist in reference to that proposal there was nothing in it of the nature the hon. gentleman imagines. The reasons for refusing the proposal would be reasons that would prevent Mr. Bayard or any representative of the American Executive from making such a proposal as is contemplated. Now, what are the words:

"While continuing their proposal heretofore submitted—on the 30th ultimo,—and fully sharing the desire of Her Britannic Majesty's plenipotentiaries to remove all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries; the American plenipotentiaries are constrained, after careful consideration, to decline to ask from the President authority requisite to consider the proposal conveyed to them on the 3rd inst. as a means to the desired end, because the greater freedom of commercial intercourse so proposed would necessitate an adjustment of the present tariff of the United States by Congressional action; which adjustment the American plenipotentiaries consider to be manifestly impracticable of accomplishment, through the medium of a treaty under the circumstances now existing."

And with a reason like that, can my hon. friend seriously press this theory, that in defiance of that rule, such a proposal was ever made or conceived? But if a further answer were necessary, we have it in the American plenipotentiaries declining to admit:

"That such a mutual arrangement as is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries, could be accepted as constituting a suitable basis of negotiation concerning the rights and privileges claimed for American fishing vessels. It still appears to the American plenipotentiaries to be possible to find an adjustment of differences by agreeing to the interpretation or modification of the Treaty of 1818, which will be honorable to both parties, and remove the present causes of complaint, to which end they now—as they have been from the beginning of this conference—ready to devote themselves."

Well, Mr. Speaker, has it not been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that the fixed and stated policy of Congress is now, and for some time has been, not to permit any such arrangements to be made by the Executive? Is not the position taken in this debate that no authority outside of Congress can interfere with fiscal matters? If that position be correct, how can he suppose that, on the contrary, such a proposal as is suggested, could have been made, or was ever contemplated? I will not weary the House by reading, as I could, a resolution from Congress, illustrative of that. It has been admitted on the other side. The Judicial Committee of the House of Representatives, in 1835, solemnly decided that no treaty could be made by the Executive of

the American Government which in any way interfered with the fiscal matters of the people of the United States, that all changes in the tariff were to be discussed openly in Congress; and that has been the reason, as every one knows, why, since the Treaty of Washington, no such arrangement has been entered into by any country in the world by the United States, and that was a long time ago. Treaties had been made, but no treaty touching fiscal matters has been ratified by Congress since that day. Therefore, it is unnecessary to argue further to show how utterly impracticable is the step that the other side ask us to take. I have gone on to show the sinister object underlying their policy. But I wish to point out, in addition, that these steps taken by hon. gentlemen in this debate, the attitude adopted by them, are, according to their own opinion, calculated to prevent our receiving the benefit of a certain amount of reciprocal trade with the United States, and why? Every one knows that this party, the Government representing this party, is the only party that ever obtained trade advantages from the United States. They negotiated and obtained the Washington Treaty. The negotiations for the Reciprocity Treaty in old Canada, were made by the Conservatives. We have the cause of irritation in reference to the fishery question so far removed that we have identified ourselves, our country, with the interests of a powerful and growing party in the United States. We now see a measure introduced into Congress in which nearly every article which we desire to be put on the free list—a great many of the articles of the Treaty of 1854—are put on the free list, and when we are moving in this direction, is it wise, is it statesman-like, is it worthy the Canadian people, that we should fall down and worship the Americans and tell them that if we fall short in this matter, we are left in a state of dire extremity? If there is any way, and I have the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite to back me up, by which we might be excluded from the advantages of reciprocal trade, it is that pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite, which tends to drive us into annexation with the American Union. I was not astonished—some things did surprise me—that the financial exponent of the Opposition should take special care not to give any details, or any scheme, or any definite statement as to the way in which this unrestricted panacea business would work, because that hon. gentleman years ago, used to make a financial prophecy, he used to come down to the House and in the same emphatic and loud manner, tell Parliament and the country that they could mark his words, and that the imposition of certain duties would give a surplus of so much, whereas the general result was a deficiency. At Halifax, however, the hon. gentleman went further. He came there to enlighten the people by the sea, for whom he has expressed unqualified contempt that emboldened him to use language which I was sorry to hear from the lips of any man in the Canadian House of Commons. The hon. gentleman came to Halifax, as Minister of Finance, to endeavor to rally his party in that Province. He talked a little about direct taxation there. He tells us, in his opinion now, that there is no danger of direct taxation, but, even if there is, it would be a very good thing for the people. He went on to show it was the correct way of taxing the people, that it would make them more careful as to how the money was spent, and for a long time he argued in its favor. However, in 1878, the hon. gentleman, knowing then a good deal more, perhaps, of finance and the working of the revenue than he does now, because he has been long out of office, said:

"If you deprive yourselves of your present Customs tariff (17½ per cent.) you will have to resort to some method of direct taxation, and that of a very formidable kind."

I ask that hon. gentleman now how is it that in 1878 it was a dangerous thing to interfere with the 17½ per cent. tariff for

fear of being met with direct taxation of a most formidable kind, when now, as we well know, when the needs are such that a larger amount of revenue is required, he tells us, he does not hesitate to say that though you interfere with the 25 per cent. tariff, as it has been called all round, there is no danger of our having to resort to direct taxation? The hon. gentleman cannot explain this I feel confident. But he was more definite. He went into figures and, knowing how he has failed to accomplish the results he predicted formerly, I am not surprised that he comes to such a conclusion now. In that summer, as reported in the *Halifax Chronicle*, the hon. gentleman said :

"The National Policy was a loss of ten millions of Customs duties which would have to be made up by direct taxation, equal to an income tax of 20 per cent."

I always felt a certain amount of comfort in the hon. gentleman's prophecies of gloom. I stated on a previous occasion to this House that, having studied the hon. gentleman's career with some interest, I had come to the conclusion that when he declared the condition of affairs in the country were very much down, they would be very much up, and I find as I live and grow older—and the hon. gentleman reminded me last year that I was very young—I have good reason to hold that opinion of him. The hon. gentleman told us then that, with the slightest interference with the existing trade of that day, direct taxation stared us in the face; and the hon. gentleman who sits behind him, who sat quietly in his seat while his Province was maligned, said that if there was the slightest chance of direct taxation he would cry: "Stay your hands." Let us see if the hon. gentleman has the courage of his convictions. The hon. member for South Oxford, from whom I have quoted already, and the statement from the old speech of the late Minister of Finance of the Mackenzie Government, lead to the same conclusion, that there is considerable danger of direct taxation. I want now to deal with the charge of corruption, and I may say that the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) can be excused for going so often into this, because I have noticed of late years that he seems to burden his mind with all the charges that so disgrace the political hustings in Canada. Now, that hon. gentleman heard the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), charge as one of the serious dangers threatening Confederation, one of the causes of the threatened disruption of Canada, the bribery of Nova Scotia. He did not say, in so many words, that it was bribery under what is known as "better terms," but he alluded to the transaction known as the "Act for better Terms." He charged that, as the *Toronto Globe* charges it, as a bribe paid to Nova Scotia to keep her in Confederation, and naturally he thinks that the men who gave that bribe are worthy of condemnation. He indicted them, he charged not only the men who gave the money as bribers, but the Province generally as being bribed, and he declared that it was that reason alone that kept Nova Scotia in Confederation. Will he be surprised to learn that, on the hustings at Halifax, the leader of the secessionists, the leader of one wing of the party in this House, said to the people that he was the man to whom the people of Nova Scotia owed the credit of the bribe, that he was the man most instrumental in obtaining better terms for Nova Scotia. He boasted of it; yet he sits quietly and takes that frightful slap over the face from his leader without uttering a single word. I have something more to say in regard to it, because there is no hon. gentleman who could keep quiet on such a subject. The hon. gentleman heard the hon. member for South Oxford asperse and malign a leader under whom they were at one time proud to serve. Instead of our being guilty of the bribery—the party to which I have the honor to belong—what would the hon. member for South Oxford think of this? If he believes the statement made by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) under his own hand,

Mr. TUPPER (Picton.)

in a letter he wrote to the press in 1872, when the subject was much discussed—and then I thought it was discussed for the last time—the hon. gentleman who follows his leader tells him that he was the person who proffered and gave the bribe. The senior member for Halifax said :

"What Blake and Mackenzie wanted was that the increase to our subsidy should be made as on the basis of our debt and public works, and had their advice been followed we should have had \$240,000 per annum for ever instead of \$160,000 as at present, \$85,000 of that being only for ten years, five of which have already expired."

Is the Liberal party to be charged with being guilty of high crimes, misdemeanors, and corruption, because that party offered only one-half the amount with which hon. gentlemen opposite would have bribed the Province? But then the hon. member for South Oxford and the senior member for Halifax are accustomed to hold up their hands in holy horror in regard to bribes in the shape of subsidies. The railway subsidy they declare to be a corrupt expenditure; and I would remind the House that we have been told over and over again by hon. gentlemen opposite the same old story that the granting of such large bonuses would inevitably lead to direct taxation. The senior member for Halifax denies that they would cut off the subsidies. That is too dear to him; it is not the policy he desires; but I am afraid his influence is on the wane when he has to sit and listen to attacks made on Nova Scotia by his allies, and stands up and assails the interests of Ontario and Quebec as he has done this evening. But the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that this retrenchment is to be based upon the stoppage of all the railway subsidies. "We can save," says the hon. member, "the railways subsidies and avoid any repetition of such little scenes as occurred in No. 8 a few years ago; we can save by putting an end to the system of bribery in giving grants to railway lines of \$3,200 a mile; we can cut off the whole thing with advantage to our Treasury, advantage to our markets, advantage to our country, advantage to our hopes in the future, not only in this world but in the world to come." Now, will the hon. gentleman resign his future in the world to come for the sake of getting on those Treasury benches? We have had a taste of the qualities of the hon. gentleman from Halifax (Mr. Jones); we have heard his speeches in Opposition, and we have heard his speeches when he was in power. Why, there was not a more liberal, large-minded man when he was in power in his professions as to what he would spend if he got hold of the public money. When he was in power the same hon. gentleman who advises retrenchment to-day (it is not permissible, I know, to allude to a past debate, but some of the hon. gentleman's most earnest addresses have lately been in reference to the advocacy of an increase of expenditure rather than to the decrease), in 1878, when running for an office, or running an election, at any rate, in the city of Halifax, there claimed credit not only for the agitation for better terms, but when a Minister of the Crown this mild and subservient follower of the hon. gentleman who has defamed and villified both his Province and mine, villified him and myself and every man from that Province, this hon. gentleman went down to Halifax as a Minister of the Crown in August, 1878, and as a reason for support claimed on the public hustings "that the present Government," that is, the Liberal Government, "have expended \$1,250,000 in Nova Scotia, during five years, more than the late Government expended in seven." But now it is a terrible thing for a Liberal-Conservative candidate to make promises. You must not say, according to the new code of morals laid down, that when you get to Parliament you will advocate the granting of a subsidy for a railway in your county, nor should you advocate the expenditure of public money upon post offices! Post offices and public works generally were alluded to as having been promised the electors in Prince Edward county. This is a terrible thing, but now we see that, in 1878, a Minister

of the Crown and the Minister of Militia of that day, the senior member for Halifax of to-day, said to the electors from the hustings at a political election: "that if he were elected he would use his influence to get the Government to extend the Intercolonial Railway to Wert's wharf. It is wrong for us to promise that the Government will spend money upon public works, but it is all right for the hon. gentlemen opposite. It is all right for them to talk about retrenchment when in Opposition, but it was quite a different thing for them to practice it when they held the public purse. The same hon. gentleman further said, on this question of public expenditure:

"That during the time the late Government were in power"—

"The late Government" was the extravagant and the corrupt Government now in power—

"they had only spent on an average three millions a year on public works, but during the time the present Government"—

Those hon. gentlemen who preached retrenchment and reform from 1867 down to 1874—

"they have spent on an average of six millions a year. That is the best evidence of the way the money is being expended by this Administration."

They gloried in the expenditure then, and of course my hon. friend would not go back upon the policy of aiding railways and local subsidies, because he knows that having regard to this question of bribery, he knows that he claimed the Government ought to do more than it has done in that Province of Nova Scotia. He knows that he and his party have wrung the changes from one end of Nova Scotia to the other, to the effect that we have been neglected since Confederation in regard to railway expenditure, and that the Government ought to have built those railways long ago which they promised to build and I say they are carrying out their promise in this respect as they have in all others. I thought the question of bribery was settled last year, when the late leader of the Opposition discussed the matter with the present Minister of Finance, and when the present Minister of Finance was able to read the language of that gentleman and that party's lieutenant in Nova Scotia, when he came down to a public meeting and promised there a far larger expenditure on railways to the Province of Nova Scotia if they would only support the Liberal party. I thought that matter of bribery was threshed out then. It does seem extraordinary that this hon. gentleman's allies down in the Province should have blamed us at public meetings for not spending enough money, and then formulate an indictment against us in the House for having spent so much. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this discussion will not be fruitful; that it will not aid us, at least with the United States, to obtain unrestricted reciprocity by washing this dirty linen of Nova Scotia, which the hon. gentleman has brought before the House of Commons of Canada, and which will bring neither credit to him nor to the people who sent him here. Now we have the record of the speech delivered by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He took up a large portion of the time of this House by telling us the other night about the effect this duty had upon our barley, and about our dependence upon the American market and that we had to pay a duty on all the products which we send into that market. When the late Government was in power that Government which spent their money with such a lavish hand—when they occupied the Treasury benches, when also the late George Brown had failed to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States the hon. gentleman's opinion was of another kind. At Simcoe in February, 1878, he made a speech, and I ask the attention of the House to this, for the argument answers the very weak and disingenuous argument he addressed on the other side of the question during this debate. The hon. gentleman said:

"It may be claimed that the agricultural interest has been interested by the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty. With one single exception the average prices we have received since the abrogation of that treaty have been higher than they were when the treaty was in force. In 1875 we exported 5,400,000 bushels of barley and imported less than 5,000 bushels. Our business is in the exportation of barley; it may be that the American duty reduced the amount exported somewhat, but, of course, we cannot help that as we do not make that treaty and cannot reduce it, but that state of things will not continue longer. We have opened up a great export trade of barley with England, and England will take our whole crop. We can say to the United States: If you pay us the same price for this barley less the cost of transportation which England pays you may have it."

He continued to point out that in reference to peas, beans and other articles, it was the American that paid the duty and not the Canadian. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, coming again to that speech that was addressed to us to-night by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), I would like to call attention to the authority he has brought before the House on the question of the assessment of property in Nova Scotia. I think the hon. gentleman is bold. I think the hon. gentleman proved his boldness by quoting, in support of his argument on the coal trade, a letter quoted by the hon. the late member for Digby, which was answered by that gentleman's own letter; but he is a far bolder man when he quotes this statement of James Thomson, of the city of Halifax, in reference to statistics. Mr. Thomson is the man that came, in 1878, under the lash of the hon. the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). That hon. gentleman held this same James Thomson up to ridicule in the city of Halifax; that hon. gentleman amused his audience by picturing this man as a comical statistician and that hon. gentleman christened him "Baron Statistics." Now "Baron Statistics" is the hon. gentleman's authority to-night. James Thomson, when he wrote this article was against the hon. gentleman; he has turned I have no doubt to his side, and having turned and made a somersault on unrestricted reciprocity the hon. gentleman takes him up and quotes his statistics. On that occasion the hon. gentleman—and it would have been a help to our side of the discussion if he had repeated his argument—was also reported to have said:

"He went into the question thoroughly showing that the benefits of protection would be for the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec."

Does the hon. gentleman repudiate that argument now? Does he say that protection is not a benefit for the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec? As to Mr. Thomson, here is one extract from the *Chronicle*:

"Mr. James Thomson was dealt with in a manner that would have stirred the people to indignation against him, if they had not been overcome by the ludicrous aspect of the case."

They ridiculed him as a candidate for a judgeship; they ridiculed him for the manner in which he handled figures and called him "Baron Statistics"; and yet the hon. gentleman asks the House to take his statements as to assessments. My hon. friend knows well, that in reference to that statement of Mr. Thomson's, two things can be said. If it be true, according to the assessment rolls of Nova Scotia, that property happens to have had a lower value in 1884 than it had in 1868, the hon. gentleman knows that the burning question in local politics in that Province is, how to get a fair and rational and sensible assessment, how to get the property assessed at its proper and true value; and he knows that that argument is puerile and weak, whether it came from "Baron Statistics" or any other baron. He knows that property in Nova Scotia reached a boom value immediately after Confederation. He knows that the promises which he held up to ridicule as deluding the people as to the wonderful prosperity that was going to come to them, raised the value of property to an abnormal value in 1868, and the value has no doubt since gone down to its proper and normal level. But the hon. gentleman knows that the statistics I read to-night from the authorised publications of the repeal Government give a full and complete answer as

to whether the Province is poorer or richer than it was before. Now, I have taken up considerable time, Mr. Speaker. I have carried my remarks further than I intended; but young as I am, and mindful of the rebuke I received in this House a Session ago that when a member, authorised by the people of Nova Scotia, should speak, and when he should not, should be gauged by the years of that member, and yet remembering the liberal sentiment which pervades this House, I felt justified in taking up some time in quoting from the mouths of these hon. gentlemen and their friends throughout the country, to show that this movement, first of commercial union, now of unrestricted reciprocity, vague, indefinite, meaningless, about which hon. gentlemen on the other side are now squabbling and disagreeing among themselves, was nothing more nor less than a small and petty dodge of a very desperate and hopelessly beaten political party in the Dominion of Canada. These hon. gentlemen have made specious promises before; but I will tell them that in all these political wiles, as some one has said: "You can fool some of the people all the time, you can fool all the people some of the time, but you cannot fool a majority of the people all the time."

Mr. RINFRET moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 20th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

HENRY CORRY, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the West Riding of Hastings, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Hon. Mr. Bowell.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Federal Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 52) to amend the Act incorporating the Mas-kinongé and Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. Coulombe.)

Bill (No. 53) to make further provision respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Brant.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DAVIN. I would ask permission of the House to make a personal explanation. In the *Evening Telegram*, March 19, there is an article which professes to give the exact words that I used, when speaking the other night, and the words are between quotation marks so as to show more pointedly that they were those I made use of. They are as follows:—

"Goldwin Smith he characterised 'as a student blowing bubbles in his library.' He went on: 'The Anglo-Saxon, the Celt, penetrated our
Mr. TUPPER (Pictou).

virgin forests, tilled our virgin soil; our land will never suffer them to lapse from its memory; all our rivers and streams mingle with their fame for evermore. Who, then, shall speak of geographical obstacles? Goldwin Smith, forsooth.'"

Now, I desire merely to say that I did not use that language. It would be disrespectful to a distinguished man, a man whom, however we may differ with him, we all honor for his great literary attainments, and I thank the House for permitting me to say here that I did not use the language attributed to me.

THE FISHERIES COMMISSION.

Mr. EDGAR. Yesterday I enquired from the Government as to bringing down the instructions of Lord Salisbury to the Fisheries Commission, and the hon. the Minister of Public Works said he would speak to the First Minister about it. Has he done so?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I mentioned the matter to my colleague. He will be here shortly, and I will mention the matter to him again.

KENT (ONT.) ELECTION.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Some time ago we had the matter of the Kent election before us. I believe, Sir, that you were prepared to issue the writ for that election, but the gentlemen on the Treasury benches took a different view, and the matter was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. In cases where a writ is not issued, and it is alleged that corrupt practices generally prevailed, the law imposes a certain duty on the Minister of Justice. That duty has, to some extent, been shifted to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The committee ordered the evidence to be printed. It has not hitherto been found necessary to delay the proceedings of the committee for any length of time in consequence of the printing of any evidence necessary to be brought before it, but on this occasion nearly a fortnight has elapsed since the order was given for the printing, and up to this moment, so far as I know, the evidence has not been printed, the committee has not been called, and this large district is deprived of the representation to which it is entitled. Hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches ought to be in a position to inform the House why all this delay has occurred, and why whatever steps may be required to be taken have not been taken to issue the writ for the holding of an election in the county of Kent. I mentioned in the committee that rumors were abroad that it was the intention of the Government to secure delay, and everything so far certainly points in that direction.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman would believe all the rumors he hears, he would have a great deal of work to do. I do not think that the rumor he mentions is well founded. The hon. gentleman may remember that, when the committee ordered the other day that the evidence in this case should be printed, the chairman was directed to have that done and promised that he would do so, and I have no doubt that he gave the necessary orders. Unfortunately, the chairman has been away for two or three days and I understand he will be back to-morrow, and I have no doubt that, on his return, he will take the necessary steps to have the committee called together and to have the evidence put in the hands of members. However, I will ascertain whether the evidence has been printed, in order that there may be no delay in the consideration of the question, but at the present time it has been left to the chairman of the committee, as it is in every case of this kind.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The volume of evidence which was sent to the committee is not a greater document than

we receive here almost every day, and more than a fortnight has gone by since the order was given for the printing of the evidence. I think it is a breach of the privileges of the House that such a delay should have existed.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps, at an early date, to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada, in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending Trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

MR. RINFRET. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. members who have already spoken against the motion of my hon. friend the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), have all urged the same argument which they regard as very powerful in support of the Government's policy—that prosperity exists in Canada. The evidence of this fact does not strike me as clearly as the light of the sun, because, to establish it, or, rather, to make the electors of Canada believe it, there is need of so great a display of eloquence, so many long speeches, backed by false presentation of facts, and founded on conclusions unjustified by any principle of sound political economy. Canada is thriving, they exclaim, and hence it is well governed. It goes without saying that the hon. members at the right of the Speaker take unto themselves all the merit of this fancied prosperity, and attribute the same to the fiscal laws established by them, some years ago, with the view of raising a large income to meet their extravagant administration and favor a few individuals in order to secure their assistance, in times of election. Canada, Mr. Speaker, does not flourish enough. It has not reached that degree of prosperity to which it would be entitled, if we calculate its immense mining resources, the fruitfulness of its soil, in a vast portion of its territory, and the splendid advantages which it offers to navigation and business. This fact has been proven, to my mind, with absolute clearness, by the speakers who have preceded me in supporting the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford. My purpose is not so much to prove that the stand taken by our adversaries is a mistaken one, and that our prosperity is not so great as they make it out, inasmuch as I leave it to every educated and intelligent elector to judge for himself, by what he sees about him, how much truth there is in the proposition. I had rather compare our present situation with that which it would be, with a sound fiscal system, laws which would yield justice to all classes of society, and commercial treaties which would open to us all the markets of the world. The divergence of views on this point between our

opponents and ourselves may be summed up in a nutshell. The Government have adopted a restricted policy, and we plead for a policy of commercial expansion. Nine years ago, Mr. Speaker, in 1879, when we inaugurated against the Conservatives the campaign which still continues, the favorite charge of our adversaries was that we were Utopian, and that our theories and principles could receive no practical application in a country like Canada, which, according to these gentlemen, for all sorts of reasons, could not be brought under the influence of the general principles of political economy. This was an absurd argument, as facts have abundantly proven. What are the results of this policy on the general interests of Canada? The first result has been the unequal distribution of the public fortune in enriching the rich and impoverishing the poor. The second result has been to enrich certain privileged classes at the expense of the remainder of the population. The third result has been to ruin certain industries which formerly contributed to the prosperity of Canada, in rendering impossible the exportation of their products abroad, and furthermore, to impose on the people taxes heavy enough to affect sensibly the incomes of individuals, and drain, for the behoof of the public exchequer and of certain favorites of the Government our national resources. There is not a man of good sense, Mr. Speaker, who does not admit to-day that this policy of restriction has tended to paralyse our general commerce, which has remained at a standstill these ten years back and has hampered our farming interests—the chief source of our revenue—by the enormous taxes on farm utensils and articles of prime necessity and not opening to our farmers the markets necessary to the exportation and sale of their produce. But one of the worst results of such commercial restriction, in a moral as well as an economic point of view, is the establishment of monopolies exclusively due to this anti-national policy; monopolies for manufacturing companies and monopolies still more disastrous granted to railway companies. There is one principle that guides business and is founded on natural right, that is, that prices should be settled by the general laws of supply and demand. When the demand is not sufficient to maintain a manufacture of itself, it is clear that there is an end of its usefulness, and it is a great mistake to maintain it by legislation at the public expense. But what shall we say of a law which allows a certain number of manufacturers, in a same industrial branch, to coalesce against the interests of the public and form a three-fold combination, as the sugar refiners did with the wholesale and retail dealers in this staple article of consumption? We know what took place. The sugar manufacturers made a covenant together to settle the selling price of this commodity to wholesale dealers. The latter made a like agreement to fix the wholesale price among themselves and the retail price with all the retail vendors of the same article. The objection of this understanding is to maintain a price above normal price of sugar, and to make the consumer pay a cent or two more a pound on the retail price which he is not lawfully bound to pay. But, Mr. Speaker, the refiners are not the sole monopolists. We may add to the catalogue manufacturers of cotton, woollens, india rubber, dealers in whiskey, in coals and a host of other articles. How is it possible that such combinations can be got together? For the most part, the manufacturers who thus coalesce against the interests of the people, with the view of amassing large fortunes in a few years, are favorites with the Government, who, for more or less legitimate reasons, have obtained a special protection for their respective industries. The Government of Canada have closed the entrance of foreign products by the imposition of a tax of 30, 40 and even 50 cents in the dollar on articles manufactured by these favorites. These heavy duties, by forestalling all foreign competition, allow these manufacturers to

sell at their own price, provided only they can succeed in understanding each other to despoil consumers, or, in other words, the people of Canada. A law which allows such a state of things is a law that legalises theft, and a political party permitting the same is unworthy of public confidence. The Government, by adopting the motion of my hon. friend the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), would sweep away at once all such ruinous combinations. They would strike a mortal blow at all manner of monopolies. By the same token, they would cause a decrease in what consumers purchase and would favor, in addition, in a sensible manner, all the great industries of the country, by opening up the markets of over 60,000,000 of people, and make the immense capital of the neighboring republic abound in Canada, for the development of the natural resources which our country has at her disposition. I do not think I could be charged with exaggeration, Mr. Speaker, when I state that we probably have in Canada the finest and the most powerful water power in the whole world. There is scarcely a county on the shores of the St. Lawrence, and of the great lakes, which is not crossed in every direction by streams flowing into the great river, and fit to propel hundreds, and even thousand of mills of every description. Why are such mills not built? For two reasons: first because we have not the requisite capital, and secondly, the necessary markets are lacking for the numerous products which might be manufactured there. Commercial reciprocity would give us this double advantage—capital for construction and markets for exportation. And our countrymen, who leave by thousands every year for the United States, would stop with us, finding here all the advantages held out to them by the neighboring republic. They would have the same work to do, the same wages to earn, they would share in the general prosperity, without having to bear the regrets of banishment and continuing to enjoy all the civil and political rights denied them in a foreign land. It is the farmers themselves who should derive enormous benefit from commercial reciprocity with the United States. It were idle to recall the fact that the present fiscal laws which ought to afford protection to everybody, have not only not protected farmers, but have hurt them instead, by increasing their burden of taxes without raising by a single cent, the prices of agricultural produce. But what is particularly injurious to them are the duties levied by Canada on the one hand, and by the United States on the other on the natural produce of both countries. We are severed from our neighbors by a merely fanciful line, but unfortunately, this separation has been made real by the imposition of Customs duties raising a Chinese wall between the two peoples. If this barrier did not stand there, we should have twice as much business as we have to-day in the natural products of both countries, and there would be a notable rise in the price of our farming produce. The farmers' national market, promised us by the framers of the protective tariff of 1879, has since become a laughing stock. If we had the national market only for the produce of our agriculture, the bulk of our corn and grain would mildew in our barns, and these staples, along with hay, and animals of all kinds, would command only a nominal price. Canada is first and foremost a farming country, and she requires markets for the exportation of the surplus of her immense produce. For a certain number of these products, the most natural because the nearest market is that of the United States. They are almost the only market for our horses and other animals; poultry, barley, hay, potatoes, butter, eggs and numerous other articles. On these goods we pay duties varying from 20 to 30 per cent. The abrogation of these duties could not only raise the selling price of these products, but result, furthermore, within a few years, in materially improving their production and stimulating their exportation. The hon. supporters of the Government

Mr. ALEXANDER.

have often maintained that the duties we impose on the natural products of the United States are a protection on our products of the same class. Nothing could be more erroneous than this statement. Nay, in almost every case, it is the Canadian farmers and consumers who pay the duty not only on the natural products which they are obliged to import, but even on those which they export to the United States. My hon. friend, the member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dessaint) gave a conclusive example of this, the other evening, in speaking of the horse trade. As is well known, American dealers purchase a number of horses from us every year, at our regular market prices, and pay a duty of 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, to sell them with profit on the American market. This at once proves that the price of horses is higher in the United States by at least 20 or 30 per cent. Now, let us see what would happen if this duty were swept away. It is clear that if the number of horses is the same, the American market will not be affected. Prices will stand as they are, and, as a result, the only effect will be to increase by 20 per cent, the price of Canadian horses. The price of every article is determined by the general law of supply and demand. It follows then that if we export the same number of horses to-day, this general law not being affected, the prices, all other things being equal, will remain the same. But admitting that, for a few years, the abolition of the duty and the rise in prices tend to increase notably the production and exportation of horses, it will be possible then that this surplus should have some effect on the law of supply and demand, and that the prices should decline in a like proportion, but this decrease cannot amount to much in view of our population, which is only 5,000,000, while that of the United States is 12 times greater, or 60,000,000. In that case, the surplus of production must counterbalance any possible lessening in prices. There is positively no question, at all events, that if this duty were set aside at once, the Canadian farmer would sell 20 per cent. dearer, a fact which further proves that it is he who pays the duty. On the other hand, it is equally certain that, even in the future, the abolition of this duty cannot have any other result than that of vastly favoring Canadian horse breeders. What is true of horses, applies with like force to the exportation of cattle, sheep, potatoes, hay, butter and other articles. We export yearly a considerable amount of potatoes to the American market, in spite of the enormous duty of 15 cents a bushel which we have to pay. Clear away that duty and, at once, not only will the price increase by 15 per cent, but the production will be doubled. The duties on hay are \$2 a ton, wholly paid for by the producer. This is a fact established by the American courts in a case tried, a year or two ago, between the exporters of the counties of Maskinongé and others on the north shore of the St. Lawrence and the United States Government. The latter was persuaded to remit a portion of the duties or overcharge levied by the American Customs. This is the most conclusive proof possible that these duties are borne by the Canadian farmer and not by the American consumer. The duties on butter are 4 cents a pound, and another cool loss for the Canadian producers, as the price of butter is always much higher in the United States than here. I could multiply examples, if I did not fear to prolong my remarks beyond measure. The practical conclusions to be drawn from these facts are easy. In the district of Quebec, where is situated the county which I represent, the farmers have completely changed their plan of farming in late years. The raising of grain and cereals diminishes every year, and makes room for the growth of hay, the improvement of pasturage for cattle and the manufacture of butter and cheese. It is quite clear that the growth of wheat, for the present and for many years to come, cannot vie with the grand productions of the North-West, of the American West, of British India, of Australia, and other countries, which can produce cheaper, both on account of their

phenomenal fertility, as is the case with the American West and North-West, and the low price of labor in British India, joined to the incredible fecundity of those States and of Australia. The production increases in the ratio of millions of bushels annually, and the glut that follows naturally brings with it a lowering of prices and the impossibility of competition from the farmers of my district. The price of wheat has some influence on the price of grain and cereals, rendering their cultivation a little less profitable than it formerly was. It is my duty, Mr. Speaker, as one of the representatives of that district, to foster any policy that tends to promote a new system of farming which necessity has imposed on those whom I have the honor of representing. Commercial reciprocity alone can afford this protection, because for hay, cattle, horses, butter, poultry and eggs by far the most advantageous market is that of the United States. It is there we sell our horses and our animals of all kinds, with our poultry, and there, but for the imposition of duties, we ought to sell our butter, our cheese, and our surplus of hay. The profits would thus be raised by 15 to 20 per cent., or, in other words, doubled. Indeed, there is no need to prove, because every body admits, that if we set aside all the cost of tillage, and expenses of feeding, raising and fattening stock, the net profits do not average 15 to 20 per cent. Hence, I shall not be said to exaggerate when I state that the net profits would be doubled, and even more than doubled, if the American Customs duties on such articles were done away with. Commercial union, Mr. Speaker, will likewise facilitate the grain trade in certain parts of the country, although, speaking generally, it cannot have a marked effect on the rise or fall of prices. The price of wheat, oats, peas, and of grain and cereals in general, with the possible exception of barley and peas, is settled for Canada and the United States by the Liverpool market. This is universally understood and admitted. The reason is the simple one that, here and in the United States, there is a surplus of all grains and cereals to be transported to an immense market which cannot be affected, much less controlled, by any legislation or combination on this side of the Atlantic. This proposition is true and just in so far as it regards the general trade of Canada. Hence, the reason why we have opposed as puerile the imposition of taxes on grain coming from the United States, with the object of creating a national market. We witness to-day the results of this absurd fiscal policy. The price of grain has not risen at all; it has even been steadily less since 1879 than the average of the previous decade, and if we go to the trouble of comparing the quotations here, in the United States and in England, for the past 15 or 20 years. We shall conclude that these taxes on agricultural products have only clogged the grain trade without any counter-acting assistance to the farmer. Now, I go further. In some cases, these taxes have become burdensome, as, for instance, that on certain grades of flour, of which we do not produce enough for consumption, and which we import from the United States; and low-priced flour used mostly in the Maritime Provinces and certain portions of the Province of Quebec, and the tax on Indian corn which has been proven directly injurious to the farmer, and a dead-weight on the poorest class of the people. The abrogation of duties on grain and cereals not only would harm no one, but would prove a source of benefit to the farmer. It would be the end of an unjust and annoying tax on an article of staple necessity, and would result in opening the channels of commerce, by giving through free trade between certain portions of Canada and certain parts of the United States touching each other, and which would gather a natural profit in exchanging their goods. But, Mr. Speaker, it is the wheat growers of the North-West who would derive enormous advantages from this abolition of duties, inasmuch as it would enable them to get rid of that Pacific Railway

monopoly which burdens them with inflated tariffs. During the last session, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) drew the attention of the House to the vast mischief which the monopoly of the Pacific Railway inflicts on the farmers of the North-West. And only lately, I was reading in a newspaper, the comparative prices for the transfer of grain between St. Paul and New York, and between Manitoba and Montreal. Thus, in June last, the Manitoba farmers paid for the freight of grain from Winnipeg to Montreal 50 cents per 100 pounds—a distance 1,423 miles. From St. Paul to New York, a distance of 1,420 miles, the price was only 32½ cents per 100 pounds, or a difference of 17½ cents per 100 pounds in favor of the Dakota and Minnesota farmer. This fact alone is sufficient to explain why it is that immigrants will not settle in the North-West, and why they almost all go across the border. And, unfortunately there is to be added to all this the enormous duties in farm implements, and the bad general policy adopted by the Government for the colonisation of the North-West. We have spent millions upon millions for the colonisation of the North-West and the building of the Pacific Railway. We have herein contracted an immense debt which should be paid back by the sale of federal lands and by the increase of the public income that ought to augment in proportion as our population increases by immigration in the vast territories of the North-West. I regret to have to say that the hopes of our rulers have been illusionary up to date, and that it is daily becoming plainer that we can no longer rely on that boundless territory, so long as the Government do not abandon that policy of monopolies and of commercial restriction to which they are bound hand and foot. There is nothing to be gained, Mr. Speaker, in altering our fiscal laws. Let us make the experiment of reciprocity. We had it once before for 12 years—1854 to 1866—and they who were then in Parliament, as my hon. friend for St. Johns (Mr. Bourassa) will remember that never did Canadian farmers enjoy greater prosperity. Oats sold at 60 cents a bushel; barley reached the almost fabulous price of \$1.50 to \$1.00 a bushel; grain and cereals of all kinds, potatoes, and cattle, not only sold at high prices, but were literally carried off our markets for the American trade. Our commerce had expanded almost boundlessly. In 1860 it had doubled; and almost tripled in 1865. I cite the following passage from Mr. Turcotte's work "Canada under the Union," page 527:—

"This treaty had been of advantage to both parties. It had considerably favored the Western States which had got their building timber from the Canadian market and taken advantage of our canals for the transportation of their products. It further gave some Eastern States great revenues, and the people of these States worked hard to have the treaty maintained, but they were in a minority. The treaty had also contributed to the material advantage of Canadians, giving them the facilities of working off their surplus on the American market, and of buying in that market, under favorable conditions, the articles they required for consumption and for the material of their manufactures. During the treaty of reciprocity, the import and export trades had grown almost threefold. In 1854, the figures stood at \$24,000,000 and the fiscal year 1864 showed \$89,150,000."

These remarks of Mr. Turcotte cannot be regarded as partisan, in the liberal sense, as it is well known that the author leaned in politics to the side of our adversaries, as his history abundantly proves. Of course, the present condition of the country is not quite the same as it was then. We could not work for a large increase in the transit trade on our canals, unless we improved them and gave the ports of Montreal and Quebec, as well as the canals, facilities which would enable them to cope for the transportation of the produce of the west, with the American water-ways and especially the Erie Canal. There may be obstacles in the way of realising this great measure of public interest, but one thing no man can call in question and that is, the enormous influence which reciprocity would exercise on the prosperity of farmers and the development of agriculture throughout the country. Can-

ada, Mr. Speaker, is a farming country, and it is by agriculture that it may expect to occupy some day a high position among the nations of the earth. We have in Manitoba and the North-West a boundless area of fertile land, rightly accounted among the most prolific on the face of the globe. We must develop this immense territory. Nor it alone. In the Province of Ontario and in the Province of Quebec there are tracts of vast richness which would double in value if properly opened out for their products. And what better market can we look for than the United States lying at our doors and requiring all that we can spare for their overflowing population of 60,000,000 souls. Our old Provinces, Mr. Speaker, are deserted and devastated by the plague of emigration. Every year whole families leave for the United States, and, among these, multitudes of young people that are the flower of our nation. Why do they go? To find work with the stranger, to make money for the payment of their debts. They go to the United States because that is a prosperous country, where there is more employment for them than at home. There is more business, more work, more manufactures of all kinds. We count in the United States, at the present time, over one million of Canadians, that is, nearly 20 to 25 per cent. of our whole population, and before long, Mr. Speaker, if things go on as they do, there will be as many Canadians in the United States as in Canada. It is a grave matter, this unceasing and steady and increasing exodus of the children of Canada; and the Government should take it into serious consideration. It is their duty to find a remedy for this social pestilence, unless they wish to see the total depopulation of the Province within a few years. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the magnificent speech which he delivered the other day, drew the attention of the House to the large emigration of our people to the United States, especially from the Province of Ontario. He quoted statistics to show that, not only has the population of Ontario not increased, but that it is likely less than it was some years since. I regret, Mr. Speaker, having to confirm this alarming state of things in respect of the county which I have the honor of representing. There, in the last few years, certain parishes have remained stationary, while others—the poorest ones—have lost their population. I repeat, Sir, that it is pitiful to see our fellow-countrymen emigrating to the United States to pay their debts. And I deem it my duty to state to the Government that the sole means, according to my judgment, to check this tide of emigration would be to adopt commercial reciprocity with the United States. In this way the prosperity of Canada would be assured and an avenue would be open for the inpouring of American capital that would go to develop the national wealth of the country and establish manufactures of every description. Commercial reciprocity, by throwing open the immense markets of the United States to the products of our forests, our mines, and our agriculture, would impart to Canada an unprecedented prosperity, give labor and high wages, and keep in our midst those who are compelled to emigrate. For all which reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford, on the ground that I believe it to be in the interests of the electors whom I represent and the general interest of the country.

Mr. GIGAULT. Mr. Speaker, after the speech made during the last electoral campaign by Mr. Blake, the ex-leader of the Liberal party, I had hoped that the National Policy would have been accepted by both political parties, but I am sorry to find that I was mistaken. After having fought a protective tariff the Liberals now combat even a revenue tariff, which according to them was sufficient to foster our manufacturing industries. If a revenue tariff was absolutely necessary to foster our manufacturing industries, why should the Liberals adopt unrestricted reciprocity?

Mr. RINFRET.

I do not contend, Mr. Speaker, that the intentions of the Liberals are not patriotic. They may have in view the best interests of the country, but, to my mind, by favoring unrestricted reciprocity they are committing an error, the consequences of which will be highly detrimental to the interests of the Dominion. The last speaker said that the farming community would be highly benefited by unrestricted reciprocity. That hon. gentleman should remember that the circumstances to-day are quite different from what they were under the old Reciprocity Treaty. What contributed largely to make the American market, during the old Reciprocity Treaty, so advantageous to our farmers was the American war. That war has terminated. Since the end of that war the Americans have devoted a large portion of their energy and intelligence towards developing their agricultural resources, building at the same time in their fertile North-West new railways for the cheap and rapid shipment of their agricultural produce. The result of that policy has been that the agricultural production of the United States has enormously increased. We see, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States for 1887, that in 1861 the Americans exported cattle, sheep and hogs to the value of \$254,930, while in 1887 they exported the same articles to the value of \$9,991,614; in 1861 our neighbors exported breadstuffs to the value of \$72,152,366, while in 1887 the value exported was \$165,768,662. In 1861, during the old Reciprocity Treaty, they exported provisions, meats and dairy products to the value of \$22,000,000, while in 1887 the value reached \$92,000,000, or an increase of more than \$70,000,000. So the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House should not have lost sight of the fact that the circumstances in the United States have so greatly changed that that market is far from being as beneficial to our farmers to-day as it was during the old Reciprocity Treaty. We can ascertain that fact, also, by the decrease in the imports of agricultural produce by the United States. An allusion has been made to hay. During the last three years there has been a constant decrease in the importation of that article by the United States. In 1885 our neighbors imported hay to the value of \$1,517,883; in 1886, \$1,035,408; in 1887, \$791,686; so that if we compare 1885 with last year we ascertain that there was a decrease of more than \$700,000 in the importation of that article by the United States. They also imported last year less breadstuffs and less provisions than in 1885. That decrease in imports by the United States, has been ascertained not only by myself, but also by a member of the Liberal party, who, in 1878, proposed to impose a duty on corn and oats coming from the United States to Canada. That member of the Liberal party said:

"The circumstances are changing in the United States. We are now far from exporting to the United States as large a quantity of oats as we formerly exported, and even the United States export to Canada more oats than we export to the States."

That Liberal member also said in his speech that we imported from the United States in 1876, 623,368 bushels of oats; in 1877, 672,834 bushels; while we exported in 1877, only 7,378 bushels to the United States; and that Liberal member stated at the same time that our exportation of oats would go on decreasing, from the fact that the farmers of the western States during the last few years had been growing that product very extensively, and that already they provided a sufficient quantity to supply the United States market, and had a surplus to ship to foreign markets. The United States export the surplus of their agricultural products not only to Europe, but also to Canada. Last year we imported, chiefly from our neighbors, a large quantity of agricultural products, on which we collected a duty of \$668,107, and that amount would be lost to the revenue if we adopted unrestricted reciprocity. We imported live animals to the value of \$268,400; grain of all kinds for \$931,517;

flour and meal of all kinds, \$958,740; butter, cheese, lard and meats for \$1,187,108; vegetables, \$201,634; in all, we imported agricultural products to the value of \$3,547,449. The compiler of the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States says in his report to Congress:

"The United States have to export their surplus of agricultural products to countries which have a deficiency."

That is the right theory. We must expect to send our agricultural productions, not to countries which have a surplus, but to countries which have a deficiency of agricultural produce. That is the reason why I agreed with the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), when he said that the price of our agricultural produce was regulated, not by the American market, but by the Liverpool market. That hon. member showed, by stating so, that the natural market for our agricultural produce was not in the United States, but in England. Last year we exported agricultural produce to the latter country for \$25,000,000, and to the United States for \$15,000,000. But I may say immediately that I have always been, and am still in favor of a reciprocity treaty for the natural productions of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Why?

Mr. GIGAULT. Why? Well, it has always been the policy I have supported, and that policy was included in the Statute-book of 1879. We said then that, as soon as the Americans were willing to give access to our agricultural produce, we were willing to admit their agricultural produce free of duty into our country; but there is a thing which I am not ready to do in order to obtain that reciprocity treaty for the natural productions, and that sacrifice which I am not ready to make is the sacrifice of our manufacturing industries and of our home market. That is the reason why I am in favor of a reciprocity treaty for natural productions, and am not in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. If in reciprocity there would be certain advantages, we must consider also what would be the disadvantages of that unrestricted reciprocity; and I believe that, after we have considered the disadvantages, we must come to the conclusion that such a policy would be much more detrimental than beneficial to the interests of this country. First of all, we would lose a large portion of our revenue from customs, and would be obliged to resort to direct taxation. I know it has been contended by our Canadian free traders that it would not be necessary to resort to direct taxation on account of the loss of revenue which would follow unrestricted reciprocity; but I do not see how such an opinion can be upheld. We would lose certainly more than \$7,000,000 on the imports which would come from the United States; our imports from other countries would certainly also decrease, and I think I may safely say that we would lose more than ten or twelve millions of revenue by the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity. And, for that loss of revenue, what advantage would we have? We sell to the Americans, our neighbors, agricultural produce for the sum of \$15,000,000. Well, in order to sell agricultural produce to that amount, we would be obliged to resort to direct taxation for ten or twelve millions. We pay now about 20 per cent. upon our agricultural produce exported to the United States, but, if we adopt unrestricted reciprocity, we would perhaps pay 30 or 40 per cent. on account of direct taxation upon property in Canada, so that, instead of decreasing the duty, we would increase it upon the exports of agricultural produce which we would sell to the United States. The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) has attacked the National Policy, and has contended that the National Policy has a detrimental effect upon the condition of Canada. He speaks of the high price of the manufactured goods which are made in our manufactories, as if a protective tariff had the effect of increasing the price of manufactured goods. What do we see in the United States?

The American Returns of Commerce and Navigation for the year 1887, give the prices of the different commodities manufactured in that country. We see that in 1847 the price for standard sheetings, per yard, was 8 cents, and that in 1886 it was only 6 cents. We find that the price of standard drillings, per yard, was 8 cents in 1847, and in 1886, 6 cents; that the price of bleached sheeting, per yard, in 1847 was 14 cents, and in 1886 it was only 10 cents; that the price of standard prints in 1847 was 11 cents, and in 1886 only 6 cents; that the price of printed cloth, 66 by 66 inches, per yard, was, in 1847, 6 cents, and in 1886, 3 cents. That is the way that the price of those manufactured goods has been increased by a protective tariff in the United States; while here in Canada we ascertain by facts that the prices of almost all the manufactured goods of Canada have been reduced since the adoption of a protective tariff. But there is another thing which should not be lost sight of by our farmers: unrestricted reciprocity would almost destroy, or greatly diminish, the importance of our home market. Let the free traders say what they like, I know that in the county of Rouville, and, in its vicinity, a protective tariff has produced a very good effect. Our farmers are increasing their deposits every year in the banks. In the cities of St. Hyacinthe and Montreal, the number of consumers of agricultural produce is largely increased. Every week our farmers resort to those markets; every week traders go over our rural districts buying eggs, poultry, animals, fruit and other articles of farm produce. And where do these articles go, and in a much larger quantity than in the past? They go to the markets of St. Hyacinthe and Montreal, where there is a much larger number of consumers than there was in the past. Destroy, by unrestricted reciprocity, the manufacturing industries of those two cities, throw out of employment the thousands of workmen who gain their living in those manufactories, and what would be the result? Our market for agricultural produce would lose its importance; that would be the sad result of unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret) has alluded to our magnificent water powers, and he seems to believe that, under unrestricted reciprocity, the American manufacturers would leave their own country and come here to build up manufactures in Canada. Such a thing cannot happen, Mr. Speaker. When our doors are thrown open to the trade of the United States, it will not be necessary for the manufacturers to come and settle in Canada. They will have free access to our country, they will make it a slaughter market for the surplus of their manufactured goods as they did before 1879. In England, in France, in the United States public men have always felt it to be their duty to protect equally the manufacturers and the farmers. They believe that they should be equally prosperous, that alongside of the farmers there should be mechanics and workmen in order to consume the agricultural products. Napoleon I, whose genius was admired by all nations, not only endeavored to favor agriculture, but also made great efforts to encourage and foster manufacturing industries. Near the fields covered with abundant harvests, he wanted to have thrifty villages and cities inhabited by numerous workmen in easy circumstances. He did not rely upon foreigners to create a home market and home industries in France; he relied upon himself and upon the intelligence and energy of his fellow-countrymen. That is the line of conduct that we should follow; and if we do so, we will continue to encourage our manufacturing industries as we have done in the past. We have no reason to be despondent. Our North-West is developing itself rapidly, our deposits in the savings banks are increasing, our manufacturing industries are growing, and I believe that, under present circumstances, Canadians can create for themselves a most enviable position.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). In rising to perform the task which now becomes my duty, I must compliment the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) on the speech he has just made, for the manly, upright and honorable way in which he has presented his case. I never object to any individual entertaining opinions contrary to my own, because if I have a right to hold opinions, another gentleman has an equal right to hold different opinions, as long as he places them before the House and the country in a gentlemanly and straightforward manner. I have very great pleasure indeed in complimenting the hon. member who has just taken his seat for the remarks he has made, not that I agree with his arguments, nor with the deductions he has drawn from his statistics; that does not necessarily follow. But to my mind his speech was very refreshing, because of its contrast to the harangue of personalities which we had to submit to last night, for three hours, and which appeared to be the crowning effort of the day's work. In fact I was so sick yesterday of the personalities that were flung from one side of the House to the other that I felt as if I would like to be out of the House altogether. I think that, as representatives of the people, we should deal as seriously as we can with the great issue before us. I must express it as my candid opinion that there has not been such a great issue before the Canadian Parliament since the Provinces were united into a Confederation. I do not believe that there ever was a question that attracted more attention throughout the length and breadth of Canada than the question which has been discussed during the last few days. But I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that when the intelligent men outside read a discussion containing so many personalities, they will be anxious to get down to the real question that is under discussion, and will give credit to those who discuss facts apart and free from personalities, which are undignified and ungentlemanly. We were told during this discussion that the Reciprocity Treaty which lasted from 1854 to 1866 was not a success; we were told by others that it was a comparative success, and we were told by others still that it was a great success. Indeed, Sir, it appears to me there is a difference of opinion among hon. gentlemen opposite as to whether it was a success or not. It will therefore devolve upon me, as rapidly as I can, to prove by statistics and otherwise that the Reciprocity Treaty which we had in Canada from 1854 to 1866 was largely in the interests of the people of Canada, largely in the interests of the products of the great industries of the country, and contributing largely to their success. It was stated the other evening, by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Porter), that there were attendant circumstances, that other events occurred during those years which rendered Canada more successful than it otherwise would have been. He stated that the Grand Trunk Railway was built during those years, forgetting the fact that the Grand Trunk Railway was commenced about five years before we had reciprocity, and a large proportion of the money that was spent on account of that railway was spent before we had the benefit of the Reciprocity Treaty. He also told us that we had a war in Europe, which gave large prices to farmers for their products. It was true there was a war, but the war was nearly over when this treaty went into operation in the United States, for the treaty went into operation in March, 1855. But the hon. gentleman did not give this House to understand that, on account of the excessive prices that prevailed for a number of years previously, never did more distress prevail in this country than in 1857, and that there was such a depreciation in the money markets of this country that caused a great number of insolvencies. There was never a period in Canadian history when we recovered more rapidly from depression than we did in 1857, and this was on account of the impetus given to the trade of the country on

Mr. GIGAULT,

account of the operation of the treaty. We are told again that the Civil War in the United States had given a great impetus to the trade of Canada. Now, if the hon. gentleman who made that statement will look up statistics upon that matter, he will find that our trade did not increase very rapidly during the American war; he will find, also, that a large proportion of the Americans were cut off from the markets of Canada by that very war. The South was blockaded and 10,000,000 of people could not be reached during the war, and the result was that Canada, which formerly supplied largely to the southern States, was cut off from trading with them, so that, by the blockade of the southern portions of the American Union, we lost more than we gained by the impetus of trade with the north. The statistics of the trade of this country with the Americans will show that the Reciprocity Treaty was a great advantage to Canada. We have it from Government figures that, in 1854, the export from this country to the American Union was a little less than \$9,000,000, and in 1866, or about twelve years afterwards, our export was \$54,000,000. That proves without a doubt or a contradiction, that a great trade had sprung up between this country and the United States under the operations of the treaty. It must be remembered, upon the other side, that we had the advantage under the provisions of that treaty. Our trade grew from \$9,000,000 to \$54,000,000, while their trade only rose from \$23,000,000 to \$29,000,000 in the same number of years. Our trade rose 500 per cent. and their trade only 24 per cent. It is perfectly clear from these facts that we in this country derived great advantage from having the United States markets open to our products, and thus giving the lumbermen, fishermen and miners of this country an open market in which they could sell the products of their toil. To show you, Mr. Speaker, the extraordinary bounds which trade reached between the two countries during this period, allow me to give you a few figures which bear upon the point. We take first Canada—that is, old Canada, Upper and Lower Canada as it is now called. The export trade, in 1854, to the United States was \$8,649,002. It increased in the twelve years to \$34,770,251, so that the increase of the export trade in those Provinces was 300 per cent. in twelve years. Nova Scotia had an export trade, in 1854, of \$1,593,428, and her trade increased to \$3,228,550 in this period, or 100 per cent. in the twelve years. New Brunswick had an export trade, in 1854, of \$489,650, and her export trade, in 1866, rose to \$1,555,914, or 280 per cent. Prince Edward Island, of which we have heard so much and in such eloquent terms, had an export trade, in 1854, of \$81,782; under the auspices of the Reciprocity Treaty which existed during those twelve years she increased her export trade to \$1,058,642, or during the treaty period of an increase of 1200 per cent. This proves beyond a doubt that the Reciprocity Treaty had a great effect in stimulating trade in those eastern Provinces. Now, Sir, if we compare the increase of export trade during those twelve years with the increase from 1866 to 1887, it will show a large increase in the former period over the latter period. As I have shown, we had in Upper and Lower Canada an increase of 300 per cent. in the first period and only 70 per cent. in the last twenty years, or 300 per cent. for twelve years as against 70 per cent. in twenty years. In Nova Scotia we had, during the first period to which I have alluded, an increase of 100 per cent., while during the last twenty years we had only 158 per cent. increase, or quite a considerable percentage less, taking the number of years into consideration. In New Brunswick we had an increase, in the former period, of 280 per cent. for twelve years, and in the same Province during the latter period an increase of 160 per cent. for twenty years. Now coming to Prince Edward Island the increase during the twelve years of the Reciprocity Treaty was 1200 per cent., but for the latter period of twenty years it was only 20

per cent., or one per cent. per annum. Those facts go to show that the Reciprocity Treaty had a tremendously beneficial effect upon the export trade of the eastern Provinces, during the period of reciprocity. Now, take the shipping of those Provinces: Nova Scotia, in 1868, built 3,038 tons of shipping, and in 1887 she only built 15,932 tons. New Brunswick built in 1868, 24,919 tons of shipping, and in 1887 only 6,817 tons. In 1868 Prince Edward Island built 26,041 tons, and her shipbuilding industry has been nearly wiped out altogether, for she only built this year 1,686 tons as against 26,041 tons ten years ago. Does not this prove that the shipping industry has been prejudicially affected by the operation of this protective or restrictive system which has been adopted in this country? Sir, I want to point out another fact in connection with this matter. As I said before, the total export trade of this country to the United States was \$8,931,904 in 1854, and \$54,704,909 in 1886, an increase of 600 per cent. The imports from the United States during those years only increased 12 per cent., showing that we had the advantage of that trade during the reciprocity year. Was there a difference of opinion in this country as to the advantages derived from the Reciprocity Treaty when the United States in 1864 gave notice of the abrogation of the treaty? We see there was not. There was consternation throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, and the Executive Council, the Government of the day, met for the purpose of memorialising the English Government to take steps to prevent such a calamity falling upon the Canadian people. In order that I may give the exact words, allow me to read you the report of that committee made in 1864. The report was made the 19th February, 1864, and reads as follows:—

"The Committee of the Executive Council deem it to be their duty to represent to Your Excellency, that the recent proceedings in the Congress of the United States, respecting the Reciprocity Treaty, have excited the deepest concern in the minds of the people of this Province.

"Those proceedings have had for their avowed object the abrogation of the treaty at the earliest moment, consistent with the stipulations of the instrument itself.

"Although no formal action, indicative of the strength of the party hostile to the continuance of the treaty has yet taken place; information of an authentic character, as to the opinions and purposes of influential men in the United States, has forced upon the Committee the conviction that there is imminent danger of its speedy abrogation, unless prompt and vigorous steps be taken by Her Majesty's Imperial advisers to avert what would be, generally regarded, by the people of Canada, as a great calamity."

If in those days the abrogation of that treaty would be considered a great calamity to the people of Canada, would not the return of that treaty be considered a great blessing for the people of Canada? If the loss of anything is a great calamity, to receive that same thing must be a great blessing. Nor, Sir, was this all. There was a convention held in 1864, for the purpose of bringing to bear on the American people as much influence as possible with the view of obtaining a continuance of the treaty. You will no doubt remember that great convention which took place in the city of Detroit, and which was attended by many delegates from this country, for the purpose of discussing this question; and you will remember the great speech made on that occasion by the great father of Nova Scotia to whom every Nova Scotian looks back with pride and honor—I mean the Hon. Joseph Howe—that speech, in which he set forth the desirability for wider and freer trade with the American Union than we should have if the abrogation of that treaty took place, and in which, with unusual eloquence, he brought forward argument after argument to prove that it would be advantageous, not only to Canada, but to the United States as well, to continue in the new relationship which existed for twelve years. Now, Sir, all these facts go to prove that that treaty was a great blessing to the people of this country; and it was considered by the people of this country to be a great blessing, because there were efforts made year after year to obtain a renewal of the

treaty after it was abrogated in 1866. The hon. leader of the Government had a high appreciation of its advantages, because he never gave up the prospect of obtaining freer trade relations with the American Union until this so-called National Policy was established in 1879, by which the combines and monopolies and manufactories in the country, by their influence and money, have been enabled to keep him in power. Then he forgot what he had stated in those former years, which were the years of greater prosperity than the present.

Mr. SPROULE. Is your resolution for the same kind of a treaty now?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). My dear Sir, our resolution is in principle the same. We, on this side of the House, are perfectly willing to accept the Reciprocity Treaty upon the same terms as before; but you know very well, if you know anything at all about it, that the United States will not grant the same privileges that we had before. Are we, then, Sir, to deny the great boon to the industrial classes of this country, because the United States will not give it, unless we give up the special protection to the manufacturers of this country? Are we going to neglect the farmers, the fishermen, the lumbermen and the miners, to whom it has been a great boon, because, forsooth, a number of manufacturers say it will interfere with their interests and deprive them of some of the profits that the hard-working people of this country contribute out of their earnings? If the hon. member will get it, I am sure the Liberal party will hail with gladness a reciprocity treaty identical with that which we had from 1854 to 1866. But we had at that time the best end of the stick, and they will not give it to us again. But we are willing to go further to-day to get the other great boon; and I say, if it should injure the manufacturers, their interests must be sacrificed for the interests of the great body of the people of this country. It is a principle of all Governments to sacrifice, if necessary, the interests of a few for the purpose of securing benefits for the great majority of the people.

Mr. SPROULE. That was not what your leader promised at the last general election.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. the present leader of the Government was favorable to a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty. Nay, more, he pronounced himself a free trader on the public platforms of this country. Let me read some of the expressions he made use of. Probably the hon. gentleman who has been disturbing me does not remember so far back as that; probably he did not read those speeches. Probably he feels quieter and more complacent in his mind when he does not read what took place in his own party. You will remember that 1877 was the year in which it was decided by the Conservative party that the great National Policy should be made the issue before the country in the ensuing general election. They went up and down through the country preaching the great benefits that this so-called National Policy was to secure. But did they go to the people, and say: We are going to change this into a protective country? No, they said to the people: We have been trying for years to get a reciprocity treaty from the United States, and they refuse to give it to us; in consequence of that refusal, we are going to adopt a high protective tariff, and force them to come to our terms, and give us the great boon we have been asking for. I ask hon. gentlemen if that was not the case. Now, listen to what was said at that time by the hon. leader of the Government, then leader of the Opposition, which he will likely be again after the next general election. The hon. gentleman, at Napanee, on September 11th, said:

"He was a free trader if he could get free trade."

That is just what we are to-day, and if we cannot get full free trade, with the American Union, we are willing to

take partial trade. We are willing to go in for reciprocal free trade and are, therefore, standing on the same platform the hon. leader of the Government stood upon when he delivered that celebrated speech. At Cobourg, on August 29th, he said :

"The Canadian farmer would raise his barley for say \$1 a bushel, and it would not be the brewer who would pay the 15 cents; he paid \$1 for his barley, no matter where it was from or from whom it was bought, but the duty came out of the pocket of the Canadian farmer."

Now, I think this principle the Tory party deny at the present time. When hon. gentlemen on this side were settling forth the amount of money we lose in consequence of the duty on the barley we send to the United States, it was thrown back that it was not the Canadian farmer, but the American consumers who lost it. But let me read what the hon. leader of the Government said at Newmarket, on September 14th, 1887 :

"If we cannot get reciprocity of trade, we must get reciprocity of tariff."

I hope the hon. members will remember this language. The protective tariff was only put forward as an alternative to what was wanted—if we cannot get reciprocity of trade, then we must get reciprocity of tariff, but he preferred reciprocity of trade. At Hamilton, on October 17th, the hon. gentleman said :

"I want the Canadians to say to the Americans : We will have free trade, fair trade, or reciprocal trade if you like, but if you will not have any of these, we will have a reciprocity of tariff."

That proves beyond any cavil that the present leader of the Government was favorable to unlimited reciprocity up to 1878, when he fell into the trap of the National Policy ; and ever since he got into that large strong trap, the combines and monopolists and manufacturers have put their foot so strongly on the spring that the hon. gentleman has never been able to get out of it. He has made up his mind to die in that trap, and his followers are determined to keep him there. But I understand there are still among the Conservative party, and even among the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, gentlemen who are in favor of reciprocity in a wider degree of trade between this country and the United States ; and I believe one of these is the hon. gentleman who, I am sorry to say, has been compelled to be absent for many days on account of illness. I believe the hon. the Finance Minister has enlarged views on this question, and I believe this from many circumstances. I am, therefore, sorry he has been unable to attend this debate, so as to give us the expression of his own opinions in this matter ; for I am of opinion that had he been able to do so, he would have thrown a bombshell into the Government ranks. The right hon. the leader of the Government has often told us that Providence comes to his assistance in time of need. He once, indeed, stated that Providence made the wheat grow as soon as his party came into power ; and I am sure that Providence has come to his assistance during the last few days, by opportunely shunting off from the track a gentleman of great ability and great force, while the great car of unrestricted reciprocity was being driven across the House. But I sincerely hope that the hon. gentleman will be here before the close of this debate, to give his views on this subject. I wish to make a few remarks with regard to those papers of which we have heard so much. Among the papers placed at our disposal, is a letter written by the Hon. Secretary Bayard to the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, to whom I refer now in his capacity as one of the plenipotentiaries. From this letter, I learn that a desire was expressed on the part of Secretary Bayard to have the commercial relationship between the two countries settled. We are told that Mr. Bayard wrote his letter, with his own hand and unofficially. Anyone who knows the position Mr. Bayard occupies in the Washington Cabinet, knows well that whatever he pens with his own hand, even unofficially,

Mr. MACDONALD (HURON).

may be taken as an indication of the policy of the American Government. Now, what has that hon. gentleman penned ? He has penned the following words :—

"The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain, which has been a *questio vexata* ever since it was concluded."

That is the immediate question which the plenipotentiaries are supposed to meet to decide. But he says further :

"I am confident we both seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

You see the force of the word "entire," and his pointed use of it. He does not mean a relationship between the farmers of both countries, or between a particular class in each country. No, he evidently embraces all the industrial classes of the United States and the Dominion, and you see how careful he was to explain himself :

"I say commercial, because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to affect the legislative independence of either country."

Now, where is there any reference to commercial union in this language ? In the first place, Mr. Bayard pointed out that his plan was not intended to affect the political relationship of either country ; and he goes further, and adds : "It is not to affect the legislative independence of either country." Now, commercial union will affect the legislative independence of this country, because under it we must have equal customs laws with those of the United States. There must be an arrangement between ourselves and the United States as to the customs laws, which must be the same in both countries, and any alteration in these laws, in years to come, would have to be based on an agreement between the two Governments. Therefore, independence of legislation under commercial union would be affected. But Mr. Bayard says it is not to be affected, and we must conclude from this that commercial union was not in his mind at all. Sir Charles Tupper agreed with the sentiment to which Mr. Bayard gave expression. Any of you who have read these papers will see how the words correspond, even in their verbal character. The language used by both hon. gentlemen is almost identical. Sir Charles Tupper replied :

"I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement,—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

Mr. Bayard's object was to call Sir Charles Tupper's attention to the method which he proposed, by which the whole commercial relations of the two countries would be brought under the consideration of a commission, on the supposition that, in all probability, the Government of Canada would refer the matter to the Government of England, and that power would be given the commission to take into consideration all these questions. But such power was not granted. Now, let me show you how the powers were granted in England. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) brought up a question last night—to which I wish to draw his attention—in order to show that this proposition with regard to enlarging the trade between Canada and the United States was a buncombe proposition. If you turn to the powers granted by Her Majesty Queen Victoria to her plenipotentiaries, you will find the following :—

"Whereas for the purpose of considering and adjusting in a friendly spirit with plenipotentiaries to be appointed on the part of our good friends the United States of America, all or any questions relating to rights of the fishery in the seas adjacent to British North America and Newfoundland, which are in dispute between our Government and that of our said good friends, and any other questions that may arise which the respective plenipotentiaries may be authorised"—

Not "authorised," mark you, but "may be authorised," if an authorisation is required,—

"by their respective Governments to consider and adjust."

Now, that authorisation and power was given to the British plenipotentiaries on the 24th of October, 1887. Powers were not granted to the American plenipotentiaries until the 18th of the following month, and the President, of course, granted the United States plenipotentiaries exactly the same powers. What were the powers granted?

"To meet and confer with plenipotentiaries representing the Government of Her Britannic Majesty for the purpose of considering and adjusting in a friendly spirit all or any questions relating to rights of fishery in the seas adjacent to British North America and Newfoundland which are in dispute between the Governments of the United States and that of Her Britannic Majesty, and any other question which may arise and which they may be authorised by their respective Governments to consider and adjust."

Now, these are the powers that were given. You see that the powers given to each were exactly the same, couched in the same words. Then when this proposition was made by Sir Charles Tupper, in regard to the widening of our commercial relationship with the United States, what did the American plenipotentiaries say in reply? They said: We have no power to consider such a proposition at all; we must first obtain authority from the President. I want to ask the House if the American plenipotentiaries had no power to consider the proposition of Sir Charles Tupper, how had the other plenipotentiaries the power to make such a proposition? They were vested with the same powers from their respective Governments, and if one was not able to receive it, the other was not able to make it, and I believe the whole thing was done in order to lead the Canadian people astray, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) attempted to lead them astray last night. He said we were favorable to it; did not our plenipotentiaries at Washington attempt to obtain it? And then he read the American denial. Could they accept it at all? We were told by the plenipotentiary himself in this House that discussion took place and continued for weeks, over what? Over the trade question? Probably it did. Was that discussion inside or outside of their powers? It was a discussion that took place around the table in a personal way. Each one, speaking on his own responsibility, laid down a line of action, and others laid down another line of action, and our plenipotentiary expected that these propositions and counter-propositions should be laid upon the table in connection with the protocols. But it was ruled out of the protocols. Why? Because neither the one party nor the other had power to consider these propositions, and it was absurd to expect that these would come into a public document entirely of a different character. That proves to my mind that this proposition made at Washington was only made for a sham, and was brought before the Canadian people to lead them to believe that an offer had been made; and I am satisfied that on the public platforms in western Ontario I shall hear that the Canadian plenipotentiary, Sir Charles Tupper, laid a proposition for extended trade on the table at Washington, and that the Americans would not consider the subject at all. How could Canada bring it about when the United States plenipotentiaries would not consider it? That is what they will say; and I want to say here in my place in this House that the English plenipotentiaries must have known that that could not be carried out, when they knew perfectly well that they had not been invested with the power to do it. I believe that a public trade policy must be based upon the lines along which the strongest capabilities of any country lie, just as if you, Mr. Speaker, or I, had a son whom we wished to educate; we would study his abilities and capacities, and, after learning what they were, we would educate him along the lines of his strongest abilities; and, as that is the true and proper policy in the education of a son, it is just as true in the development of a country. What are the great natural sources of wealth in this country? The first is the farming industries. They stand pre-eminently higher than any

other in the community. We have a large quantity of magnificent lands, we have the hardy and sturdy pioneers who have gone to these lands and are working to develop them. There are 600,000 farmers in the Dominion of Canada. They are the largest investors in property, the largest employers of labor, and the largest consumers of what is imported, and the demand is made that this House should adopt a policy which is in their interest, and which the Government have shown in the past they were favorable to in the interests of the farmers. It has been repeatedly stated in this debate that the farmers are well off. I live in an agricultural county; I live in one of the finest sections for agriculture that you can find in Canada, and I am satisfied that the farmers are not well off. They have large and heavy debts upon them; and this brings me to a question which was brought up by the hon. the Minister of the Interior the other night. He tried to show that the farmers of Ontario and of Canada were not in debt, and to prove that he took the returns of the loan societies of this country, and showed that according to their report there are not so very many mortgages on the farms. Did not the hon. gentleman know that there is not one mortgage in five owned by the loan companies? Does he not know that the farmers have become so sick of the shaving and cheating principles of the loan companies that they will hardly accept any money from them? They are, of course, not all of that kind, but the farmers would rather pay a much larger rate for money obtained from other sources; and I believe that for every one mortgage which the loan companies have, other parties, outside of those companies, have three or four. So his argument falls entirely to the ground, because the premises upon which he built the argument was entirely at variance with the truth. I may ask, how is a free trade policy to favor the farmers? We have been told by a good many hon. members on the other side that free trade with the United States will not afford any relief to the farmers, that it will not give them an enlarged market. If that is so the statistics which are placed at our disposal by the Government of the country do not tell the truth. We were told that on account of the United States exporting large quantities of the articles we had to send there, therefore the American markets were not ours. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Porter) brought out that argument very strongly. He said the American market is now filled. The Americans export a large number of horses and cattle and other animals, as well as cereals of the country, and, therefore, is not a market for Canadian produce. Let me give you what the Trade and Navigation Returns show in regard to our export. Of our exportation of horses, 97 per cent. goes to the United States and 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. goes to England; of horned cattle, 39 per cent. goes to the United States and 54 per cent. to England.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear."

An hon. MEMBER. What is the value?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Let me answer one at a time.

An hon. MEMBER. Answer the question.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Which? That as to the value? There is a large number of horses that go to England that are superior to many that go to the United States, and, if the hon. gentleman knew anything about buying and selling horses, he would know that we send to the United States a great many that are not very valuable, and consequently the prices are low. Last year we sent 826 horses to England and 18,225 to the United States. The average price for these, as given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, was \$116 for those sent to England, and

\$121 for those sent to the United States. How is that? I challenge the contradiction of these figures, and the very gentleman who has asked this question will, I hope, look up the Trade and Navigation Returns, and show me if I have made a mistake when he speaks on this question.

Mr. MASSON. The question of values refers to cattle.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). There is a gentleman who wants to know something about cattle. If that hon. gentleman is a farmer—

An hon. MEMBER. He is a lawyer.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I thought he was not a farmer. I do not think he would ask such a question if he was a farmer, because every farmer here knows why our cattle fetch less prices in the United States than they do in England. Our best and fattest cattle go to the English market for beef; it is our stalkers from the grass field that go to the United States. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the stalkers would fetch the same price as those cattle which have been fattened and fed upon corn and oats for beef in the English market? There are many farmers around me, and I do not wish them to shield me one iota if I do not state what they know to be true. I think, if you study a little less law and more common sense, you would not ask such questions. Here is a list of several articles of export, showing the proportion going to the United States, and the proportion going to England:

	To the United States.	To Great Britain.
	per cent.	per cent.
Horses	97	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Horned cattle.....	39	54
Sheep.....	81 $\frac{1}{2}$	15 $\frac{1}{2}$
Poultry.....	92	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Eggs.....	99 $\frac{7}{8}$	None.
Potatoes.....	81 $\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{10}$ of 1
Vegetables.....	90	$\frac{1}{10}$ of 1
Straw.....	100	None.
Hay.....	90	$\frac{1}{2}$ of 1
Barley.....	99 $\frac{7}{8}$	$\frac{1}{10}$ of 1
Beans.....	99 $\frac{7}{8}$	None.
Apples, green.....	25 $\frac{1}{2}$	73
Wool.....	91 $\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{10}$ of 1

Now, in the face of these facts I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, I would ask those who said that the United States was not a market for Canadian products, to consider these figures. They are not my figures; they are the figures put into the Trade and Navigation Returns for our use. Where are the men now who say that the United States is not the market for us? It does not matter to us whether they export these articles again, so long as they pay the highest price to us. If we have to send them there paying a duty, the farmers in this country will not realise the full benefit of having that market; but if, on the other hand, the duty is removed, then we would have a market where we would realise a higher sum for those articles than we are realising now. There is an hon. gentleman yonder, who, by his face, I should say, wants some information; he looks as though he could hold a good deal.

Mr. McNEILL. May I ask the hon. gentleman if I understood him correctly to say that nine-tenths of the vegetables go into the United States and only one-tenth to England?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Yes, our exports.

Mr. McNEILL. I am asking for information on that point—with regard to vegetables.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He will forget it, it is no use.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). He may put it in his pocket. Some men have more room in their pockets than in their heads. Here are the figures I gave: 81 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of our potatoes go to the United States, and $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 per cent. go to England. Of other vegetables 90 per cent go to the American market and $\frac{1}{10}$ of 1 per cent. to the English market.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

Mr. McNEILL. What about our own home market?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Mr. McNEILL. That is amusing to hon. gentlemen opposite. They do not realise the value of that at all.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I suppose I could not please the hon. gentleman if I tried. I suppose, if I told him about the home market, he would ask something about the foreign market, and here he would keep me running around after him, first into one corner, then into another. I do not think the bird is worth the powder, or the shot. Now, I want to make a few remarks upon some of those articles. We send to the American market 18,225 horses. Now, it is said that we would not realise any higher price for horses. In the American market they require 2,500,000 horses a year. They require 300,000 horses to keep up the supply; we only send them 18,225, which is about one horse out of every 140 which the American market requires; therefore we are not in a position, by our present exportation, to dilute the American market to any marked degree, and, therefore, we command the price in the American market on account of the demand in that market. Very well; accepting that doctrine as the true one, if we send twice 18,000 horses, still we would not dilute the American market so as to affect the price. Then, acknowledging that point, the Canadian exporter will make all the duty. For instance, if a horse is purchased here and crosses the line, and has to pay \$20 duty, and goes to the American market and is sold there, he is sold at the same price as an American horse. If the duty is removed, and if we cannot affect the price in the American market by dilution, then we make exactly \$20, or, according to the price of horses last year, \$24.30 on the value of each horse; the farmer makes that profit on every horse he sells on the other side. But if, on the other hand, we were to send any such large number to the American market as appreciably to dilute it, then that would increase the supply a little above the demand, and the result would be a depreciation in the price, and the Canadian farmer would not realise as much as he otherwise would. But if we cannot alter the price by the number we send in, the Canadian farmer makes every dollar of the duty. The same principle is true in respect to everything else we send in. Now, last year the duties paid on horses amounted to \$443,000; that sum would have gone into the pockets of the Canadian farmer if the duty was removed, according to the principle I have laid down. There was \$195,000 collected in duties on sheep that went into the United States. There was \$9,900 collected on poultry that we sent in to feed those people over there who wanted our poultry. \$199,521 were paid in duty on potatoes; and I would ask my hon. friend who is looking me in the face, to consider the fact that in his own Province, that exports over a million bushels of potatoes, and pays 15 cents a bushel duty, the tariff takes that sum out of the pockets of the farmers of Prince Edward Island to-day. Then we export a large amount of hay principally from the eastern Provinces, and we paid last year \$139,000 duty on hay. On barley, which the Americans take from us to such a large extent—in fact they take it all—we paid \$994,000 in duty. And just one or two words about barley. It is impossible to dilute the American market with barley. We have a special kind of barley that the Americans must have. We have the hard, white barley that they do not grow, and that is considered the best for malting purposes, and, therefore, the brewers demand that barley. The Canadian farmer cannot put his barley on the United States market without paying 10 cents per bushel duty.

Mr. TAYLOR. They must have it and they must pay the duty. If they want the barley they must pay the duty on it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I know that hon. gentleman has been a Conservative all the days of his life, and I suppose he will be so the balance of it. I just want to answer him by the leader of that party, a party that would have gone to wreck, head and heels, long ago, if it had not him to guide it. He was the builder of it, he has put the bulwarks around it, he holds it together, and when he dies I believe the party will resolve itself into its original elements of individual entities. Now, Sir, if I answered that hon. gentleman in my own words he would, no doubt, on account of my being on this side of the House, declare that I was not sufficient authority, but when I place in opposition to his statement the opinion of his own leader, surely, as a loyal follower of the hon. gentleman, he would accept the testimony of the First Minister. Would you not?

Mr. TAYLOR. No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Does the hon. gentleman say no?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is not necessary to accept it if it is not correct. You gentlemen on that side of the House accept it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). On the 29th of August, 1877, the present leader of the Government addressed a large audience, and in the course of his speech he went on to prove that the Canadian farmer, and not the United States brewer, pays the duty of 15 cents per bushel on barley that is sent into the United States. He said:

"The Canadian farmer would raise his barley for, say \$1 a bushel. It would not be the brewer, who would pay the 15 cents; he paid \$1 for his barley, no matter where it was from, but the duty came out of the pocket of the Canadian farmer."

Surely the hon. gentleman is satisfied now. I am sure, rather than have his testimony placed in opposition to that of his leader, he will have the manliness to stand up in the House, beg pardon, and withdraw his opposition. There is another point to which I wish to direct the attention of the House, and it is this, that notwithstanding a duty of 10 cents per pound is imposed on Canadian wool going into the United States, 91½ per cent. of our wool enters the American market. Will any one believe that if the duty upon wool was removed a larger price would not be paid in this country, and that instead of our wool selling at 20 cents per pound, at which it has been sold for a number of years under the auspices of the National Policy, and this for wool which has brought in the United States 30 cents per pound, a larger price would be obtained here, and the 10 cents per pound duty paid on exported wool at present would be retained in the pockets of our farmers in the shape of profits, in addition to the present profits they obtain, which amount to very little? On the articles I have enumerated \$2,268,971 duty was paid last year, and if I were to enumerate a large number of the other articles which paid duty, I could show that our people have to pay a very large sum, and that it behoves our farmers, who are at present suffering, to bring all possible influence to bear upon the Government in order to obtain treaty relations with the United States, so that our agriculturists might be able to keep these profits themselves. There is another large industry to which I beg to draw the attention of hon. members here, and of the people in the country, and that is the large lumber interest. That is a source of wealth that requires development, but it is a source of wealth that cannot be advantageously utilised until the wood is converted into cash. We have 5,500 mills in this country, which is a very small number compared with our extensive forests. We have 45,000 men engaged in the lumber industry in those mills, and in addition we have the men employed in the forests cutting down the trees, bringing the logs to the river and rafting them to the mills to be cut into lumber, and a number of men employed in shipping them to the markets of the

United States. On every thousand feet of lumber shipped to the American market there is a payment of \$3 duty to be made, and this bears heavily on manufacturers of lumber in this country and those having timber limits. I desire to give the House the opinion of a gentleman largely engaged in this industry for a great many years. Mr. A. H. Campbell, of Toronto, President of the Lumbermen's Association of Ontario, said that he himself, out of his own pocket, had paid during the last nineteen years \$350,000 to have the products of his own industry placed in the American market. That sum was paid by a single individual, and if the amount paid by the trade throughout the country were aggregated, the amount paid would be very extraordinary indeed.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the lumbermen suffering badly now, too?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The hon. gentleman says the lumbermen are suffering badly.

Mr. SPROULE. I said, are they?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). They are suffering more than they would suffer if we had a free trade policy with the United States. I suppose that is a sufficient answer to the hon. gentleman. They suffer to the extent of about \$2 a thousand on all lumber exported; that is the amount of the suffering at the present time. There is another drawback which I desire to mention. If we had a free trade policy with the United States in lumber the result would be that there would be a large number of planing mills established throughout the lumbering districts. Under the present tariff no finished lumber, no planed lumber can enter the United States without paying 35 per cent. duty, and that is almost a prohibitive duty; but if the duty were removed, then our lumber would pass freely into the United States and increased profits would be obtained by our lumbermen, planing mills would be established in this country, increased employment would be given to skilled hands in those factories, and the result would be a "boom" in connection with our lumbering interest. Then, again, there would be an advantage because the machinery used in those mills and planing factories is largely brought from the United States. I am sorry to say it, but I am compelled and constrained to say, that the machinery for such mill work produced in this country is not equal, and not nearly equal, to the machinery brought here from the other side, and lumbermen would sooner pay the duty on the superior machinery than buy Canadian machinery at a much reduced price. That is the testimony of nearly all the mill owners and manufacturers of the country. Another advantage would be this, that our lumbermen would be able to send to the United States a larger portion of their rough lumber than they are able to send now. The duty of \$2 per thousand acts almost prohibitory in this respect, and only the best lumber is sent to the American market, while the rougher lumber is consumed here. Another advantage that would follow, if this free trade policy were adopted, would be, that a larger number of people would be engaged in this particular business and their wants could be supplied at a cheaper rate. Nearly every lumberman has to be a merchant; he has to supply the men with clothes, boots, chains, hooks, with everything necessary for the work. Under a free trade policy he could purchase to better advantage to himself and sell more in the interest of his employes. Now, as I have said, in order to develop our natural resources successfully, we must develop them along the right lines. Another great source of wealth we possess is the mining interest. I call the attention of the House to this fact, that the Finance Minister delivered last year one of the most eloquent speeches

on the Budget that he has delivered for a long time. He dilated very largely upon the extent of ore and the mining capabilities of this country, notwithstanding that we see there is not a single blast furnace in operation to-day in the Dominion of Canada. Take the iron industry in Nova Scotia. We have the best iron in the world. There is no iron superior to it. It is purer than any iron thrown on the American market, because it contains less phosphorus; and we have iron in Lower Canada, containing a proportion of chromine, which is the best iron in the world for making steel, and only one iron can compare with it in this respect, that is, the Swedish iron. We have the coal lying side by side with the iron. We have the limestone in the same neighborhood which is put with the iron and coal for the purpose of smelting the iron with greater facility; yet how is it that our industries are languishing while those on the other side of the line are prospering?

An hon. MEMBER. The National Policy.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The National Policy. Come with me to the iron mines south of Lake Superior and you will see that they have no coal or flux there, and that they have to take the iron ore 1,000 miles down to Pittsburg to the coal in the Ohio Valley, still they can put that iron on the market and more than compete with us, notwithstanding our facilities. We have all the commercial facilities to take our iron into the foreign markets. The railroads are passing the mountains of iron in the eastern section of the country, and we have boats and ships lying within sight of those mines. Every facility and advantage lie at our doors; yet our mining industries lie dormant, while those not half so well circumstanced in the United States are prospering? I cannot understand it in any way, neither have I heard arguments that would prove it on any other grounds than this: that our market is so limited that it does not pay for the investment of those large sums required to operate the iron industry. We cannot get into the American market with our pig iron without paying \$6.72 per ton, which is a prohibitory duty. Look at the copper industries of the country. I may say again that we have the best and richest mines of copper on the continent of America. We have a larger proportion of copper to the ore than they have in any other place on the continent. We have it more conveniently situated to the coal mines of Ohio and Pennsylvania than they have on the south shore of Lake Superior. Look at the Hecla and Calumet Mine, on the south shore of Lake Superior, and you will find that this mine gives a living to nearly 10,000 people and turns out 2,200 tons a day. Now, if you please, come with me to the mines at Sudbury Junction, where the Canadian Pacific Railway touches on the copper district, and not a sound of a hammer is heard. We have mines there with a larger proportion of copper to the ore than the American ore possesses. Will any gentleman take a note of this and explain the reason why our ore, being richer in copper than theirs, and we having better facilities than they, how is it that they are mining 2,200 tons a day while our mines are standing idle? The reason is because we have no market in Canada for the copper manufactured in our country. When we send copper ore into the United States we have to pay two and a half cents per pound on the copper in the ore, and for the copper itself three cents per pound which is almost a prohibitory duty. The result of this is that the industry lies languishing and not a sound of a hammer or a pick is to be heard, while the busy hum of industry is found in the mines of the United States. Is it the lake between the two countries that makes the difference? Is it because the Canadian people are not as smart as the Americans, or is it because we have not the same ambition or enterprise that they have? One Canadian is equal to an American, at any time, perhaps better, but the reason of this sad state of affairs is because we have not the facilities of

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

the great markets as they have. We have not the consuming markets in which we can sell, and the result is that our mines are lying dormant and not a single effort has been made to develop them, while on the other side there is every effort and every energy put forth to develop them to the extent which I have stated. In connection with mining there is another industry which might be developed in this country. We have nickel, and nickel is a very scarce metal on the continent of America. There is only one small nickel mine in the United States, and that is owned by a single individual down in Philadelphia. We have abundance of nickel in the north, and there is no attempt to develop it. It is selling on the United States market for \$1.30 a pound, and competent men say that it can be put on the market for 30 cents a pound, yet we have no investors in our country to work our rich nickel mines. From the extraordinary and valuable nickel we have to the north of us we have sufficient to make all the implements of war required by the States and England; but this great storehouse of wealth lies idle, because, according to the restrictive policy of the United States, we have to pay 10 cents a pound on every pound which is sent to the American Union, and which is a prohibitory tariff. Then there is another great industry to which I will refer for a short time—our fishing industry. We have wealth in the sea of an extraordinary and almost illimitable character, and we should seek to bring that wealth out by giving to the fishermen an open market in which to sell the products of their toil, and by which they can realise a larger return for their labor than they have done in the past. If we had this open market more wealth and more competence would come to the poor fishermen than they have under the present restrictive policy. They could go to the United States market and sell their fish and buy those articles which they and their families required at home, and bring them back far more cheaply than by going to the American market as now selling under a protective duty, coming home with money, and going west to Montreal or some other city and buying what they require for their families. Such a policy increases the expenses both to themselves and to their families. I want to draw the attention of the House to our geographical difficulties. Hon. members opposite say that we have no geographical difficulties of any consequence in this country to prevent an inter-provincial trade. They say that those difficulties can be easily overcome by the ingenuity of man in the present inventive age. There is nothing, they say, to prevent them from overcoming those difficulties. I maintain, Sir, that those difficulties can never be overcome to the full extent. They may, it is true, be overcome to some extent,—but the enormous expense required to overcome them eats up the profits of the parties who send their goods across them. Those difficulties will always hold. Take the Province of British Columbia—and there are a number of British Columbians here supporters of the Government, but if they are supporters of the Government they are not supporters of the interests of that great Province—that Province contains I suppose more natural wealth than any Province of its size in the Dominion of Canada. What is this great wealth comprised of? British Columbia has rich fisheries; it has immense limits of timber and has rich mines of iron and coal. I would ask those hon. gentlemen from that fair Province with the finest climate in Canada, where do they purpose, in the future, to send the products of their forests, the products of their mines, the products of their seas? Will they send the products of those great natural resources across the mountains over these topographical difficulties to the North-West Territories and Manitoba?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Very well, we will see. That man says "yes." I will bear that in mind for a few moments and deal with it when I come to it. We find that out of an export trade of \$3,000,000 in British Columbia over \$2,250,000 goes to the United States. The exportation of their coal, which is the best coal on the continent of America, not even excepting that of Nova Scotia, must have a market somewhere. Will it come across the mountains into the North-West Territories? Have they not coal in the North-West Territories to supply that country and to spare? Have they not coal at Banff? Have they not coal on the Saskatchewan? Have they not coal on the Souris? Have they not limitless quantities of coal in various parts of the North-West country? And then, to think that British Columbia will send its coal hundreds of miles across the continent—it is an absurdity. Will they send their fish across the Rocky Mountains to the North-West Territories? The people of the North-West have in that country all the fish they want. Great Bear Lake, Slave Lake, Lake Winnipeg, Lake Winnipegosis, the Lake of the Woods and Hudson's Bay are teeming with fish which they can more easily obtain than the fish of British Columbia. Will the British Columbians send their iron across the mountains to the North-West Territories? They cannot. Will they send their timber?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No; they cannot send their timber; they cannot send their coal; they cannot send their fish with profit over these topographical difficulties, even if Manitoba and the North-West constituted a market for these products, which they do not.

An hon. MEMBER. They do it now.

Mr. CHISHOLM. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to explain that, as far as the fish business in British Columbia is concerned, I happen to know something about that, for I have been engaged in that business. I wish to state that we do not sell one case of fish to the United States. We sell some to Canada and some to Australia, but the principal part of our fish goes to England. We export about \$1,000,000 worth of fish, for the most of which we find a market in England, where it comes in direct competition with the fish of the United States which is put up on the Columbia River.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a correction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I know some gentlemen are never in the habit of telling the truth themselves, and they form the opinion that others do not. I think the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) is of that character, judging from his unmannerly interruptions. He is all mouth generally.

Mr. HESSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman should take that back.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, Order.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). If I understood the hon. member from British Columbia, he told the House that they did not export any fish to the United States. You will find on page 736 of the Trade and Navigation Returns for 1887, under the head of fisheries, the following statement: Export to the United States of fish from British Columbia in 1887, \$186,774 worth.

Mr. CHISHOLM. Will you allow me to explain?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order. He will have to wait for his turn to reply.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I would have thought that he members for British Columbia would have understood

something about their own far west country, for it is evident that I know a great deal more about the trade of that country than they do. I believe, Sir, if they knew a little more than they do about the interests of British Columbia, they would not support the present policy of the Government. I believe it would be well for them to devote their energies and their leisure hours to obtaining some information, so that they will be at least prepared to discuss intelligently the interests and the trade relations of the little Province from which they come; and when an eastern man who has never seen that sunny clime beyond the Rocky Mountains, speaks of their trade relations, they should not interfere with him when he tells them what they don't know about their own Province.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). When you left the Chair, Sir, at six o'clock, I was speaking of the resources of the great Province of British Columbia. I had spoken of the vast treasures of wealth to be found in its lumber districts; I had spoken of the vast storehouses of wealth that are found in the waters surrounding that Province; I had spoken of the immense quantity of minerals that were found in its soil; and I had begun to speak of its treasures of coal. British Columbia possesses, as I have said, the best coal on the continent of America, not even excepting the good coal of the Maritime Provinces. The United States War Department, a few years ago, made a test of the different coals found on the Pacific slope. They found that 1,800 lbs. of Vancouver Island coal produced a certain pressure of steam; and that to procure a similar pressure, it took 2,400 lbs. of California coal, 2,600 lbs. of Oregon coal, and 2,400 lbs. of Washington Territory coal. That test established beyond dispute the fact that British Columbia coal will command the markets in the southern territories, and that the duty of 75 cents imposed on it, under the National Policy, is exactly the sum that must be paid by those who are developing the coal mines in that Province to enter United States markets. Out of an output last year of 328,000 tons, 274,000 tons went to the markets of the United States, and no less than \$294,000 duty was paid to enable the producer to place that coal upon the American markets. Were it not for the duty that \$204,000 would have gone into the pockets of the coal miners of British Columbia. It is evident that if you have an article which is superior to a similar article possessed by your neighbors, the freer you can get that into competition with theirs the better it will be for you. If this duty on coal were removed, the consequence would be that the vast coal regions of British Columbia would be developed to a much greater extent, thus giving employment to a much larger number of hands, and causes greater investment of capital. As it is with coal, so it is with iron; there are very large quantities of the very best iron to be found in British Columbia, within 20 miles of these rich coal mines, with the streams of the Bay of Georgia intervening between the two, so that they are almost in juxtaposition with each other, and, therefore, the western Provinces of our Dominion, in a few years, would supply the great western coasts of the United States, down as far as Mexico, with that particular mineral which is so largely required in those markets, and is not possessed by the States to the south in the same abundance and with the same facilities for its manufacture. Leaving British Columbia we come to the great North-West Territories and Manitoba, and the question arises, what are the great natural resources of that country? To what elements of natural wealth is the energy and the skill of the people of that country to be applied, so as to develop its various interests and encourage the emigration which we all so much

desire? The natural elements of strength in that country are the following: cattle raising, farming, mining, and fishing. I would ask the hon. gentlemen who are in favor of a restrictive policy, if they will be kind enough to point out the markets in which the products of those industries can be sold to such advantage as they can be in the markets immediately to the south. If our coal mines of the North-West Territories are developed, they will certainly require markets in which the products can be sold; and unless they are developed the employment in developing them that would be given to the people, will be so much lost to that country, and the mines might as well have no existence there. But we are looking forward to the time, which I hope is not far distant, when the people of that country will get an open market in the United States, which they do not possess to-day, and which is to them an absolute necessity. The States of Michigan, Dakota and Montana, do not possess coal. Is it not reasonable to say that there is a good outlet to those places which Providence has not blessed with this natural wealth? Is it possible that the coal mines at Banff, Saskatchewan, and on the Souris, are forever to be restricted to supplying the home market. They cover an area of several hundred square miles, and only wait for their development by the exercise of the intelligence and perseverance of the people of this country, and be sent south to the neighboring States. Again our North-West is destined to produce a large number of cattle. Its rich pasturage is specially adapted for that purpose, but unless a market is furnished to the south of the line, these cattle will have to be sent over long distances to the eastern coast and thence to the markets of the old world, the long distance and heavy freights cutting away a large portion of the profits that ought to go into the hands of the producer. It may, however, be urged with some plausibility—although that has no effect on the matter—that there is no market for these cattle in the country to the south. But you know, Sir, that if we allow those cattle of high grades of breed to pass through and go into competition with the cattle in the American States, they will find a market there, and the American cattle will have to pass through to be shipped to foreign countries. We have, in the northern part of this continent, the best cattle, in all particulars. We have cattle far superior to cattle in the Indian Territory and the Territories further south, and entering into competition with the American cattle in the markets of Chicago and St. Louis and the other markets, the consequence will be that the Americans will pick out from the eastern bound trade the cattle most suitable to their own wants, and will allow the others to pass through, so that our herds will find a market there to the exclusion of the American cattle. Again, the cereals grown in Manitoba and the North-West are said to be ahead of any grown elsewhere; and it is a cause of a great deal of discontent in that country now, that the farmers have not a market for their cereals in the country to the south. It is expensive for them to send their cereals to the eastern markets on account of the distance and of the high rates charged on the Canadian Pacific Railway which eat up all the profit, so that there is no encouragement to the farmers there to put forth the energies and the abilities they possess. The consequence is that a great many of them are resting on their oars, and their productive energy has been, to a large extent, thwarted by the restrictive policy of this Government. Another large and natural source of wealth of that country is its fish. That fish, which is caught in the various rivers and lakes that abound so extensively in the North-West Territories and Manitoba, would be sent directly south to the people in the American States, who do not possess these natural advantages to the extent they do, were it not for the National Policy. It is well known that in Dakota, the people have not the advantage of having such fine fish as

Mr. MACDONALD (HURON).

are caught in our North-West Territories and Manitoba, and the same remark applies to the other States lying adjacent to that territory. And in this way a policy of reciprocity, or a policy of free trade is applicable to every one of these national sources of wealth which are possessed by that country. Then, again, there is a long stretch of rough country between Manitoba and Ontario which will continue to be rough for all time to come. Notwithstanding the efforts which have been made to overcome these topographical and geographical difficulties, and they have been successful to a certain extent, these difficulties will always continue to exist, and that adds to the charges made by the railway every time a train goes over that section; and the existence of that long section of rough country, which will prevent to a great extent the inter-provincial trade which would otherwise take place, is another reason why a southern outlet should be given to that country. If we come to Ontario and Quebec, we know that our relationship to the American Union is far more intimate than our relationship to any other portion of the world, and, if that country gives us a market, as it does, for a large portion of our export, it is evident to every thinking man that that is our proper and natural market. In order to show how large a market Ontario finds in that country, I may state that the total exports of Ontario last year were \$28,218,471, and that Ontario exported to Britain \$5,167,273 worth, and to the American markets \$23,061,198. That fact, which is taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns, which I presume are correct, proves to a demonstration that the southern market, at least to Ontario, is the great market where the produce of that Province is sold, and, therefore, that the more freely we can get into that market, the more facilities that we can give in that direction, the greater will be the advantage to those who export to that country, and the more prosperous will the people be made as compared with the present condition. In the Maritime Provinces you find the same condition of things, that the United States is the market for that part of the country. The total exports of Prince Edward Island last year were \$1,266,577. Of that, Prince Edward Island exported to Great Britain \$384,700, but to the United States, her natural market, notwithstanding the high restrictive tariff imposed on all articles crossing the line, she exported \$667,580 worth, or \$282,880 worth more to the American than to the British market. That also proves to a demonstration that, as far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, the United States is her natural market. Then again, Nova Scotia exported last year \$8,370,821 worth all told. She exported to Great Britain \$2,478,123, and to the American market \$2,733,930, or \$255,862 more to the United States than she did to the English market. Does not this also prove to a demonstration that the United States is the largest and best market for the eastern Provinces. New Brunswick exported last year a total of \$4,787,798 worth. To the English market she exported \$2,403,379 worth of timber, much more than she sold to the Americans, but outside of the timber, her whole trade with England only amounted to \$200,000—that is, all the natural products of that country, consisting of hay, potatoes, oats and many other things of that kind—while that Province exported of these articles of produce to the United States \$1,200,000 worth, or six times as much as she exported to Great Britain. That clearly proves that that is her natural market. As the Hon. Joseph Howe said at one time, when he was asked to come into Confederation: No; if we do, we will lose our markets to the south of us; and, standing and pointing with his finger, as it may be supposed, over the Bay of Fundy to the New England States, he said: There is our market for our hay, there is our market for our potatoes, there is our market for our small fruits, there is our market for

nearly everything the Nova Scotians produce, and, if I come into Confederation, duties will be imposed and we will lose the markets which appear to be, as it were, only across the street. That was the statement made by that eminent statesman from Nova Scotia, and, now that the question has been solved by the cementation of the Provinces, that is the statement that the Nova Scotians will make to-day. They will say, there is our market, and that notwithstanding the restrictions which have been imposed by the National Policy for the last few years. This policy has not brought prosperity to the people of Nova Scotia, but it has engendered a feeling of restlessness and a desire to go out of the Union into which that Province was brought by false solicitation several years ago. Now, I have shown you that this system of policy, which we on this side of the House put forth as the best policy, is applicable to every industry in the country and to the condition of every Province. I have pointed out how it will benefit the farmers, who are three out of every five of the inhabitants of Canada. I have pointed out how it will benefit the lumberers by giving them a free market to the south. I have pointed out how it will benefit the mining interests of the country by providing also a larger market for their products. I have shown also how it will benefit the fishermen by giving them the market which they want for their fish. I have shown how it would benefit British Columbia on account of her geographical relationships with the neighboring States. I have also shown how it would advance the interests of Manitoba and the North-West Territories in aiding the development of their natural resources. I have shown that it is the market for Ontario and Quebec. I have, therefore, proved that this is a principle which is applicable, not as the National Policy is to one particular industry, but is applicable to all the great industries of this country, and applicable, not only to the great industries of this country, but to the particular interests of each Province forming part of this Dominion, and, therefore, I think that efforts should be made by this Government to bring this matter before the United States Government in such a way that we may know the terms and conditions on which they will enter into reciprocal trade if they will. The resolution which is before the House does not commit us to any particular line of action, and does not commit us to accept any conditions the United States may seek to impose upon us, but it simply expresses the view that we think it would be in the interests of the country to have reciprocal trade, and that it would be expedient that the Government should take steps to ascertain if the Americans are prepared to enter into reciprocal trade with us. Is there anything more reasonable? and still it is objected to. It may be said, and it will be said, in the country, that the United States will not accept of reciprocal free trade, that they have been approached on that subject several times, and have shown that they will not accept of it. I have five or six reasons to give why I believe that the United States are more willing now to enter into this arrangement than they ever were before. The first reason is one which will show the consistency of the American Government and the inconsistency of the Canadian Government. You will remember that, in 1879, there was an offer placed upon the Statute-book, an offer to the United States that, if they permitted certain articles to go in free, or at a less duty than was then charged, the Canadian Government would allow similar articles to come in free or at a less duty than the rate of tariff. The United States in 1883, in an Act passed in the 45th Congress, in the 2nd Session of that Congress, at chapter 121, placed upon the free list a number of the very articles contained in the schedule of our Act of 1879, and up to the present day the Canadian Government has not reciprocated. They placed fruits, trees, shrubs, vines and seeds upon the free list. Now, our

apples are allowed to go in free to the United States; but instead of being consistent, instead of acting a manly part, as the Canadian Government should have done, they have allowed apples to be charged 40 cents on each barrel that comes into Canada from the United States. Those coming from the United States are charged the usual duties by the Canadian Government, while those going from Canada into the United States go in free. 1884, '85, '86 and '87 have passed, and the Government that were so patriotic, so devoted to the people of this country, when they wanted to maintain themselves in power, have not moved a finger to reciprocate with the Americans in removing the duty imposed on these articles. I challenge contradiction on this matter, and if I am right, the Canadian Government should remove these duties and place these articles in the same position as they promised to do when they made that offer. There is another reason why I believe the United States are prepared. In 1886 there was a resolution passed in the United States Congress and it received two readings. That resolution bore particularly upon this question, and was considered sufficiently important to attract the attention of the English ambassador at Washington. The ambassador, Sir Lionel West, got a copy of that resolution and sent it to the Canadian Government for their consideration. That resolution found its way to the English Government, and, notwithstanding all that, there was no attempt made to open up negotiations. This resolution received its two readings, and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. But some one will say: Well, it was killed there. Certainly it was killed there. Do you suppose the United States are going to carry through a Bill, and come to the Canadian Government and say: We sue for reciprocal trade? No, they wait for the Canadians to take the first step, and it is right that they should, because we are the weaker and the smaller nation, and we are the nation that will receive the greater advantage from a treaty of that kind. This resolution has not been referred to before as indicating the willingness of the United States to negotiate in this matter. On the 5th January, 1886, this joint resolution was read twice and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that this Congress would look with favor and approval upon any action taken by the executive, dependent upon the Government, tending to a renewal of negotiations with the British Possessions in North America, by compact or treaty, having in view the reciprocal interests of both nations."

That was never taken notice of further than to place it in the public correspondence that took place between the two Governments. In the fishery correspondence we find that resolution placed before the Canadian public, but not a single move was made, no power was given to the plenipotentiaries to negotiate a treaty of that kind. Then, we are led to believe that the Americans are prepared because not very long ago the President, in his message to Congress, stated that he believed it would be to the advantage of both nations and contribute to promote a feeling of friendship between them, if reciprocal trade was entered into. Then, again, the National Board of Trade unanimously passed a resolution, not very long ago, in the city of Washington, in favor of reciprocal trade with the Dominion of Canada. These facts show to the country at large that the United States, almost with open arms, are inviting us to appoint a commission and send it down to adjudicate upon the whole question of commercial relations between the two countries, and unite upon a reasonable and equitable arrangement which would be advantageous to the people of both countries, and contribute largely to the prosperity of Canada. Now, it is said by hon. members opposite that the National Policy fosters the manufacturing industries of this country. There are many manufacturers in this country who have testified that they are

favorable to reciprocal trade with the United States. John Campbell, of London, a large manufacturer of waggons and carriages, says so. Mr. Waterous, of Brantford, a large manufacturer of steam engines, says he is prepared for reciprocal trade, and is able to compete with the Americans on equal terms. Then again, Mr. Raymond, manufacturer of sewing machines, says so, and this is one of the industries that it was promised would be fostered by the National Policy. Mr. Raymond says: "I am prepared, yes, I am more than prepared to meet them in open market. I can sell equally as cheap, and I can sell a great many more, because the markets are large." And so I might go on from one to the other. Now, I come to an interest that is specially identified with my county, I mean the salt interest. That interest in my county, is the largest salt interest in the Dominion of Canada. Its exportation reaches within a few barrels of the entire salt exportation from Canada. Now, Sir, the National Policy has been the cause of almost entirely crushing out that interest. I know that those who are at the head of it in our county, who have been strong Conservatives, and have supported the party in power in all political meetings, and in every election that has taken place, say now that the National Policy has been the cause of the depreciation of the value of their property. In 1875 the price of salt in this county was from 86 to 95 cents per barrel; in 1887 the price was 50 cents per barrel. The Syracuse salt producers, on the American side, tried the crushing out process for some time, and sent salt into Canada and charged a certain price, and the price was the smaller the further away it was from the seat of production. The result was that our salt men competed in the United States with their salt men, and sold a large number of barrels, bushels and sacks of salt. But a few years ago salt depreciated in value over there, and now the restriction placed upon salt is such that it is impossible for our salt interest to send one bushel there. Twelve cents a hundred is charged upon salt going into the United States in sacks, and 8 cents is charged upon every 100 pounds that is sent in bulk, and the result is equal to a prohibitory duty, and our producers are blocked out of the United States market altogether. Now, let me show what the policy of this Government is doing for the salt industries. No less than two hundred and eight million pounds of salt, free of duty, were brought last year from England. It was brought across the ocean almost for nothing. It has been sent west as far as the city of Montreal, and distributed through the eastern part of the country, and all the territory that our salt men have is the Province of Ontario. The consequence is that the salt wells that a few years ago were in full blast and paying large sums of money in wages to workingmen, and paying a profit to those who had invested their money, have depreciated in value, and a large number have gone out of the business, and a number have failed. So it will be seen that the free trade policy of the Canadian Government respecting English salt in the east, and the American restrictive policy in the west, has almost destroyed the salt interest in Ontario. Now let me give this House and the country the opinion of one of the oldest salt manufacturers in our county. He is an intelligent man, a man shrewd in business and one who knows exactly the ins and outs of the salt industry, and with all that he is an intelligent Conservative, a man who supported the party in power for many years. He has gone upon public platforms to support the National Policy; and hear now what he says in regard to the salt interests under the National Policy. I speak of Dr. Coleman, of Seaforth, in the South Riding of Huron. He says:

"The salt industry of Ontario is in a very bad condition, indeed; in fact, its condition could not well be much worse. There have been many withdrawals from the business, and some bankruptcies. Most of our properties would sell at a low price, and some would not be taken off our hands as a gift. Most of the owners engaged in the salt industry worked and fought for the National Policy. But for years the National
Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

Policy did nothing for us, and when it did attempt to do something it only gave us legislation without any substantial benefit."

He further says:

"The assessment of salt property in this town was once over \$30,000 per annum. To-day it would not be assessed at half that amount."

That is the condition of the salt interest in the town where that gentleman is one of the principal salt men. He goes on to show the other side of the shield. He has shown what the National Policy did not do, and if it did not foster his industry it certainly did the opposite. That intelligent man goes on to say:

"We have several railroad lines. Their rates of carriage are not uniform, and they will not interchange rates of mileage. We use a great deal of iron for pans, tubing, nails, grate bars, shafting, &c. On all these the duty, being very heavy, materially increases the cost of production. The same is true of belting, rubber and leather. I purchased nails in the eastern States in November last laid down here in Seaforth at 7½ cents per pound. Similar nails from Canadian firms cost me invariably 13½ cents per pound."

Now, will hon. gentlemen opposite say that things are as cheap in Canada, under the National Policy, as in the United States? Here is one of their own supporters, a Conservative, and who would probably support hon. gentlemen at this time, and yet he gives them the lie in their teeth because he is a practical man and understands what he says. This is one testimony; but if you go a few miles further to the west you come to the town of Clinton. We find there an intelligent man, Mr. John Ransforth, a Conservative, who supported the Conservative party with the intelligence and vim characteristic of the man in every department of life. He is prepared to accept reciprocal free trade because the National Policy has destroyed his work. He says:

"It will thus be easily seen that to open the United States market to Canadian salt makers will not result in the extinction of the Canadian salt industry. On the contrary, we claim it will have the effect of developing it to an almost indefinite extent. The reason is obvious. The present condition of the salt trade is most deplorable. If means had been carefully devised to ruin the salt makers and supply Canadians with English salt, no more effectual way could have been found than by the National Policy."

Here is Sterry Hunt's analysis of salts: Canadian salt, ½ of 1 per cent. impurity; English salt, 1.69 per cent.; Spanish salt, 1.45 per cent.; Saginaw, U.S., salt, 2 per cent.; Syracuse, U.S., salt, 1.15 per cent. Of all those salts, the Canadian is the purest. Supposing Canadian salt producers were at liberty, under a reciprocity treaty with the United States, to compete with Michigan salt on one side and Syracuse salt on the other, they having a purer article would be able to compete successfully with the American producers. Is it right and proper for the Canadian Government to prevent Canadians placing a better article on the American market? But when we have to pay 12 cents per 100 pounds in sack and 8 cents per 100 pounds in bulk on all salt going into the American market it is almost impossible, even with our superior article, to compete against the inferior article of the United States. Yet, in the face of these facts, the hon. gentleman who represents that section of country, I am sorry to say, considers the interests of other persons above the interests of the farmers and the salt producers. Salt is the principal industry in Goderich, and it is one of the principal industries in Clinton, which forms part of the hon. gentleman's constituency, his constituents being for the most part farmers, who have admitted on every side they would be benefited by a free trade policy; and notwithstanding that fact he rose the other night and made a long speech, flowery and eloquent no doubt, but we have often seen a great deal of wind without much rain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I am very much pleased that hon. gentlemen opposite saw the wind too the other night. As I have said, the hon. gentleman did not take the part of those interests which are the most important in his

county. He quoted some figures which he said I used here, and he declared that the farmers of the district were doing exceedingly well. He said according to my statement of prices the average products of the farm would reach \$620 in a year. But he made a little mistake in that, because I have gone over the calculation and I found that instead of \$620 it was \$658, call it \$660. Let us see if a farmer could make any money out of that. A farmer owning 100 acres of land worth \$6,000, and I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to these figures because he was a farmer once himself.

An hon. MEMBER. A very poor one.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Perhaps he was like a man I heard of. A stranger was walking along a road and he saw a man on the fence. The stranger was astonished at the poor condition of the farm, and the man on the fence, afraid he would think he was the owner of the farm, said: "Sir, I am not so poor as to be owner of that property." Perhaps the hon. gentleman would say something of that kind too, if he were sitting on a fence and a stranger were passing his farm. Let me go on with the statement I was making. I want the hon. gentleman to note my figures to see how much the farmer makes out of an output of \$660. The hon. gentleman said I did not mention the sale of horses, cattle or sheep. If he was a practical man he would know that if a farmer sold the produce of the land he could not feed horses, cattle or sheep, because the produce must be in one form or another, either in hay, straw or cereals or in cattle and horses. One man's labor on the farm would certainly be worth \$250 a year, a team with feed \$140, interest on \$6,000 at 4 per cent. \$240, wear and tear of implements, blacksmith's work, &c., \$50, seed grain for the farm \$30, threshing and twine \$16, taxes on the farm \$30. We will now see how much the farmer will have, not including his own work. Those amounts come to \$756, and taking the produce of the farm at an average of several years during a number of which prices were exceedingly high, wheat at 99 cents, this would leave a deficit of \$90 after paying the necessary expenses and 4 per cent. on his investment. The hon. gentleman stated that that was a very fair showing for the county of Huron. If he is satisfied with that showing I am sure that we are not. I can explain very well why the hon. gentleman took that position, I can explain why he did not refer to the salt interest, because it comes under the National Policy. I can tell the reason why he did not refer to the farming interests of that county; and he has a reason which probably you do not all know. They are about improving the harbor of Goderich, and about building a new post office and a new custom house in Goderich. You do not all know that, and some of the hon. members sitting beside him do not know it either. According to the Estimates we find that there are figures down there of \$18,000 for these purposes, and I ask you how could the hon. member for West Huron oppose the genial leader of the Government, who is about to spend \$18,000 in the town of Goderich, which has supported the hon. gentleman so well. The farming and salt industries could not expect so much from human nature, could they? But he must remember this, that if he goes back again to that county, he will have to go to the town of Clinton, the town which elected him last general election. He will find some person there who will say to the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Porter): "Why, Sir, you made a speech at Ottawa last winter." "Yes, Sir." "But my interests were never touched by you, I complained to you that my interests were neglected, the salt interest in which I am engaged was neglected. You know very well I have worked hard for you, and that I have gone from door to door to collect supporters for you, but when you went to Ottawa you forgot all about me, because you were about to get \$18,000 for the town of

Goderich." That is the position in which the hon. gentleman for West Huron (Mr. Porter) is placed. But, Sir, I will not detain the House much longer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron.) Hon. gentlemen on the other side say "hear, hear." Of course we all know and I often felt it myself that when I was getting the worst of it I was very anxious that my opponents should sit down, and I think probably what is human nature on my side would probably be a good criterion to judge the gentlemen by on the other side. But, Sir, I want to say now a word or two in regard to the annexation and loyalty cries. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, without any boasting whatever, that I am as loyal to the Crown of Britain as any man who sits on the other side of the House. I tell those hon. gentlemen that I love my Queen and revere her name just as much as they can. I admire that stately Queen who sits with such great dignity upon the British throne and who instead of the British Crown reflecting honor on her, she reflects honor on it. I believe, Sir, we are as strongly attached to the mother country as any people can be, but at the same time, although I am strongly attached to the country from which my forefathers came, the country which has given us our literature, the country to whose history we can turn with pride, I am more strongly attached to our own native land. I believe, Sir, that in this country of Canada we have the best form and system of government that is to-day to be found in the world. We have everything that is firm in the monarchical form of government, we have everything that is liberal and progressive in the republican form of government, and we have new principles added to these by the genius and political wisdom of the Canadian people. So that we are bound to say we possess the best government in the world. As for our judiciary, it is by far the purest that ever existed among men; its purity is not only above impeachment, but beyond question. When we consider how much the security of our property and the safety of our lives depend on a just and proper administration of the law, the Canadian people have reason to be proud of the purity of the judiciary of Canada. We do not ask to join our fate with the Americans. Not at all. We unite with them as friends; we give what we have to them when they buy from us, and we want to buy from them what we need. Therefore this principle which we advocate does not alienate our affections from the crown of England. There are a great many possibilities, and I might go on for a long time discussing them. This question is so wide that one would hardly know where to stop. We know the great possibilities of this great Dominion of ours, and standing here, as we do, and looking forward through the years that are to come, who can foretell what the energy, the industry, the perseverance and the skill of the Canadian people is able to accomplish in the future. This is a great theatre of action, and who, looking forward through the long vista of the years to come, can foretell the great achievements under a wise and liberal trade policy, the energy, the industry, the perseverance and skill of the Canadian people are yet to accomplish. Long may this country, Sir, be a home and a refuge to thousands of the super-abundant numbers which the genius of Britain and other countries may send forth to inhabit, fertilise and civilise the untenanted portions of our vast dominions. Long may Canada be the Koh-i-noor in the bright galaxy of gems that adorn the British Crown. Long may this country be a land of liberty, loyalty and enterprise, ever increasing in wealth and population. Long may that happy connection between Great Britain and this Dominion in the bonds of mutual affection be an un failing source of profit and advantage to both, and long may Canada rejoice in aiding and upholding the grandeur, the might and the integrity of the British Empire.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat ventured to make the remark, when a certain amount of applause proceeded from the Chamber, that he fancied and always had fancied during his experience in public affairs, that when his opponents were getting the worst of it they desired that he should stop. I think I may very well say that the House has had the worst of it in connection with his speech, and that the country has had the worst of it too. In opening my remarks upon this question, let me tell a story, *apropos* of the hon. gentleman's speech. A gentleman who was speaking at a political meeting in Michigan spoke for some two hours, and after the meeting he said to his uncle: "I spoke to-night." His uncle said: "I heard you." "I spoke for two hours," said the man. "I timed you," said the uncle. "What did you think of my speech?" said the man. And his uncle replied: "A sensible man would have said it in ten minutes, and a very sensible man would not have said it at all." But, Mr. Speaker, it is very amusing to hear the hon. gentleman lecture hon. gentlemen in this House on the amenities of debate, particularly after the experience we have had in the remarks he made to this House. Let me give him a bit of advice across the floor of this House, and that is: "Doctor cure thyself." Now, in the course of the remarks of the hon. gentleman, he dwelt on a question, and I took down a few of his observations in order to prevent mistakes. He drew attention to the fact that a large amount of canned salmon or pickled salmon was sent from British Columbia to the United States, and he used that as an argument why it would be best for the people of British Columbia to have unrestricted trade with the United States, in order that they might gain the advantage. I state here as a merchant, knowing what I am saying and knowing what I am talking about, that the canned fish of British Columbia is an article of commerce which is not to be bought in the United States. I make that statement deliberately, and I defy contradiction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Take off the duty.

Mr. BROWN. I do not care; take it off if you like. I say the statement made that \$186,000 of British Columbia fish were exported to the United States and paid duty is not correct. I challenge any man on that side of the House to stand up and dispute what I say. They are silent. It is because they are unable to prove the hon. gentleman's assertion. They make these wild statements and let them go to the country, and when they are brought to book twenty minutes afterwards they are unable to substantiate them. Now, Sir, if all the statements which have been made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat are as valuable as the one I have just effectually disposed of, then I think the country will know how to value his speech. The hon. gentleman has sneered at the National Policy, and has talked of the poverty of the farmers of Canada. He has told us that the records of the number of farm mortgages held against the farmers of Ontario are incorrect, because he says there are three or four private mortgages against them to every one that is recorded against them in public companies. I tell the hon. gentleman that he cannot stand up in his own county and say that. I tell him more—if he goes before his constituents in East Huron—and I know that county pretty nearly as well as he does—and even winks at annexation, they will send him where he ought to have been sent before, not to the Parliament of Canada to advocate annexation—to advocate a policy which in the end will result in nothing else than the annexation of this Dominion to the United States, but to the bosom of his family. I have done with that hon. gentleman for the present, simply because I have heavier metal to fight. When the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) opened this debate, he threw across the floor of the House, in

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

a voice of sweet melody, the challenge that if hon. gentlemen on this side had the courage of their convictions, they would express those convictions in favor of the resolution which he proposed to move. Well, I have the courage of my convictions, and I am here to express what they are; and I know that in doing so I am backed up not only by the people who sent me here, but by the vast majority of the people of this Dominion. The hon. gentleman in opening his remarks dealt largely with figures. I do not propose to weary the House to-night with figures, but I am obliged to use one table simply to correct a very wrong impression which has been conveyed by the speech of that hon. gentleman. The hon. member for South Oxford drew as usual a doleful picture of Canada. He has not done anything else for a great many years; it would be unnatural for him to do anything else, considering the manner in which he has spoken of the progress or want of progress in the country. The hon. gentleman spoke of our small total trade, and made a comparison between the years 1873 and 1887, showing a very small difference, and asked the House to look on this picture and then on that, and to declare with him that the country was not progressing. I hope the hon. gentleman did not intentionally omit the information which I am now going to give to the House and the country. Did he not know that in all the world from 1873 to 1887 in every department of trade, in every article that is grown or manufactured, there has been a great depreciation of value?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron.) I would like to make an explanation regarding what I said about the exportation of fish from British Columbia. I want to read from the Trade and Navigation Returns to show that I was perfectly right. On page 736, under the heading "Fisheries," will be found the statement that there was exported to Great Britain \$664,139 worth and to the United States \$186,774 worth of fish from British Columbia.

Mr. BROWN. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman has got up and held up his book. I do not hesitate to say that when I challenged hon. gentlemen opposite to contradict my statement, I set a trap for them, and have caught the hon. gentleman in that trap like a rat. I say that those fish were not sent to the United States for consumption; they were sent there in transit to other countries. Now, Sir, here is a book which I will hold up as high as the hon. gentleman did his. This is a volume of the Official Records of the United States for 1887, containing statistics of the foreign commerce and navigation of the United States. The people of the United States have all the salmon they require in their own rivers, and do not need to buy any from us, and they never do buy any unless it may be to supply some slight shortage, or for a picnic or something of that kind. I find by this book that the imports of salmon, for consumption into the United States, from British Columbia for the year 1887, consisted of one package of the value of \$4. Now, the hon. gentleman for South Oxford drew attention to the fact that the total trade of this country in 1887 was very little greater than it was in 1873. We knew very well that it was not the same amount; anybody could tell that; but it was the duty of the hon. gentleman as a statesman to have stated the quantities produced in the two years. If the prices in 1887 had been the same as they were in 1873, the exports from this country of agricultural articles alone, instead of being \$18,000,000, would have been \$26,000,000. That is a fair statement of the case to put before the country. The hon. gentleman, by his language and manner, conveyed the idea that Canada was not progressing, that we were not raising more grain and cattle than we did in former years. Why, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite know we are, and they must know also that all over the world there is a shrinkage

in the values of all products, and Canada is not an exception to the general rule.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And you claim that for the National Policy.

Mr. BROWN. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) if I did not misunderstand him, spoke of the provision in our Customs Act, for reciprocal trade in natural products with the United States, and in his usual smiling way he said that it was a delusion and a snare.

Mr. DAVIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROWN. Exactly; that is what they say. I propose to show it is not a delusion and a snare. The provision in our Customs Act that we are ready to unite with the Americans in an interchange of natural products is so great a delusion and a snare, that we import from the United States articles amounting in value to \$10,000,000, upon which the duty amounts to \$2,000,000, and the Americans receive from us articles upon which they pay the duties to the extent of \$4,000,000. What an absurdity to seek to convey to the country the impression that an interchange of natural products with the United States, which, in the leading articles, represents a duty on both sides of \$6,000,000, is a delusion and a snare. The following is a schedule of the various articles:

	United States Imports.	United States Duty Levied.
Animals of all kinds.....	\$4,373,999	\$ 874,800
Hay..... tons	78,722	156,510
Barley..... bushels	10,851,846	1,035,184
Fish.....		314,919
Lumber.....		1,117,920
Vegetables.....		193,451
Coal.....		248,706
Peas and beans.....		59,774
Total duty.....		\$4,146,092

The great burden of all the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite during this debate, delivered in different strains and moods, is, from first to last: poor Canada going backwards, and everything indicating that unless hon. gentlemen opposite attain office this country is no place for anybody to live in. I have not the least doubt that, at this moment, the words of these hon. gentlemen are flying over the telegraph wires, and that the men who control American railways, and who have American railway lands to sell, are using these words on the other side of the Atlantic to induce people to settle in their country rather than to take up their abode in such a woe-begone place as Canada. We have it on the best authority that not a few of the dupes who have been carried over to Dakota in the years gone by, through the glowing pictures given of that country as compared with ours, are coming back to Canada where they can obtain better homes and have better prospects of success. Not a few of the dupes who have gone into Dakota, and have been compelled to burn Dakota grass in their stoves to keep them from freezing, now regret that they ever placed any confidence in the statements, based, in many instances, on the doleful utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is only right, therefore, that on occasions like this men should come forward and give expression to what they really believe and what the people behind them believe, and that is what I am endeavoring to do to-night. Hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken of the lack of progress of this country. Why, there is no country under heaven that has made such progress in the last forty or fifty years as Canada has; there is no people, indeed, who enjoy greater blessings and privileges than do the Canadian people, and if you look back to history, you will find a constant and steady progressive movement has taken place in the advancement of the people. It is disheartening to hear hon. gentlemen, who pretend to be Canadian in sentiment, undertaking to convey

to the people of the world the idea that this country is going backwards, and is not a place in which men can be successful. What is the position of the United States as compared with this country, since 1837? Business here has increased thirteen times in volume, and property has increased fourfold in value. Had the United States grown in the same proportion as we have in the last fifty years, comparing the ages of both countries, their population to-day would be 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 more than it is. We have more than kept pace with them. Fifty years ago all that was known of Canada was about 450,000 square miles; to-day we have 3,470,000 square miles. Fifty years ago, we had only 4,000,000 acres of land under cultivation; to-day we have 30,000,000 under cultivation. Fifty years ago we had invested in banks only \$3,000,000; to-day our banks hold deposit receipts for \$110,000,000. Fifty years ago, the total circulation, including Government notes, amounted to \$1,750,000; to-day it is nearly \$50,000,000. In 1837, we had 375 post offices; now we have 7,534 and 52,000 miles of public mail route and travel. To-day we have, perhaps, the finest system of education on this continent. The problem of education has been solved in this country, as it has been in no country in the world. Do hon. gentlemen opposite tell the people that in their speeches? Do they tell them that this is a place where an emigrant can have his children well educated? Not they. Every section of our country is dotted with establishments of education and with temples of worship, and people coming from older countries can here worship their Maker according to their conscience as freely as they can in their own homes. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not dilate on these advantages. On the contrary, their whole policy consists in decrying the country. Before 1878 what did they do? They talk a great deal about the exodus from Canada, but I challenge them to-night to deny the fact that during the years before 1878, the first exodus from Canada of hungry men—starving men—who had to leave this country to get work and send money back to feed their families took place, and it was caused by the masterly inactivity of hon. gentlemen opposite who were then in power. When the distinguished leader of the Government brought before the country a cure that relieved the land, instead of hon. gentleman being gratified to see that the evils from which the country was suffering had been removed, they growled and they grumbled, and they have done nothing else ever since. They have been snarling at everything which has been done. Notwithstanding that this policy has done good to the country, they have proposed this nostrum and that nostrum, and I feel sometimes that some of them must despise themselves for the lack of sincerity they have shown in offering to the country supposed remedies under what they call their policy. Nothing was ever like a policy in what they submitted. They have been grasping at every straw and seeking to catch the votes of the people by side winds. I may be permitted to say that the people are not so easily gulled. A great deal has been said of the farmers. I consider the farmer the least gullible man in this country, and there is nobody who knows better than the farmer, and none better than the farmers of that hon. gentleman's county, that the National Policy has been a grand thing for Canada; and nobody knows better than the farmer how to see through the misty mazes of the hon. gentlemen when they seek by catch votes to secure the approbation of the country. When they come forward and move a resolution in support of temperance, they put it in a shape so that the best friends of temperance—and the best friends of temperance in Canada have the honor to sit upon this side of the House—feel that they have to rebuke the mockery, to rebuke the hypocrisy, and to vote as one man, though they are sound and solid on the temperance question, against a resolution which, on the face of it, has the appearance of

supporting the temperance principle. Do the hon. gentlemen imagine for a moment that the people of Canada do not see through a thing like that? They do see through it, and they will see through this scheme too. But the hon. gentlemen have done nothing for years but parade this sort of thing before the country. They are always telling the people of the great blessings they will enjoy, the great progress they will have, that everything will be turned *couleur de rose*, that we here in Canada will be able to make a living without labor, as it were; all that is necessary to do is to come into this commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity, and they will get \$2 a pair for broilers. This thing that they have been attempting to make the people of Canada believe it would be good for them to adopt, reminds me of the story which was put into rhyme, and which did us good service in the last election:

"There was a young lady in Niger,
Took a ride on the back of a tiger;
Who returned from the ride
With the lady inside,
And a smile on the face of the tiger.

If this scheme were carried out, the Americans would be the tiger, and we would be inside. The hon. gentlemen opposite, one and all, in the course of their observations, have had a sly dab at the National Policy. They have been all the time saying that the public, that the farmers, that the long-suffering community, would be relieved from the burdens of the dreadful taxation which the National Policy has imposed upon them. They know perfectly well that, since the introduction of that measure, the farming community of Canada have been able to get larger prices for their goods, because of the increased centres of labor. Speaking for the manufacturing city from which I come—and in speaking of that I speak of the whole country—I know perfectly well that, before 1878, when all the interests were suffering, the farmers in our neighborhood were suffering, as they had no market; but, since then, when these factories have been busy, and we have had our own market to ourselves, and we have had mouths to feed, the farmers in the neighborhood have got good prices for their stuff. Complaints have been made of the small imports into this country during the last few years. Why, that is one of the blessings which has come from the National Policy. We want to import less manufactures and to make more here. If our imports are so many million dollars less than they were, that difference goes into the pockets of the workmen of Canada for the labor expended on that. The hon. gentlemen, ever since the National Policy has been introduced, have attacked the policy in the vilest manner. They have not only attacked the policy, but they have attacked the honored leader of the Government, who guides the destinies of this country, as the man who first inaugurated the National Policy. They have attacked him as well as the policy, but in his case his character has been a shield against their calumny, and the success of the policy is its best vindication against all the attacks which those hon. gentlemen may make. With the country prospering, the people happy, and no complaining in our streets, what more do we want? We cannot have continuous prosperity. There will be instances of depression in business, there will be lulls in trade, there will be changes in the general run of business, but that will happen under any circumstances. But let us remember the days before 1878, when these gentlemen were preparing their exodus, when, by their policy, by their masterly inactivity, and by their refusal to do anything to relieve the country from the state into which it had come, people were obliged to go away. That reminds me of the incident of the ranche man in the North-West, who came from a ranche in the United States. Everything was not *couleur de rose* there. He came to a place near the Blood Reserve. Some of the fellows knew him, and said: "Hello, Jack, what are you

Mr. BROWN.

doing here?" "Well," said he, "down to our ranche the grub is not very good, and I thought I would change. The pay is not very good either. But when they came down to flap-jacks and scenery, it was not very comfortable for me." After a time another man came along, and he was asked what was the matter, that all the ranche boys were coming along; and, says he: "It was all very well when we had flap-jacks and scenery, but, when they stopped the flap-jacks and left nothing but the scenery, by Jerusalem, I had to get, and I have got, and here I am." Before 1878 there was no work to do here, and men had to go away to get employment in order to send money back to feed their families. It is well known that, in the large cities of Montreal, Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton and elsewhere, there were men who were not only unable to feed their families, but were unable to educate their children, and had to take them from school. Now, things are changed, and yet hon. gentlemen decry this policy, not that they think they are right in their views or that they think the country is suffering from this policy, but simply because it is another of the straws they are grasping at, and they hope they may catch some favoring wind and get back to this side of the House. But it is not very likely that they will come back to this side of the House for a long time, unless they mend their manners toward the people. Those hon. gentlemen seem to think that it is time there should be a change in this glorious Confederation of ours, and that we should seek with the United States a reciprocal alliance, which no one in the world can look at for five minutes without being satisfied that it is the entering wedge to annexation. I will read Mr. Hitt's resolution that was introduced into Congress at Washington:

"The House Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously voted today to report favorably Mr. Hitt's resolution to promote commercial union with Canada. It provides that whenever Canada declares a desire to establish a commercial union having a uniform revenue system by which internal taxes will be collected and like import duties upon articles from other nations, with no duties between the United States and Canada, the President shall appoint three commissioners to meet a similar commission from Canada and prepare a plan for the assimilation of import duties and revenue taxes of the two countries; and an equitable division of the receipts in commercial union."

I will venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that should such a measure as this pass, in six months afterwards we would not know whether we were Americans or Canadians; we would rather be inclined, even in that short period, to say: Well, we are becoming Americanised pretty quickly.

Mr. MILLS. Am I, or am I not?

Mr. BROWN. Well, I am a British subject, and I hope that I will always continue to be so. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have made depreciation of this country the burden of their song, and in all their speeches they have prepared the way for hearing from this side of the House of our devotion to our connection with Great Britain. They have sneered at sentiment, what they call sentiment, we on this side of the House call loyalty. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan) who spoke the other night, declared that there was a man in his county—I think he said that he was one of a great many—who was verily of opinion that unless we could get reciprocal trade with the United States we should have to get annexation, that we must ask to be taken into the United States. Very well, I would say to the hon. member for Huron, put that friend of his on the list, and if he has an inclination of that sort himself, let him stick himself on the list. Neither will be missed by the people of Canada in connection with this great question. I tell you, Sir, that when we lose sentiment in this country, we lose the grandest thing we have got in it. When hon. gentlemen come forward here and try to mystify the House with figures, when they sneer at sentiment, which we call devotion to our country as against the almighty dollar, I say there are men in this House, and in this country, thousands upon thousands

of them, that will never tolerate any such computation of the question at all. Sentiment, Sir, has made this country as great as it is; sentiment has made the country from which we sprung, great; sentiment, which you choose to sneer at, crowned the heights of Alma; the sentiment that was taught at Eton and Rugby, that was instilled into the boys there, won Waterloo; sentiment that you choose to sneer at, was what made the volunteers of Canada jump at the call of duty, and take that journey, at an inclement season of the year, to maintain the majesty of the law. Sneer at sentiment if you will. I tell you, Sir, that there is a band of men in Canada who will never surrender that sentiment, which is one of the proudest and grandest things that belong to us. I noticed in the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, in this debate, the great care they took to sail close by the wind, so that we might not exactly catch their meaning, and so be able to pin them down; they tried to manifest indifference. Sir, there is no indifference in Canada, under which flag we sail; there is only one desire on the part of the people of Canada, except a miserable minority, and that is a desire to continue to sail and to live under the stainless flag of which we are so proud, the flag of our ancestors. And I tell you that whenever there is any attempt on the part of the public men in this country to haul down that flag and to replace it with another, 50,000 to one will be there to run it up again, and unfurl it mast high once more to mark their devotion to their country. Hon. gentlemen opposite always wind up their speeches by expressing devoted loyalty to their country, yet at the same time the burden of their speeches throughout has been that they will gladly go into any arrangement of a commercial character with the United States that will, as they must know, result in a political connection. No man living wishes to live in a greater feeling of amity with the United States than I do. They are a great people. The true American is as fine a man as you will find on the earth, and they are a people with whom we ought to live in the closest and most amicable relations. I do not think there are any people in the world who respect Her Majesty Queen Victoria more highly than the true American people—I am speaking of those who are descendants of the early British colonists. I am most sincere when I say that the Americans are a people with whom we should live in the greatest amity, with whom we should have the freest commercial relations, so long as these do not affect the status of this country as part and parcel of the British Empire. We propose now to have the closest possible relations with the people of the United States, and our Government have put in the Customs Act a standing offer to interchange with the United States in natural products; but beyond that this country should not and will not go. The hon. gentleman who just preceded me spoke of the iron interests of this country, and said that there was a lack of furnaces in Canada for the development of the iron trade. He pointed in glowing terms to the prosperity of the iron industry of the United States. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) last Session, when I was advocating an increase of the tariff on iron in order to develop that industry in this country, drew a doleful picture of the iron industry in the United States, and said that we in Canada would reach the same position. However, my hon. friend from Huron says to-night that the industries of the United States are successful. Does the hon. gentleman know why; if he does not, I will tell him. They are successful in consequence of the fostering care of the American Government in the tariff they have placed upon iron. There was a time when not one bar was made in the United States, when every bar came from abroad, and to-day by the fostering care of the United States, during a course of years, they are not only making all the iron and steel they require in the country, but they are becoming shippers.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) All the iron and steel they require?

Mr. BROWN. They can, if they do not do it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Mr. BROWN. The hon. gentleman may laugh, but I tell him they can.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Why do they not?

Mr. BROWN. Everything is not done in a minute. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that he is in just a little too great a hurry, when he expects the whole iron industry of Canada to be developed into full bloom when it has only had proper protection for one year.

Mr. KIRK. Nine or ten years.

Mr. BROWN. Why, the policy, the only practical policy that was ever put on the Statute-book here to develop the iron industry was that of last Session, which was the top stone of the National Policy. Give time and you will see the results. Hon. gentlemen opposite will remember that, when the Act was passed, the Government in its generosity and in its fairness to the importers of the country gave two months to admit the whole of the iron that was being brought from the other side or could be brought out. That resulted in an immense quantity of iron being brought here. That checked the operation of the iron works of the country, and to some extent, probably, that is the reason why there has not been a movement to erect more furnaces. But that stock of imported iron is about used up now. As hon. gentlemen ought to be informed of the situation of the matter, I have taken care to fortify myself with letters from many of the large iron industries in the country, and I will read very small portions from them, and with the permission of the House and with the desire to shorten the debate, I will hand them to the *Hansard* reporters. I have letters here from the Hamilton Bridge Company, Hamilton Forge Company, Canada Pipe Company and Ontario Rolling Company, and all these letters say this: That they approve of the iron tariff, that they are using largely of Canadian iron, that they consider it first-class in quality, and that they look forward to the tariff passed last Session as the means of immensely developing the iron industry of Canada and the cause of the erection of furnaces so as to double the present output.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the hon. gentleman passes from the subject, I desire to say a word in case he should desire to refer more fully to the papers in his possession and lest he should not get them on record. I hardly think the suggestion he has made would be willingly assented to by the Debates Committee, or that the committee would agree to it. In fact, I think it would be a very bad precedent to establish that lengthy documents such as the hon. gentleman mentions should be handed in to the reporters.

Mr. BROWN. Then I will read them. My only desire was to shorten the debate, and as it is important to have them on record I will read them. Here is a letter from the Hamilton Bridge Company:

“HAMILTON, 11th February, 1888.

“We use iron of local manufacture very largely, and find it of at least equal quality to that imported, and the price as far as our experience goes is reasonable and not so high as the full tariff increase would warrant; we also have the great advantage of ordering and obtaining this material just when wanted, and without having to lay in large stocks. We are convinced that the tariff as it at present stands is a wise and far reaching measure, and one which has also an immediate result by causing the cost of material to be disbursed in this country instead of being remitted abroad to pay for the imported goods, giving as it now does employment to many who otherwise would have to look elsewhere for work. You may remember that the iron bridge business is the direct growth of our protective system, it has had the effect of keeping out, in many cases, American structures of inferior design and material; this is shown by the number of bridges of American build, which we are now and have been for some time past so

placing and renewing, and which had been erected in Canada previous to the National Policy advent.

"HAMILTON BRIDGE & TOOL CO.,
"Per C. TRIPER.

Mr. MULOCK. What Bridge Company is it?

Mr. BROWN. Hamilton Bridge Company. That company is erecting some of the grandest structures in Canada—on the Grand Trunk, Canadian Pacific, and almost every railway in the Dominion. The demands upon the company are so great that it is almost impossible for the company to overtake their orders. Here is a letter from the Hamilton Forge Company:

"HAMILTON, 21st January, 1888.

"ADAM BROWN, Esq., M.P., Hamilton.

"DEAR SIR,—We now very cheerfully comply with the request made by you in reference to the general effect of the tariff changes in iron inaugurated last May.

"In the first place we respectfully submit that the extension of time given to importers by the Government enabled them to bring into the country a large quantity of the finished article, that otherwise would have been made in Canada, thereby increasing the stocks then held, and to-day this iron has not all gone into consumption; but we are assured the spring will largely reduce, if not wipe out altogether said stocks; we find even now a considerable number of orders coming from men who have refused in the past to buy at home choosing rather the imported article; but they are finding out that iron can be made in Canada equal in quality and finish to any foreign make.

"In our own business we have felt the good effects of the wise and judicious policy of the Government, notably during the past four months, having largely increased our output by running our force full time, both night and day, and within the past few days have started another furnace in our establishment with all the necessary equipment, capable of turning out about one car load more of finished bar iron per day, this will give active employment to twelve skilled men, besides day laborers. We have also increased the capital stock of our company for the purpose of further developing the business, and in the near future we propose placing another mill plant with a capacity 6,000 tons per year.

"In conclusion we have much pleasure in stating that we have never heard a consumer of iron complain of the tariff changes; moreover we desire to place on record the general feelings of satisfaction expressed by them in having their wants supplied promptly at home, without having as in the past to purchase abroad, and carry large stocks, and pay cash for them, they can now secure iron within a reasonable time, that at once goes into legitimate consumption, thereby giving a hearty and vigorous tone to business.

"The continuation of an iron policy, wise in its inception and having for its object the development of the mineral resources of this country, covering the whole Dominion of Canada, meets with our hearty approval, and must eventually lay a foundation broad and enduring, that will be materially helpful to every class of man living between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

"We beg to remain, yours respectfully,

"HAMILTON IRON FORGING CO.,
"THOS. D. BEDDOE, *Manager.*"

The Canada Pipe Company writes:

"The immediate result has been that my factory has been steadily employed during the past season, and will soon necessitate the increase to double its present capacity.

"I may say that another foundry for the same product is being built at the Londonderry Works in Nova Scotia, in which it is proposed to produce about double my capacity.

"The effect on the consumers has occasioned a small increase in price, but it has been my policy (and I also think that of others) not to ask the addition to the full extent of the increase in tariff, as what we want is steady work at a moderate profit, rather than the full advance in price.

"Of course, the extension of the time for admitting goods until the 30th June last year affected our business somewhat, but I could not see how that could be well avoided.

"Your respectfully,
"ALEX. GARTSHORE."

The Ontario Rolling Mill Company writes:

"We have not felt at all fully the effects, as yet, owing to the large amounts of material brought in under privilege to July 1st last; however, we knew last summer that we must expect this and governed ourselves accordingly.

"We are now beginning to feel the beneficial effects, and expect that by spring we shall be called on to make far more iron than ever before.

"This feeling justifies us in making many improvements in the way of increased capacity here. We may say that we shall be able to turn out by spring nearly double the tonnage we ever made here. We are also arranging to start up the mill we have in London, either there or elsewhere, so that by May we can, if necessary, make in that mill about thirty-five tons per day. As we have explained to you, before our increased capacity, with that of the Forge Company and mills east, will enable Canadian manufacturers of bar iron to turn out more iron per year than has been used in Canada.

Mr. BROWN.

"We took the position last spring that under the advanced price of foreign iron made so by increased tariff, that it would tend to lessen the dissatisfaction of some importers and consumers; if we put our selling price down to a fair profit instead of holding it up to all the tariff permitted, and, also, show those who had before imported all their iron and disparaged our product in comparison with foreign iron, that we were disposed to forget all that, and treat them liberally as possible.

"We may say this policy has been followed out by us and the result is satisfactory, so far as we know. While this state of affairs has been brought about, as explained above, we hope the conditions existing between makers, jobbers and consumers, will not be disarranged by further changes. We mention this, as we heard last fall that an effort would be made to have the duty increased on scrap iron this coming Session.

"If that were done, it would necessitate our adding the increase to our price of finished iron, and that would raise a general howl over the country. We are firmly of the opinion that the tariff, as it applies to manufacturers of iron, should not be disturbed.

"We may say that it is impossible for us to make finished bars out of imported and domestic puddled bars, and sell, without loss, in competition with foreign bars.

"Should there be any further information that you wish, please let us know. We have not changed our opinion as to the wisdom of the policy of the Government on the iron question.

"We are, yours truly,
"ONTARIO ROLLING MILLS."

Now, Sir, to show you the opinion of those interested in industries there, in which, probably, I suppose there are not less than \$5,000,000 invested and which is being increased every day, and to show you that they are satisfied with the policy of the Government on the development of the iron industry, that they believe the policy to be the right one, and to show you that we can get in time all the iron we want in Canada, I will quote some of those expressions of opinion. The hon. gentleman said there was lots of iron in the bowels of the earth, and I need not point out that the object of the National Policy is to unearth it. We know very well that hitherto the policy of our Government has been to do all that it could to promote immigration of the proper kind to this country. I believe, with the hon. gentleman, that the farmer is at the bottom of the success of our country, and I advocate the bringing of all the farmers that we can, of the right sort, to this country, bringing them in to plough the furrows, to sow the seed, and to reap the golden harvest which will be sent to the rest of the world. That is what we want in this country, and I wish to see as much of it as we can have. Let no man try to gull the country and to gull the farmers by telling them that the National Policy is not a benefit to them. I have here a number of telegrams which I have received from Hamilton, and from those interested in different industries there, which are all against unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, and which are after this style.

"Commercial union would kill our forge and preside at the funeral of our rolling mills. As loyal Canadians, we protest against the possibility of our tariff being arranged for us at Washington.

"T. D. BEDDOE,
"Mgr. Hamilton Iron and Forging Co."

"If commercial union should be adopted, it would utterly destroy the pipe industry and certainly lead to annexation. Don't let Washington dictate our tariff.

"ALEX. GARTSHORE,
"Canada Pipe Works."

"Under commercial union we would have to shut down our works entirely.

"ONTARIO ROLLING MILLS CO."

"Commercial union would destroy our business in carriage and saddlery hardware and scales, and would seriously damage stove business.

"BURROW, STEWART & MILNE."

"Unrestricted reciprocity would effectually close the canning industry. In most cases farmers receive for their products twice the price paid in the United States, particularly for tomatoes.

"J. W. CUY KENDALL & CO.,
"AND RISING SUN CANNING AND PICKLING Co."

"Unrestricted reciprocity would close every sewer pipe factory in Canada.

"CANADA SEWER PIPE CO."

"The furniture trade would be severe sufferers, more particularly the manufacturers, for the following reasons:—The American factories are now nearly all large stock companies with large capital, and have all the advantages in purchasing that capital gives. From their large output they have the division of labor so fine that the cost of production would be and is much less than we can hope to arrive at here with a limited production and output. Our manufactures are only now getting nicely on their feet. The large concerns could wipe them out before we could change our style of business to the change of market.

"J. HOODLESS & SON."

"Unrestricted reciprocity would be hurtful to the country and ruinous to our business.

"OSBORNE-KILLEY MANUFACTURING MACHINISTS CO."

"We consider that commercial union would be most disastrous to our interests.

"HAMILTON COTTON CO."

The managers of the Wheel Works, who employ a large number of people, say:

"After considering the question of commercial union in all its different bearings, political, commercial and social, we are of the decided opinion that it is not for the interest of this country to entertain the idea. It is but the stepping stone to annexation. As far as our particular business is concerned, we are positive it would injuriously affect it, if not altogether destroy it.

"F. W. HORE & SON."

"Consider risk far too great; can make as cheap, but would have to make New York the chief distributing point for selling; can make fair living now, and no money consideration would make me give up our Canadian independence. When the Canadians show that they have no brains to make living without foreign assistance, by all means let them annex, and wipe themselves out as a miserable race.

"JAS. WATSON,

"Strathroy Knitting Co."

"We believe it would destroy the manufacturing part of it, and resolve us into traders or agents for western houses. Am writing.

"F. W. FEARMAN,

"Pork, Bacon and Lard Packer."

"We should have to share the market here with little prospect of entering the American market. The effect would be ruinous.

"B. GREENING & CO.,

"Wire Workers."

"Were unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union to come in force we would at once remove our business to United States.

"D. MORTON & SON,

"Soapmakers."

Now, I have a telegram from the Bridge Company, a company that we are proud of, and a company whose structures have excited the admiration of all experts in bridge building in this country. Not only this Bridge Company, but the companies in Montreal, Lachine and elsewhere, are entirely an outcome of the National Policy. And yet hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, as if it were a mere nothing, and a matter of no importance to the company, wish to have this industry wiped away. Here is what the President of the Bridge Company telegraphs me on this question:

"Unrestricted Reciprocity would destroy our bridge business. American bridge shops are generally attached to iron works, where they have raw material at their hand, and have large capital and an unlimited field, but competition with them is such that few pay dividends. A large part of raw material used by us is imported from Europe, but we use all we can get made in Canada. Our work is preferred to either English or American.

"WM. HENDRIE,

"President Hamilton Bridge Company"

There is another point I would like to refer to, and I regret that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is not in his seat, as I made a special memorandum for him on this question. He represents a constituency in which the article of cheese is the great staple of the country. Canadian cheese has worked its way up from a very small beginning until to-day it occupies a position on the British market superior to the American cheese.

Hon. gentlemen will be astonished when I tell them that I can remember when there was not a man in Canada who made boxes to hold cheese. I believe, Sir, that I saw the first box that was turned out to hold cheese, and to-day the export of cheese from Canada alone to foreign markets, to say nothing of the home consumption, exceeds \$7,000,000. Now, the point I want to make is, and on which my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) will have a little difficulty in explaining himself to his constituents, is that unrestricted reciprocity will put Canadian cheese on the same level with inferior American cheese, and, therefore, it will bring no better price to the Canadians than to Americans. Hon. gentlemen on the other side may laugh, but I tell you there is no doubt about it and it is a proper proposition to make and a good argument to use.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Mr. BROWN. What is the use of talking. I have here a telegram from the president of the largest cheese concern in Canada on this question.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is equal to saying the Canadians do not know cheese.

Mr. BROWN. Some of you on the opposite side do not know beans. I asked the gentleman if he was president of the Cheese Association, as I wanted to have the highest authority. He answered:

"Yes, I am president of the association. No fixed prices can be given for cheese, as it depends on the supply and demand abroad. Think unrestricted reciprocity would not benefit us. Our cheese at present leads the market in price and quality, and any interference in the present mode of shipment that would be the means of our cheese being sent to the English market as American cheese would interfere with our high prestige against us."

That is the highest authority. This is from a man that leads the cheese organisation in the west.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) What is the name?

Mr. BROWN. His name is E. Caswell, he lives in Ingersoll, and he will see anybody from 7 o'clock in the morning till 9 at night; he is always at his business. Hon. gentlemen seem to have been a good deal mixed in the last three or four weeks, and it is only now that they are getting the tangle taken out. Their opinions respecting this unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union have appeared in various forms through the press; but they seem now to be pretty well whipped into line, and I suppose before this debate is concluded they will all be of one mind as to what unrestricted reciprocity is and what commercial union is. But they seem to have a woeful forgetfulness of what they used to think, many of them, of the noble consummation effected by the Fathers of Confederation, which is making our country great, and which has already commanded the admiration of the world. Perhaps there is no country that has prospered so much, or that has made such satisfactory progress, as Canada has since the time Confederation was accomplished. I would just like to read an extract written at the conclusion of the first decade of Confederation:

"The Dominion of Canada has now completed the first decade, and can with pardonable pride review the history of those ten years, while the future can be looked forward to with hopefulness and confidence. Every one acknowledges that Canadian Confederation has been a great success, and those who had the greatest doubts about the venture are now ready to confess that the plan was a wise one, and that the result has been all the most sanguine could have anticipated."

"Ten years have come and gone, and what do we see? Canada stretches from ocean to ocean, and in all her wide domains there is not a section of the inhabitants that is not loyal to her Government and deliberately and enlightedly attached to her constitution. The idea of annexation is dead. The desire for it is to-day not spoken of as a factor in the politics of the continent. Its discussion is not thought of even in juvenile debating clubs when 'questions' are at a premium and there is a desire to have something that will 'draw.' Never was there a time in all the past when there was more neighborly cordiality between Canada and the United States, and at the same time less thought of or desire for a nearer political relationship than exists at present.

Both go on their way with mutual respect and with a growing conviction that each has a divergent destiny, with different habits, different national peculiarities, special modes of thought, and special civilisations which may have their own particular excellencies and their own shortcomings, but can never be amalgamated without mutual injury and loss.

"While the material progress of Canada has during these last ten years been very marked, her educational and religious progress has not been less noticeable. In every respect we have cause, not for boasting, but for commendable satisfaction. The past is full of encouragement. The future is full of hope. We may all address ourselves with renewed energy and alacrity each to our own proper work, with the full conviction that, individually, we can all help to make Canada flourish more than more in all which really characterises a free and prosperous people, and that as each and all cultivate what is really true, manly, moral, intelligent and religious, so will Canada flourish, and flourish long and ever progressively, sharing as she does and will the glorious, and helping to accomplish the destiny, of the mighty empire which after centuries of trial, and triumph is found to have nothing about it of age, but its matured wisdom; its gathered experience; its prudence without a touch of feebleness; and its true conservatism which is ever found in rational progress and timely improvement and reform."

This splendid extract I have made from the *Toronto Globe*. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite have for the last ten years sought to disturb this great Confederation which has been the hope of the people of Canada, and which is full of inspiration for the young men of our country—something for them to live for, something for them to work for. But hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends have sought to neutralise all our hopes in the future of this country; they declare that there is no prosperity in store for Canada under its present rule and its present institutions. They declare that we must have our whole fiscal policy changed, no matter if the result may be that we must change the institutions of our country and seek for sustenance and support by giving allegiance to those of another. Hon gentlemen opposite, as I have said, have had their nostrums now and again. They have sought to excite ill-will among the people towards the administration of this country. One cannot help being reminded of the scene of the witches in *Macbeth*, with all their toil and trouble, their boil and bubble, as they were mixing up the various ingredients in their caldron and say to each other,

"Round about the caldron go,
In the poisoned entrails throw."

The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, since 1873, has been as strange a mixture of heterogeneous compounds as that of the witches' broth, described by Shakespeare, into which they put:

"Fillet of a fenny snake,
In the caldron boil and bake;
Eye of newt, and toe of frog,
Wool of bat, and tongue of dog,
Adder's fork, and blind-worm's sting,
Lizard's leg, and owl's wing—

In these changes they have sought—

"For a charm of powerful trouble,
Like a hell-broth, boil and bubble,"

Which after all has produced for them nothing but—

"Double, double toil and trouble,
Fire burn and caldron bubble;"

And if they continue long the same kind of cookery, the people of the country will get tired of both them and their broth. We have a country well worth living for. I consider the people of the United States about the grandest neighbors anybody could possibly have, and we ought to cultivate the closest relationship with them. They spring from the same blood, and inherit the same laws—the best laws under heaven which have been transmitted to us by the best blood of our forefathers.

Mr. LISTER. And foremothers.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, foremothers; and your foremother would not be proud of you if she knew the company you are keeping. We should cultivate the best relations between the two peoples, and we are doing it; and I hope the day will never come when there will be any

Mr. BROWN.

rivalry between that country and ours, but that rivalry which will produce the greatest good for humanity. I hope that the avenues of commerce between the two countries will be held sacred in the interests of peace and commerce. I may, with pride, quote to you the words of a distinguished statesman, one who has shed lustre upon his career in this country, one who has adorned the history of Canada. I refer to Lord Dufferin. In his great speech at Winnipeg, speaking of the United States and of the propriety of keeping on the best terms with that country, he said:

"But of no nearer connection does she dream. In a world apart, secluded from all extraneous influences, nestling at the feet of Her Majestic mother Canada dreams her dream, and forebodes her destiny—a dream of ever broadening harvests, multiplying towns and villages, and expanding pastures; of constitutional self-government and a confederated Empire; of page after page of honorable history, added as her contribution to the annals of the mother country and to the glories of the British race, of a perpetuation for all time upon this continent of that temperate and well-balanced system of government which combines in one mighty whole as the eternal possession of all Englishmen the brilliant history and traditions of the past with the freest and most untrammelled liberty of action in the future."

I will not detain the House any longer but I will close my remarks by asking the House if I could give any better advice to the people of Canada or to the hon. gentlemen opposite, in our discussions of all matters connected with our country, than to repeat the words of that same distinguished nobleman when, following up the spirit of his address to the people of Manitoba, he used the following language which should be written in letters of gold, and be taught in the schools of our country:

"Love your country, believe in her, honor her, work for her, live for her, die for her."

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) I do not mean, Mr. Speaker, to inflict a long speech on the House, particularly in a tongue which, unfortunately, is not understood by a large number of my hon. friends. But I make it a special point to record my views on the important subject before the House, as representing an essentially farming county, which is deeply interested in having its opinions known through my instrumentality in this House and throughout the country. I desire to state my way of thinking on this question, chiefly to repudiate the propositions set forth by the hon. the Minister of the Interior, who led the debate on the other side of the House, and the observations made by a number of other members, chief among whom is the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Brown), all to the effect that this matter of reciprocity never went before the country, and was not submitted to the people at the last general election. I do not know precisely what was done in other counties, but in mine I may say that the question was particularly discussed, and that it was one of the principal points on which the election hinged. One special reason which I had to make that subject a principal issue, was that my opponent professed to be independent at the time, and declared that he did not differ with me on the national question, which was then stirring the Province of Quebec. And to prove his independence he said that, like myself, he had condemned the Government for its North-West policy. Thus the controversy between us was reduced to the narrower confines of the question of protection and reciprocity with the United States. Well, Sir, I say that the question was debated with us, and the best proof that it was understood by the electors of Montmagny county, is the verdict which they rendered. In 1882, the discussion turned on the same topic, and the subject of protection came in incidentally, when Montmagny county—rightly or wrongly—wrongly, of course, according to me—declined my humble services and elected my adversary by a majority of 120. At the last election, however, it turned in my favor and chose me as the representative of its genuine interests in this Chamber by a majority of nearly

200. Now, let us suppose that this question had not gone to the public, had not been submitted to the electorate, could the hon. gentlemen on the other side blame us therefor? Have we not the right to bring up this question before the House, in advance of other general elections? Have we not the right to put forward in this House, and before the country, our own ideas upon which the electors shall decide later and ratify them? And if we have not that right, can the party at present occupying the Ministerial benches make it a matter of reproach? When these gentlemen imposed Confederation on the country, did that question go before the people? So far from it that, when the time came to pronounce on the question, to approve or to condemn it, whole Provinces stood up against it, and yet Confederation was carried. When these hon. gentlemen brought before the House the Franchise Bill, which, so to speak, altered the representation, and changed in a number of the Provinces the representative system, did they fear that we should blame them for not consulting the people beforehand? And when they flung millions to the Pacific, and are about to throw more, did they go before the people to ask the sanction of their policy? Hence, Mr. Speaker, let us suppose that the question has not been discussed, although I hold that, so far as I am concerned, it was discussed; and a verdict rendered upon the issue, have we not the right to come before the House and expose our views, and later, demand a confirmation of the same from the people? I say that we have the right, and feel convinced that, in time, we shall receive the support of the electorate. As to the subject of protection, with which we are engaged, has that been submitted to the people as it stands to-day? Have the counties had a chance to pronounce fairly and squarely on this tariff of 30, 35 and 40 per cent.? I say they have not, and will prove it. In 1877 and 1878, when the hon. gentlemen filling the Treasury benches were in Opposition, they wanted to place before the House and country resolutions tending to sanction the policy of protection. Did they do so? Did they really submit their policy to the people? Did they tell the people, through the House and through the press, that they would set up a Chinese wall between Canada and the United States, and impose a tariff of 30 and 35 per cent.? No, Sir. The right hon. the First Minister, then leader of the Opposition, proposed in 1876, the following resolution:—

“That this House regrets that His Excellency the Governor General was not advised to recommend a reconstruction of the tariff with the view not only of making less sensible the stagnation which is deplored in the gracious speech from the Throne, but also of offering encouragement and the protection necessary to the suffering manufactures and industries as well as to the agricultural people of the country.”

Well, was the policy which the Government meant to be established; intimated in this motion? Does it state what proposition was to be before the people? Were the latter told that they were to put up with a tariff as high as the one which now exists? Certainly not! Take the resolution of 1877, the hon. the First Minister proposed at that date:

“That this House regrets that the financial policy of the Government increases the burden of the taxes on the people, without procuring, as compensation, any advantage to Canadian manufactures, and, furthermore, that the House is of opinion that the deficit in the revenue should be met by a reduction of expenses and by means of a reconstruction of the tariff protecting and favoring the agricultural, mining and manufacturing interests of Canada.”

This resolution of 1877 is pretty much the same as that of 1876. The wording is changed, but the people are not yet instructed in what is wanted of them. We come now to the Session of 1878. Here is the resolution then proposed by the right hon. the First Minister:

“Be it resolved that this House is of opinion that the prosperity of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy which, by a readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and favor the agricultural, mining and manufacturing interests of the country.”

Well, Sir, I hold that there was nothing here before the House or the country showing that these gentlemen wanted to impose the enormous charges which now exist. I hold that, coming before the people with these resolutions, getting elected on the strength thereof, and then imposing the enormous tariff in force to-day, they obtained the popular suffrage under false pretences. I declare that the hon. members of the Opposition would not reveal their views to the people for fear that the truth would work them harm. Hence, if they would not honestly expose their object, I state that they deceived the people and rode into power under false colors. And I will say further. During the election campaign, a certain Mr. Boyd telegraphed the hon. leader of the Opposition of that time, in the following language:—

“The Ministerial press here affirms that you propose raising the tariff generally to 35 per cent. May I contradict it?”

What did the present leader of the Government reply? Here is his despatch:

“To Mr. JOHN BOYD, St. John, N.B.

“It is an absurd story. Neither in London nor elsewhere did I go beyond the resolution proposed by me in Parliament. I did not speak of an increase of tariff, but of a reconstruction.”

There were three resolutions put before the House during three different Sessions, and in the ensuing electoral contest, when the Mackenzie Government were under trial, and charged with not overhauling the tariff, for the protection of our farming and mining industries; while the Government were virtually accused of treachery to the country, the enquiry was as to what their adversaries would do? Would they increase the tariff, if they reached power? And the present head of the Government replied that it was an absurd story, that he had never dreamed of increasing the tariff beyond the meaning of his resolution, although these resolutions said not a word about the tariff. I repeat, Sir, that votes were then obtained under false colors, and to-day the hon. members on the other side of the House cannot state, without violating the truth, that they obtained power under the auspices of protection. Now, as they wanted only a reconstruction, not an increase of the tariff, several members on the other side have said, during this debate, that protection was a settled question, the people having pronounced on it three different times, in 1878, 1882 and 1887, and the Government had carried the day. Hence they argue that protection must be maintained in the country. I object to that argument, Mr. Speaker, and say that neither the Government, nor the hon. members on the right have reason to hold before the House what they assert to-day. In 1878 the protective system, as it stands to-day, was not discussed before the people, and hence the latter could not have pronounced upon it. In 1882, the people were approached and this famous protection had to be explained to them, contradicting their despatches, their speeches, their motions set forth in public books, and the position which the Government held to be defended. What did the Government then do? Knowing that they would be condemned by the people, they passed the Gerry-mander Bill before the elections, and when the elections did come off, the people could not pronounce on the question, for the counties had been so handled that the Liberal majorities were swept away and transformed into Conservative majorities. Consequently, not more in 1882 than in 1878, was the question of protection placed before the people on its true merits. And in 1887, what took place? Was this same question presented to the public? Did the Government submit it to the same body of electors? Did the Government ask the same electors to ratify its policy? In 1887, was it the same people who were called upon to approve or condemn the Government's policy. No, Mr. Speaker, for there again, with the object of carrying the elections, they passed that famous Franchise

Bill, and through it, were enabled to maintain themselves in power. I repeat, therefore, that the people gave no pronouncement on this question in 1878, nor in 1882, nor in 1887. Reciprocity is the subject for the next elections. On our side we take the lead, and mean that there shall be no false or side issues. We want the electors to be enabled to decide whether they desire protection or not. This is why I uphold the present motion, and I approve the opportuneness of its presentation now in order that, at the next election, it should be thoroughly understood of the electors who shall have to pronounce thereupon. Now, is the system of protection, actually in vogue and in force among us, satisfactory to the wants of the country, as is pretended? Is it a policy which the people in general, without difference of class, can sanction, on the score that it operates for the general interests of the country? And is it truly in the general interests of the country? I say not, Sir. The word protection is the synonym of tax and it means that where a tax exists it cannot be in the interest of the country, because a tax exists always at the expense of the consumer. They who have read Bastiat, or other writers on political economy, will be easily convinced of this. It will be quite enough to take up the authors that teach protection; the English writers who hold that a protective tariff should be adopted, because it is the best, and who have adduced reasons repeated by hon. members opposite in favor of it. I may cite, among others, "Sedgwick's Political Economy," page 489:

"Of course such a duty—if needed and effective—imposes a tax on the consumers of the articles protected."

As a matter of principle, I assert that a protective tariff is the imposition of a tax; that when a tariff is raised, the taxes are also raised at the expense of the consumers or purchasers, and, at the same time, this tax is imposed to the profit of the producers who are represented by the great manufacturers. I was not surprised to hear, a moment ago, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) read to the House a multitude of telegrams and letters from all sorts of manufacturers, who profess their satisfaction with the protective tariff. But did he read a single despatch or a single letter from a farmer or a workingman, or, in a word from a consumer? No. He read despatches and letters from men who are benefited by the protective tariff. I do not blame the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) nor his correspondents, for, if I were a manufacturer, I should likely do the same thing. But we who are here to defend the general interests of the country and not to favor a class who represent the great majority of consumers, if we are good citizens—and I hold that they are good citizens who desire the good of the greatest number—our duty is to protect the greatest number, those who purchase and consume, by removing their taxes. Hence, the letters just read by the hon. member may have their meaning, from the standpoint of manufacturing interests; but I defy anyone to place before the House missives from farmers or from consumers—from the poor or farming class. If it is only the producers and manufacturers who derive profit from these protective duties, the poor classes and the farmer classes are the sufferers, and it becomes our duty to supply a remedy. The remedy lies in a reciprocity treaty. The poorer classes may then buy where they like and where they find the cheapest bargains. I repeat once more, Mr. Speaker, that the duties imposed to protect manufactures are a tax, and I do not understand the consistency of gentlemen opposite who, after establishing the protective tariff, rise from their seats and ask for enquiries into the combinations entered into by manufacturers as inevitable results of the protective system. They remind one of Saturn, who, at the birth of his children, proceeded to devour them. They impose a duty to protect manufac-

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

turers, and at the next Session they declare that the latter have formed a "combine" and must be opposed. The proper mode of opposing them would be to allow competition, remove the enormous duties in favor of manufacturers which force the poorer class and the agricultural class to buy from them, and at their own price. This question of protection, Mr. Speaker, is not as new as some would have us imagine. Certainly, the hon. members on the other side of the House have not always been of that mind. It is not so long since they took up protection. They were in want of a watchword to captivate the public trust, and in 1878, under false pretences, they hit upon this word, with the result which we all know. Numerous documents have been read to the House since the opening of this controversy, and especially last evening by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) in a speech more fragrant in flowers than tasteful in fruit. Many quotations were made in the attempt to show contradiction in the view of the Opposition leaders, to prove our inconsistency, to demonstrate that the Liberal party never had a settled policy, and that to-day this term was seized upon because capital might be made of it. Sir, this recalling of the past can work both ways. It is a two-edged weapon this charge of inconsistency against hon. members on our side of the House, and the taunt of entertaining contrary views to-day from those held a decade ago. But did not hon. gentlemen opposite have leaders whom they respected, and with reason—for the leaders of the past were as honorable and distinguished as those of our time—and did not these leaders also shift their opinions? Did they not emit an opinion contrary to that held to-day? Did they not say, some eighteen or twenty years ago, that to set up protection would be the entering wedge destined to destroy our natural industries? In 1874, was not Sir Charles Tupper, for one, driven to say that thing after being obliged to vote for taxes imposed by himself in 1870 on bacon, potatoes, coals, wheat and other staples? What said the great spirit of these, Sir George Cartier? In January, 1871, at a grand banquet given to the honor of this distinguished leader at Quebec, he was called on for an outline of political policy, in view of the elections to be held in a few years, or even much earlier, and in reply he made a noteworthy speech, specially remarkable in that it flatly contradicted that policy of protection so much lauded to-day, and which is still steadily maintained, almost under false auspices. The great Conservative said the following, and I regret that the majority opposite do not understand French, or that those who upbraid us for having altered our stand cannot appreciate the language of the late Conservative statesman. This is what Sir George Etienne Cartier said in 1871, at Quebec, in that essentially Liberal city, a division of which enjoys the honor of being represented in this House by our distinguished chief, who, as we fondly hope, will always espouse the cause of the farmer class, the poor class and the class of consumers. These are Sir George Cartier's words:

"Manufacturers demand protective duties. This is absurd. If you push protection too far you kill your foreign trade, as has been the case with the Americans, and you must fall back on direct taxation. We shall be guilty of no such folly. We have adopted the policy of imposing a fiscal duty, but not a protective duty. We are asked for a protective tariff. But if you protect manufacturers, you limit the sale of your produce to your own people. If the United States do not export more it is because protection raises the price of goods overmuch."

This, Mr. Speaker, is what Sir George Cartier said at Quebec. The adoption of a protective tariff is a folly, an absurdity, and we must not think of it. And yet, when he has gone, and they who profess to represent and continue his policy, following in his footsteps, come and speak to the contrary, I shall not say that it is a folly, nor an absurdity—for I believe them to be sincere and really solicitous of the good of the country; but if it was unwise in 1871, it cannot be anything better at the present date. Times do not alter so fast. With the centuries changes may take

place, but not within ten years can a foolish thing be converted into a reasonable measure. Hence these hon. gentlemen are wrong in twitting us with inconsistency. Our leaders were never inconsistent on this score. They may have modified their views, as every one is free to do. Every one knows that times, circumstances, and the wants of the country can temper opinion on the fiscal policy of a people, especially a young nation such as ours. But it lies not with the gentlemen opposite to accuse us of inconsistency in the premises. Mr. Speaker, according to myself and according to the great Conservative leader, protection is an evil thing, if there be another financial system that is good. There must be another system to manage the business of the country and ensure its prosperity. That system is reciprocity. Nor is the system novel, Mr. Speaker. Here, too, the hon. members on the right of the Chair contradict themselves in their speeches, writings, and even in the amendment actually set before the House. Let us see whether this reciprocity is a good measure. And if it were good when the nation was young, when its population was small, when its resources were weak, why should it not be good to-day? Why not adopt it now, when we see from the public documents, and from history, that it was advocated by the Conservatives, not long since, as a remedy for all the ills of a country. Is it bad because put forward by the Liberal party? I maintain that the member voting on this question through party spirit would be worthy of the position which he occupies. I do not act thus for the pleasure of fault-finding, being well disposed toward the Government, and although I oppose the policy of the Government in this regard, I do not do so in a partisan spirit. The people have put in their hands the reins of power, and we cheerfully submit. We shall keep all we can, but when their policy turns to mischief, we shall oppose them as we do now. In 1847, there was a question of a reciprocal treaty, under the Sherwood-Daly Administration, to which the present First Minister belonged as Receiver General. At page 24 of the Constitutional History by Turcotte, a Conservative writer, this is what we read about reciprocity:

"The Province was about to enter into competition with nations wealthier and more progressive than herself, but to carry on the rivalry with advantage it was necessary to set aside all the obstacles likely to thwart her commerce, and grant free entry into Canadian ports to all foreign vessels."

Thus, in 1847, under a Conservative Government, of which the present Prime Minister was a member, it was held that the sole means of forwarding the interests of the country, and rendering it great and prosperous, was by opening the gates wide to American commerce, and free its ports to all foreign craft. In 1854, under another Conservative Cabinet, we find the following on page 251 of the same work:—

"Trade took a further expansion, which commercial reciprocity with the United States was about to increase still more. Already, in 1854, trade, forth and back, attained the figure of about \$50,000,000."

Hence, Mr. Speaker, in 1847 reciprocity was preached, in 1854 it was demanded, and in 1865, when there was question of forming the Coalition Ministry—Taché-Macdonald-Brown—a treaty of reciprocity with the United States was set down as a special article of the programme, and for the purpose of engaging the Provinces to adopt the scheme of Confederation which was about to be inaugurated. And, further, one of the motives that operated in favor of Confederation was that the United Provinces might have a widespread commerce. Well, Sir, if by uniting the Provinces and doing away with the several tariffs existing among them, and staying their progress, business was likely to improve, I hold that by removing the commercial barrier standing to-day between Canada and the United States, the same happy result would

ensue. But there is even more, Mr. Speaker. Under the McNab-Morin Administration, to which I made reference just above, and to which the present First Minister was attached, the discovery was made that business was in a very bad way; that emigration from the country was large, and that Canada was backsliding instead of stepping on. A special committee on emigration was then formed, an account of which I find in "Canadian Pamphlet," No. 25. This committee of a Conservative Government was made up of Conservative members. On page 2 these are the reasons given for the formation of the committee:

"When an ancient nation, by the excess of its population, compared to the extent and limits of its territory, feels cramped and ill at ease on its native soil, the emigration of a portion of its inhabitants is a source of relief, a benefit not only unto itself, but also for the new lands to which they repair, as well as to humanity. But a people still young, but numerous, sober and plucky, occupy a vast territory, whose surface, with the fertility of the soil, are amply sufficient to hold freely and feed plentifully a population fifty times greater, then emigration of its sons is a misfortune, a genuine public calamity. Such an emigration, not being justified by any lawful causes, can only be the result and consequence of some radical vice which society should discover at once so as to lose no time in applying remedies adequate to the situation."

Those were the reasons given for the appointment of the committee. There was in the country a radical mischief which hindered the spread of business in all the departments of our resources, population, fertility of soil, mines and forests. And on the 10th page of the same report the committee says:—

"The opinion of the majority of the public men of the day seems to be so much in favor of free trade that any contrary demonstration would appear unjustifiable and opposed to the prosperity of the country."

Thus, in 1857, Conservative members in committee assembled, stated that public opinion was so strongly in favor of free trade that it would be absurd, and even an act of treason, to set forth another policy. The country was young, the population sparse, and yet at that epoch, everybody wanted free trade and reciprocity. There must, therefore, have been something good in it, since it was foreseen that the country could thrive only beneath the folds of that banner. On page 11 of the committee's report, we also find this:

"Your committee is therefore of opinion that it is of the utmost importance for the prosperity of the country, that reciprocity in duties, as well as in free trade, ought to exist between the Provinces and the United States; that beforehand every article imported from the United States should bear the duties imposed on articles of the same character exported from any part of Canada;—that our tariff should be so modified as to ensure to the manufacturer that lawful protection which it has received and still receives in other countries where its position is about the same as that which it occupies to-day in ours."

Thus the committee recommended, in 1857, thorough free trade with the United States. And its natural and very sensible conclusion was that if reciprocity could not be had, something at least should be attempted for the manufactures and to check emigration. But mark that, in the first place, not protection was demanded, but thorough reciprocity. Now, there is a lesson here, Mr. Speaker. If we may usefully use the past in forecasting the future, it strikes me that they who, from 1847 to 1878, proclaimed the absolute need of a reciprocity treaty with the United States, thereby declared that protection is a folly, I say, therefore, that we stand in the same position, or even in a better than they, inasmuch as our country is now larger, our resources vaster, and if this reciprocal policy was worthy of adoption then, I do not see why we should not embrace it at present. Another proof that reciprocity is a benefit, with reasons drawn from the report of the said committee, is that one of the causes of the country's stationary condition and the slow growth of colonisation lies in the fact that large landed proprietors monopolised the public domain and sold lots at exorbitant rates, or that they allowed the lands to be cleared and tilled by *bona fide* settlers, and afterwards took them over to

themselves. To this is, indeed, they traced the cause of emigration. Page 6, of the report :

" 2. One of the chief causes of the emigration flows from the concessions of vast stretches of land, formerly made to an individual or to companies."

History repeats itself. In former days, the large land owners put the smaller holders under their heel, and to-day, the great manufacturers have the people, the farmers and consumers generally, in their grasp, thus preventing the growth of the country and the extension of its trade. Another objection urged against the motion before the House is that if this policy were adopted, annexation would be the inevitable result. No one in this House has spoken a word for annexation, although a large number of members, myself among the number—do not look upon annexation as a scare-crow. We are very well as we are, and we may stop there, and I do not see why we should shift our allegiance. But if, for one reason or another, the constitution were altered, in a constitutional manner, I fail to understand why we should needlessly experience any apprehension. This point is not before us, however, and cannot be used as a bugbear. And I may add here that the remarks put forth by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), that the Canadians dwelling in the United States are no better than hewers of wood and drawers of water, is neither more nor less than an outrage flung in the face of our brothers beyond the lines. It is well known that many of them have acquired distinction and occupy municipal and other positions of trust among our neighbors, some of them being members of different State Legislatures. I presume that the hon. gentleman who put forth this insult measured our fellow-countrymen by his own foot-rule, and that if he went to the States he would be no more than a hewer of wood and a drawer of water himself. And I might say the same thing of his electors, for, if he were fit for anything else, they would not have sent him here to abuse his countrymen. But once more, Mr. Speaker, there is no question of annexation. The solitary proposition before the House is a modification of the tariff, and the conclusion of a reciprocal treaty which shall favor our interests, promote the prosperity of our country and ensure protection not only to manufacturers, but to farmers as well, and to the poorer classes. I say that all these considerations adduced against the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) are contradictory. They have said that they wanted reciprocity. The same was repeated in the proposition made during the conferences of the Fisheries Commission. Now, if we require reciprocity for the fisheries, when we are more prosperous than the United States, when our fishery trade is larger and more flourishing than that of the United States, we should need it, with stronger reasons, for our other produce. I take the Fisheries Treaty as a further proof in support of the measure which we propose and which we should do well to adopt, seeing that it is echoed in the amendment of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, which asks for the removal of the barrier preventing the exchange of our fisheries; and yet I find in a pamphlet written by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Joncas), who seconded the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, that our fishermen earn \$12 more every year, per head, than English fishermen, and \$13 more than American fishermen. Now, if we are so flourishing as that, and desirous of having a reciprocity treaty, it is because we feel that our prosperity and our trade would grow; that we should widen the circle of our business connections, and render our people easier and more comfortable. Why, then, should we not reap the same advantages on our agricultural products and all that we sell and buy? Consequently, I repeat that, in discussing this question the hon. members on the right of the Chair have admitted in the past and admit to-day,—

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

they do discuss it only from a party standpoint, and not in view of the interests of the country, and I say that the proposition before the House is neither more nor less than the adoption of the proposal made by the hon. the Minister of Finance at the Washington Conference. Thence, therefore, a vote registered against this proposition is tantamount to a vote of want of confidence in that hon. gentleman. There is another reason, Mr. Speaker, alleged in support of the position taken by the members of the other side, that our revenue would suffer decrease. I admit that. I allow that we may lose an income of six or seven millions. But if our revenues lessen, it is because taxes will lessen; because the consumer will have less to disburse. If the public exchequer is a sufferer by seven millions, it is seven millions less which the buyers in the country will put, in the shape of taxes, into the public chest. We are further told that recourse will have to be had to direct taxation and other means of meeting this state of things. There is no need of direct taxation, but we shall do what the hon. First Minister used to tell us, while in Opposition—we shall have to curtail expenses. I remember that a former Finance Minister, while in Opposition, Sir Leonard Tilley, said that we should not spend beyond \$22,500,000 or \$23,000,000, and that he, being in such official capacity, would go further than that, and he charged the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), then Finance Minister in the Mackenzie Government, with being an extravagant man, who spent too much money. Admitting, Sir, that an income tax will decrease \$7,000,000, we are asked for \$35,000,000 this year, and if hon. Ministers can manage with \$22,000,000 or \$23,000,000, as they boasted when in Opposition, they ought to be able to get along with \$28,000,000 in administering the affairs of the country. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House any longer, and I shall close these few remarks by saying that, so far as I am concerned, this reciprocity question has been debated in my county, and even more effectively put before the electors, and victory turned in favour of the measure. Hence I do not hesitate to take my stand at once, and say that if called upon to renew the campaign in my county, I should be returned, not by 200, but by 400 or 500 majority. I shall repeat once more that a treaty of reciprocity with the United States has been advocated at all times, when we were in a much more inferior position than that which we occupy at present, and, if it was found well formerly, it ought to be the same to-day. When I rise in this House, to support the motion now submitted to us, I repeat that I do not do so through partisanship. I will not decry either my Province or my country and I support the proposition because I believe that it is in the interest of the agricultural classes and of consumers. I am one of the youngest members of the House; I represent the youthful generation and, like our elders, we love our country and our Sovereign. I do not wish that, on its adoption, the words of the poet to be applied to me:

*Ceux qui jennes encore sont froids pour le pays,
Quand ils deviendront vieux seront ses ennemis.*

This is the reason, Mr. Speaker, why I labor for its progress and its prosperity. And when I shall be no more, I would like to have it said of me that, when young, I loved my country, and worked for its advancement, and, when old, worshipped it, enjoying its happiness and thrift.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I shall not attempt to reply to the admirable speech which has been delivered by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. So far as I am concerned, at all events, the speech of the hon. gentleman is perfectly unanswerable. But I shall ask the indulgence of the House while I offer a few observations on the very important matter which is now under consideration. The discussion which has now taken place upon this ques-

tion differs in one important respect, at least, from the discussions to which we have been accustomed to listen in other Sessions. I have heard every Session, since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, the condition of this country described by hon. gentlemen opposite in very much the same language and the same way that they have described it on this occasion. I have heard the poverty of the country referred to; I have heard it also alleged that the burden of taxation was so great that the people of this country were obliged to leave it and find homes for themselves in the United States. On former occasions, however, hon. gentlemen opposite suggested no remedy for this state of things. They informed us that while a Conservative Government was in power in this country, it was impossible for Canada to make progress or prosper, but they never told us how a change of government would afford any relief. They never told us what policy they would adopt if they were entrusted with the reins of power, which would bring about a better condition of affairs in this country. It is in this respect that this discussion offers a striking contrast to the discussions to which I have referred. They have discovered now that it is unrestricted reciprocity with the United States that we require; they have discovered that if this policy should be adopted in this country, it would remove every cause of complaint, and, I presume, satisfy the wants and aspirations of us all. I feel that it is to be regretted, at least for the credit of hon. gentlemen opposite, that this particular remedy was not discovered at some time when they could have fairly claimed to have been the originators of this movement. It is a matter of surprise, to many of us at least, who sit on this side of the House, that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who introduced this resolution, did not discover at some former time that this was the real and only remedy for the evils under which we labor, considering the very close investigation which he is every year accustomed to give the financial condition of this country. It is a matter of surprise, too, that this has never been the result of the philosophical searches of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). It is a matter of still greater surprise that the hon. gentleman who, at the present time, leads the party opposite in this House, not very long ago, I believe, should have doubts as to the advisability of adopting this policy; it is a matter of surprise that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) not very long ago should have felt a preference for commercial union rather than unrestricted reciprocity, and that the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) when addressing his constituents in Charlottetown, should have pronounced unrestricted reciprocity—a scheme which, if it is not entirely analogous, is, at least, very nearly akin to the scheme which is now under consideration—as wholly impracticable. In some manner or by some process, which is unknown to us on this side of the House, these hon. gentlemen, apparently, since this Session commenced, have harmonised their views upon this subject. It is a mystery to those of us who are on this side of the House how this has been accomplished; and I assume that it will remain a mystery unless some hon. gentleman who is in the secrets of the party shall hereafter enlighten the country, and make himself famous by writing the history of the rise, and progress, and collapse of this extraordinary movement.

An hon. MEMBER. Especially the collapse.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Especially the collapse. To give honor to whom honor is due, I assume we may fairly attribute the origin of this movement to Mr. Erastus Wiman, the advocate of commercial union. Mr. Wiman, as we all know, is a gentleman of very distinguished abilities. If I am correctly informed, he was a native of Canada, but for some years back has taken up his residence in the

United States. He has evidently formed the opinions he now entertains, in regard to the conditions and wants of his native country, as the result of the ideas which he has imbibed and the influences by which he has been surrounded in the land of his adoption. Mr. Wiman has more advanced views on this question than hon. gentlemen opposite. He advocates a scheme of commercial union. He not only desires free trade, but he desires that all customs restrictions should be removed, and that a uniform tariff should be adopted, and the gross customs receipts should be divided between the two countries on the basis of population, or on some other basis that may be agreed upon. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not prepared to go that far. They draw the line at unrestricted reciprocity; and, while they desire free trade, they desire that each country shall have the privilege of regulating its own tariff as it chooses. It is not difficult, of course, to account for this difference in the opinions of Mr. Wiman and hon. gentlemen opposite, for these gentlemen have not enjoyed the same advantages as Mr. Wiman has; they have not lived in New York, they have not been surrounded by the influences by which he has been surrounded, and they have not had the same opportunity of having their minds enlightened and their views enlarged upon this subject. I expected, and I think the country and this Parliament expected, that these gentlemen would have pointed out some reason why we should prefer unrestricted reciprocity to commercial union. For my own part, I have been unable to discover what advantages we, as Canadians, would have under unrestricted reciprocity that we would not have under commercial union. I can see many disadvantages to Canada under either system. In the first place, as has been pointed out already, the effect upon our revenue would be very serious indeed. The direct loss, as has been stated, would amount to upwards of seven millions of dollars. The indirect loss would be even greater than this, and it is impossible accurately to estimate it, because we cannot form a correct estimate of the extent to which our foreign imports would be reduced if this policy were adopted. One thing, however, I think, must be evident to any person who takes even a superficial view of this question, and that is that Canada would be in a better position under commercial union than she would be under unrestricted reciprocity, at all events as far as revenue is concerned; for we must all admit that, if a fair tariff were maintained and we had a fair division of the revenues of the two countries, we would have a larger amount of money to provide for carrying on the government of the country, and to provide for our public expenditures, than we would have under any scheme of unrestricted reciprocity. Then, there is the disastrous effect of this policy upon our manufacturing industries, which has been already referred to. I shall not dwell at any length upon that branch of the subject. Hon. gentlemen opposite admit that it will injure our manufacturing industries, but they make this admission in the mildest manner possible. They tell us that it may be expected that some of the manufacturing industries of this country may be injuriously affected if this policy is adopted. Why, Mr. Speaker, our manufactures would not simply be injured; they would be practically annihilated; for everyone knows that the manufacturers of the United States, with their enormous wealth, with the capital they have at their command, with their long experience, with the skill they have acquired, with the great influence—almost amounting to control—which they are enabled to exercise, not only in the markets at home but in the markets abroad, and even, to some extent, over the means of transportation, places them to-day in such a position that they can bid defiance to any competition that the manufacturers of this country could possibly offer them. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in the course of his remarks, used a most extraordinary argument in connection with this branch of the

subject. The argument was very ingenious, but it was equally fallacious. That hon. gentleman referred to the growth of manufactures in the United States and he made a comparison between the growth of the manufactures in some of the newer States and in some of the older States. He instanced Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota and California on the one hand, and Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania on the other hand, and as the result of that comparison he says:

"Taking the old manufacturing States which produce more than one-half the goods produced in the whole Union, the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, I find that the increase during the same period [the period referred to was from 1870 to 1880] was \$315,000,000, or about \$50,000,000 less than in the eight new States I have mentioned, and that the ratio of increase was 21.6 per cent., against 64 per cent. in the new States. This is a striking result, and it demonstrates that the ratio of increase in manufacturing is more than as rapid again in those new States, and the newer they are the more rapid the increase; the most rapid increase was in Minnesota, 228 per cent., the increase in Illinois was over 100 per cent., and in California over 74 per cent."

He goes on further and refers to several cities in the western States, Buffalo, Detroit, Cincinnati, Cleveland, and several others, and goes on to say:

"Statistics show that the ratio of increase is many times more rapid in these cities of the west than it is in the older cities of the east. In view of these facts, I think that we are needlessly alarmed, that there is no ground for the alarm that exists in the minds of some men, that the manufacturers of the Dominion are not capable of competing with those old manufacturing centres in the eastern States. The results in the western States give the lie to such assertion. We may disabuse our minds of any fears as to our abilities to compete with those centres and to successfully maintain and sustain our manufacturing interests. The fact of it is, Mr. Speaker, that our manufacturers, as well as our lumbermen, our farmers, our fishermen and mine owners, need the blessings of continental free trade."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that argument proves anything it proves this: that it is no disadvantage to a new country to have free trade with a country where older manufacturing industries are established; and, if that argument is sound, if there is no disadvantage for the newer cities and States to have free trade with the older manufacturing States of the Union, it would have been no disadvantage to them to have free trade with Great Britain and free trade with the world. If the principle the hon. gentleman lays down is sound, the United States have not built up their manufacturing interests by the policy of protection which was adopted in that country, because those interests would have grown as rapidly, if not more rapidly, if they had maintained from the first a policy of free trade with Great Britain and the world. That is simply an argument in favor of free trade, and I cannot better answer the argument of the hon. gentleman than by using the language which he used in this House in 1876. The hon. gentleman on that occasion said:

"It may be safely assumed that no country has attained to greatness in manufactures without having in the course of its history imposed exactions and restrictions. This has notably been the case with Great Britain herself, and I think the assertion that the development of various industries is necessary to the cultivation of the self-defensive power of the nation, is incontrovertible. We have had an illustration of this in the United States. . . . The United States have adopted a protective policy under which their industries have been fostered and promoted until in 1870 their products reached 4,253 million dollars, giving employment to 2 million operatives, and disbursing over 775 million dollars."

The opinions which the hon. gentleman held in 1876 were sound. I can congratulate him upon the soundness of those opinions, but I cannot so heartily congratulate him upon his change of opinion since. But since the hon. gentleman has lost confidence in his former opinions, I could refer him to the opinions of another hon. gentleman, the very able leader of the party on that side of the House, in whose opinions he should, at all events, have a great degree of confidence. I would refer him to the celebrated Malvern speech, which has already been referred to in this debate. The leader of the Opposition, on that occasion, acknowledged that Mr. Wood (Westmoreland).

the protective policy which had been adopted in Canada, had resulted in bringing into existence new manufacturing industries. He admitted that these industries owed their continued existence to the continuance of that policy, and, as the leader of the party, he gave his pledge, and that pledge was not only for himself but for the party which he led, that the manufacturers, at all events, had nothing to fear from that party, that if they were entrusted with the control of the government of this country, no radical change would take place in our fiscal policy; in any reductions which they made in the tariff, they would have a due regard for the manufacturing interests of this country. It appears that the hon. gentleman has not only lost confidence in his opinions, but both he and all the gentlemen with whom he is associated on that side of the House, have lost all respect for the solemn pledges of their leader made a little more than a year ago; for every person knows that if this policy were adopted, the manufacturers which owe their very existence, in this country, to the adoption of a protective policy, would be utterly destroyed, for they can only be continued in existence by maintaining a protective policy against the United States as well as against the world. Now, Sir, this policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States will not only be disastrous to our manufacturing industries, it will be equally disastrous to the trade of this country. This has already been referred to—indeed, every branch of this subject has been discussed at so great length that it is needless to dwell much upon it now. I wish to confine my remarks, on this branch of the subject, almost exclusively to the foreign trade of this country. One of the objects of the National Policy has been to extend and develop our foreign trade, and that has been done to a large extent. It is specially exemplified in the sugar trade. In 1878, as we all know, we imported but 6 per cent. of the sugar consumed in this country from the country of growth and production. In 1887 this condition of things was entirely changed, for we now import upwards of 90 per cent. of the sugar consumed in this country, direct from the country of growth and production. And when we recollect that the consumption of sugar in this country last year amounted to upwards of 230 million pounds, the importance of this trade will be apparent to every one. Then take another leading article of commerce, the article of tea. Before the introduction of the National Policy, we purchased our tea largely in the United States. Last year we imported into Canada direct from China and Japan, and other tea-producing countries, upwards of eleven million pounds, and from the United States only half a million pounds. Now, I cannot conceive it possible that under any system of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union that discriminating duty of 10 per cent. could be maintained; and if it is not maintained, we hand back the tea trade of this country largely to the wholesale importing houses of New York and Boston. Then, in 1887, we imported of woollen manufactured goods from Great Britain upwards of eleven million dollars worth, and of cotton manufactured goods, upwards of four and a half millions. If unrestricted reciprocity were adopted, this trade would nearly all, if not entirely, be transferred to the United States. Indeed, Sir, without enumerating further, we may say that our entire foreign trade would be gone. When we consider the value of this trade, when we consider the important influence it has in building up our maritime cities, in furnishing traffic for our railways, in furnishing employment for both capital and labor in this country, we can form some conception of the enormous losses which would be incurred if this policy were adopted. For my own part, I can see no advantages sufficient to compensate us for this enormous loss. Hon. gentlemen have endeavored to support their position in various ways. They have referred to our geographical position, to the proximity of the United States, to their

large population of 60,000,000, and to their enormous trade. But this point does not really touch the question. The real question under consideration now is whether these 60,000,000 of people are our customers, or our competitors? With regard to our geographical position, that branch of the subject has been so ably dealt with, and the arguments so fully and so successfully met by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that it is not necessary to refer to it further. It has been said that we need the United States as a market for our agricultural products, that the United States is the natural market for the farmers of this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a position which hon. gentlemen cannot successfully maintain. Why, the United States are, and have been for years, the competitors of the Canadian farmer in very many leading classes of agricultural products in our own Canadian market. In beef and pork, in wheat, rye, peas and beans, in live stock, butter, lard and cheese, they are the competitors of the Canadian farmers to-day in the markets of Great Britain and in every other foreign market to which these exports are shipped. With regard to other classes of agricultural products to which reference has been made—horses, barley, hay, sheep and wool—the imports at the present time are utterly insignificant, and, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated, the imports are so small that they do not affect, to any appreciable extent, the value of these articles in the markets of the United States. That reciprocal trade with the United States in farm products would be an advantage, no one can deny; but this is due to this cause: that agricultural products especially are affected by local and exceptional causes. A drought in any particular year may enhance the value of particular classes of agricultural produce; the failure of a crop may have the same effect; the movement of population, the growth of cities, the establishment of new mining or manufacturing industries may, for any particular period of time and in certain localities, give enhanced value to agricultural produce; and to that extent, and to that extent alone, it would be advantageous to the farmers of Canada to have free access to the markets of the United States. But it is contrary to every principle that governs trade and commerce, to assume that while the United States are exporting every year, and exporting every year in larger quantities, almost every class of agricultural produce, they can offer to the farmers of Canada a certain permanent or profitable market, while everything we sell must simply go to swell the volume of their exports to foreign countries. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has referred to our mineral wealth. He told us that if the barriers of trade were thrown down American capitalists would come into this country, that our iron and copper mines would be developed, that new lines of railway would be built, and in a short time we would become large exporters of iron and copper ore to the United States. I doubt very much the conclusions at which the hon. gentleman has arrived. I do not for one believe that the results he anticipates would follow if his policy were adopted. But, even supposing, for the sake of argument, that the hon. gentleman is right in this anticipation, if he pretends to assert that it is in that way that the mineral wealth of this country can be developed to the greatest advantage of the people, I take direct issue with him on that point. I claim that the mineral wealth of this country should be used for the benefit of the people of this country, that by a moderate protective tariff we should offer every inducement to foreign capitalists to come here and establish new manufacturing industries, to furnish employment for our own people and enlarge the home market for our farmers, and we all know the home market is the most profitable market they can have. This, Sir, is the policy which the present Government have adopted in the past. It has been successful so far, and it promises to be far more successful in the future than it has been in the past. The hon. gentleman has also referred to the growth of trade dur-

ring the existence of the old Reciprocity Treaty, which existed from 1854 to 1866. Now, it must be apparent to every one that that can in no way be taken as an index of the probable results of reciprocity at the present time. It must be remembered that that was an exceptional period in the history of the country. It must be remembered that during the existence of that treaty the people of the United States were for five years engaged in civil war, that during that time upwards of two millions of their people were taken away from agricultural and industrial pursuits and forced to do duty on the field of battle, that the ordinary business of the country was neglected and the regular growth and development of the country was arrested. It must be remembered, too, that the values of all commodities were unduly inflated, that especially the prices of the exports from Canada to the United States were enormously enhanced, and the large profits which the people of this country gained by having free trade with the United States during that period could not be realised again except under similar circumstances. To-day, the condition of things is entirely changed. During that period the United States were importers of coal. In 1865 they purchased from Nova Scotia some half million tons of coal. Last year, such has been the development of the coal mining interests of the United States, that they not only supplied their own wants, but exported to the Province of Ontario alone 1,130,000 tons of coal, and that in the face of the duty of 60 cents per ton. If that duty were removed to-day, if we had free trade in coal with the United States to-day, it would be a disadvantage instead of being an advantage to the people of Canada, for the coal mine owners of Nova Scotia would find that coal from Pennsylvania, and Ohio, and Illinois not only had full possession of the eastern markets of the United States, but they would find, I fear, that they, the Nova Scotians, would be kept out of the markets of Ontario and Quebec. Then the development of the agricultural resources of the United States has been wonderful since the close of the war. Since that time in the United States the people have built long lines of railway connecting the east with the west; they have carried into the rich agricultural districts of the west hundreds and thousands of settlers, they have placed in their hands the best and most improved agricultural implements and machinery, they have furnished them with easy, speedy and rapid communication between the agricultural districts in the west and the centres of population in the east and the seaports on the Atlantic coast. The development of their agricultural resources has been far more rapid than the demand of the home market warrants, and the exports of the country are every year increasing. In Canada, too, the condition of things has entirely changed. We, too, have built long lines of railway. We have deepened our canals, improved our water communication, and to-day we have communication between the different sections of this Dominion which is not excelled, even if it can be equalled in any country in the world. We have, too, opened for ourselves new markets, we have established new means of communication with those markets, and if we continue to go on in the direction in which we are going, the time is not far distant when the people of Canada will have easy access to all the markets of the world where our products can be sold, or where any demand for them exists. Under these circumstances, while we are not as dependent upon the United States for the sale of our products as we formerly were, while reciprocal trade with the United States may be very desirable, it is no longer necessary to our progress and prosperity. I am not opposed to reciprocal trade. I should be very glad if our commercial relations with the United States were very much extended, I should be very glad if many of the restrictions which now exist were removed, I should be very glad if we could have free access to their

markets for the products of our farms, of our fisheries, of our mines and of our forests, I should be very glad too if we could have the advantage of the coasting trade, and I believe the Government of the country would be fully justified in making any reasonable concessions to obtain those advantages. But while I am in favor of a reciprocal treaty or a treaty for reciprocal trade, which is fair in its terms, which can be honorably obtained, which is mutually advantageous to both countries interested, I for one can never give my consent to a proposition such as that now before the House. It involves the loss of our foreign trade, the destruction of our manufactures, it would practically compel us to purchase almost everything we require in the markets of the United States, and finally it would make us dependent upon them for a market for our products. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in the course of his remarks referred to the present position of the finances of the United States. He told us that the Secretary of the Treasury if he had the authority of Congress might provide for the required expenses in three different modes. Each of the modes which the hon. gentleman proposed involved a very large reduction of the tariff and very large additions to the free trade list. Now, I am very much inclined to agree with the hon. gentleman's opinions and I believe that there are good grounds for entertaining those opinions. A measure has been introduced into Congress during its present session, which, together with the remarks of the President of the United States, would indicate that legislation in that direction may be looked for at no distant date. But, Sir, there is no reasonable man who will not admit that if the free trade list is enlarged in the United States it will be enlarged in the direction of the admission of all the natural products of Canada, and of everything which, under any circumstances, we could sell to the people of the United States. If that opinion is well founded no government can be justified in purchasing those advantages at so great a cost as is proposed in this resolution; when the United States will be compelled by force of circumstances and with no concessions on our part to open their markets in the no distant future not only to Canada but to the whole world. Then, Sir, there is another view of this question and a very important one to which I wish to refer, and that is the practicability of the proposition now before the House. Sir, I believe that the hon. gentleman would be obliged to demonstrate far more clearly than he has done in the course of this debate that this proposition is practicable before it will receive a very serious consideration from this House or from the country. I do not believe, Sir, that it can be shown to be practicable, and the history of our trade negotiations with the United States fully justifies this opinion. The treaty which existed from 1854 to 1866 was terminated not by the desire of the Canadian people but as a result of the action of the American Congress, and that action has since apparently met with the full approval of the people of that country. When the Hon. George Brown, in 1874, went to Washington to negotiate a treaty for reciprocal trade, he was prepared to make large concessions, he was prepared to offer much more advantageous terms than they had under the former treaty, and yet his proposal did not receive even respectful consideration. There has been an Act upon our Statute-book since 1879 providing for, and giving the government of this country authority to remove, the duties from imports to the United States on the natural products of this country, if reciprocal privileges were granted to Canada. To that invitation for reciprocal trade we have had no response. If we need any further proof to establish this point we have it, Sir, in what took place in the course of the recent negotiations at Washington, when the representatives of Canada and the representatives of Great Britain were given to understand in plain and unmistakable terms that no such

Mr. Wood (Westmoreland).

treaty could be entertained, and that the representatives of the United States would not even ask for authority to negotiate for a treaty which involved any change in the existing tariff of the United States, or which interfered with the power of the Congress of the United States to regulate and alter their tariff at any time they chose. Now, Sir, if we were going to Washington to-morrow to propose a treaty for reciprocal trade with the United States the proposition which is now under consideration is the one of all others which would be least likely to find acceptance. This is a proposal to establish free trade between the two countries, not only in products and manufactured goods, but at the same time it proposes that each country should be free to regulate its own tariff as it may choose. Look for one moment at the effect of such an arrangement upon the trade of the United States. Take for instance the effect upon the sugar trade. If under such an arrangement as that, the Parliament of Canada chose to reduce the duties on raw sugar or remove them altogether our refiners could import raw sugar into this country, they could refine it in Canada and they could sell it in the markets of the United States. The only way the people or the Government of the United States could prevent that result would be to reduce the duties on raw sugar until they corresponded with the duties that prevailed in this Dominion. The same principle applies to every class of imports used in our manufacturing industries which can be brought from foreign countries either in their raw or partially manufactured state. And, Sir, to suppose that the people of the United States would place themselves in a position where they might be at any time required to alter or reduce their tariff, in consequence of any action which might be taken by the Parliament of this Dominion, is to my mind simply preposterous. It is utterly inconsistent with the dignity, and independence, and self respect, of an intelligent, and proud, and prosperous people. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) expressed sound opinions, I believe, when he addressed his electors in Charlottetown last fall. The same principle precisely applies to the proposition which is now before the House that apply to the proposition of unrestricted reciprocity which he was then considering, as he has explained it. I do not know, Sir, of any better way to express my view upon this question than to refer again to the language which he admits he used with regard to the proposition there. He then said: "Unrestricted reciprocity is something the people of the United States are not such arrant fools as to accept; it is impracticable." Unrestricted reciprocity, Mr. Speaker, can mean but one of two things. It means either free trade with the world or political annexation with the United States. If adopted it must lead either to one or the other of those two results. It is utter folly to assume that while we remain a portion of the British Empire, we can maintain against Great Britain a discriminating tariff. There would be no advantage whatever in closing our market against British manufacturers if we opened them free to the manufacturers of the United States. There would be no addition to our revenue; there would be no commercial advantage. It would be simply maintaining a discriminating tariff for which we could give no excuse or justification. If we grant this privilege to one, we must in common justice grant it to the other. Free trade with the United States means free trade with Great Britain, and free trade with these two countries means free trade with the world, and free trade with the world means direct taxation. We must, Sir, accept that as the inevitable result of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, or we must accept the other alternative—political union; for it is equally against common reason and common sense to assert that we can maintain an unjust and unnecessary discriminating tariff against Great Britain, and that the people and Government of that country will at the same time entertain the same friendly relations and feelings towards us which exist at the present time.

With, Sir, all our interests so closely identified and allied with those of the United States, annexation must follow as an inevitable result; and if the results which were predicted by the hon. member for South Oxford should be realised—if the effect of this policy should be, as he said it would be, to open up Canada as a field for American enterprise—if we are to bring American citizens here, people with American sympathies and with a strong preference for American institutions and the American form of government, it must be evident to any reasonable man that political union with that country can be but for a very short time delayed. Now, Sir, when this scheme comes to be studied and to be thoroughly understood by the people of this country, it will be seen to be not only subversive of the best interests of the people of Canada, but repugnant to their feelings. The people of Canada, Sir, are loyal British subjects. We belong to different races and different creeds, for we have sprung from different nationalities; but whether it is Norman or Anglo-Saxon blood that flows in our veins—whether we are of those who have crossed the Atlantic to find a home in this western world, or whether we are the descendants of those who more than a hundred years ago crossed the border line and laid the foundations of St. John, Toronto and other cities along the American frontier, we have chosen Canada for our home largely because we have a preference for British institutions, because we desire to enjoy the protection of the British flag, and because we are willing to do our part to maintain a united British Empire. This feeling, I believe, is universal in this country, with but few exceptions. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) not long ago declared himself to be in favor of annexation; but when he made that declaration, he found no sympathy from either political party in the city he represents. Those who supported him, as well as those who opposed him, censured and rebuked him for his conduct. He was even called upon by those who had elected him to resign his seat in this House, because he was told that he did not represent the feelings or the sentiments of his constituency. But, Sir, I have this to say for the hon. gentleman, that his advocacy of annexation is frank, candid, and consistent; and I believe that if a man does believe in annexation, and desires to see it accomplished, it is better for him to go about it in that way than to advocate it under the guise of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. Now, Mr. Speaker, this has been said to be mere sentiment. It has been referred to by several hon. gentlemen in the course of this debate, and some of the leading members of this House have told us that we should regard this question simply from a business standpoint. I for one do not concur in that opinion. It is true, Sir, this sentiment of loyalty is a mere sentiment, but it is a sentiment which has a firm and strong hold on the people of this country, and it is one which will largely influence their decision in the present instance. It is a sentiment, Sir, which has been fully recognised by both political parties in this country, and it is a sentiment to which I believe we have in this case not merely a right, but to which it is our duty to appeal. The National Policy had for one of its objects the fostering and strengthening of a loyal sentiment in this country. That policy has been successful in establishing new industries, in developing our resources, and in extending our trade; but it has done more than this. The National Policy has made the people of this country self-reliant. It has given them a confidence in their own country and in its future growth and greatness. It has led us to appreciate at their true value the vast resources which this country possesses, and it has given us a true appreciation of the powers we possess to provide for their development. This policy, Sir, has been the means of creating a national sentiment in this country, a feeling of national pride; and while it has

brought prosperity, it has at the same time attached us more strongly to the land in which we live, and also strengthened the bonds that unite us to the mother country. I am, Sir, but expressing my own personal convictions; but I desire to say that I, for one, believe that the veteran leader of the Conservative party in this House owes, in a very large degree, the popularity which he enjoys, and the success which has attended his political career, to the fact that in all his acts and utterances, and in all his public policy, he has shown himself to be thoroughly and honestly in sympathy with this sentiment which so strongly predominates among all classes in this country. I believe, too, that while those who oppose him in this House have no better policy to offer, while they have no better claim to power, while they have no better proposition to submit for the consideration of this Parliament or this country, than a commercial treaty with a foreign power, which would involve the loss of all we have gained in the last ten years—aye, which asks that we shall yield up that full freedom of self-government, which is our pride and boast as a portion of the British Empire, which asks us to terminate our national existence, which, though young, is full of vigor and vitality, which has been happy and prosperous in the past, and is full of hope and promise in the future—when their policy is one that involves the loss of our very identity as a Canadian people, and our ultimate absorption into the American Republic, in my opinion at least they can have no hope whatever of gaining the confidence or support of the people of this country.

Mr. BARRON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I hope the hon. gentleman will not move the adjournment of the debate. We have been adjourning rather early the last few nights, and if we really want to bring this debate to an end some day or another, I think we must sit longer. The hon. gentleman, I have no doubt, will have time to make his speech now, and I hope he will not make his motion.

Mr. JONES. I understood that there was an understanding arrived at between the hon. gentleman who is leading the House and the leader of Opposition that the question was not to go on after half past eleven or the neighborhood of 12 o'clock.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not this evening.

Mr. JONES. The hon. leader of the Opposition has left the House under that impression.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken about that. There was no such understanding this evening. There was an understanding last night, which was kept, but this evening there is time for another speech, and I hope the hon. gentleman will go on.

Mr. BARRON. I did not intend to speak to-night, when I rose to my feet, but simply to move the adjournment, in consequence of what I understood to be the understanding between the leader of the Opposition and the Government. The leader of the Opposition certainly gave me to understand that the hon. gentleman, who is now acting as leader on the opposite side of the House, agreed that after 11.30 the debate would be adjourned, but if the hon. gentleman insists on my going on, of course I must accede to his wishes. But I hope, however, the hour being very late indeed, that the House will be as indulgent with me as possible, because I know how tedious it is to have to listen to speeches on a subject which has been pretty well threshed out already. Hitherto the all important question before the House has been dealt with almost completely from a Dominion or Federal standpoint, except in one or two notable instances: I refer to the singular speech of my hon. friend for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), the other night, in answer to the senior mem-

ber for Halifax (Mr. Jones). I did expect that hon. gentleman would have delivered a speech from which we could learn something, but it did seem to me that the hon. gentleman was actuated throughout his speech more by some personal political motive than by any other. I will make another singular exception, and that is the speech of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown), who charged against the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) that he was pretty well mixed. But I will leave it to this House to judge as to which of the two was most mixed. I do not propose to deal with the subject before us altogether from a Dominion or Federal standpoint, because I think it is better, from this time forward, at all events on the part of junior members, that they should deal with this all-important question from a local or provincial standpoint as it affects local interests. When I remember that my constituency has, as much as any, and probably more than many of the constituencies represented in this House, a deep interest in the motion under discussion, I feel it is my bounden duty to rise on this occasion and give my reasons for supporting the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). There is also another reason why I think it is my duty, on this occasion to speak to this motion, even at this late hour, and that is this: Since the last Session of this Parliament, I have taken great pains to ascertain the views and wishes of my own people on this great trade question, and I was gratified to find that by giving my vote as I intend to give it, when the time comes, I shall be thoroughly in accord with the great majority of the people in my own riding. I was not only pleased, but I confess, I was a little alarmed, to find the extent to which some of the farmers were willing to go, in my riding, to gain access to the American markets. Another reason why I consider it my bounden duty to address the House on this subject is that my own constituency is very much interested in this subject. The people there being almost exclusively engaged in the two great leading interests, namely, that of farming and lumbering. I want first to draw the attention of this House for a little while to the importance of this subject, so far as the farmers are concerned. I understand the issue before the House to be this, as embodied in the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford, the greatest good to the greatest number; while that presented by the amendment moved by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is, the greatest good to the fewer number. Now, if we start out with that proposition, and I think it is a true proposition, we should try to ascertain who compose the greater number in this country. I think we can come to no other conclusion, at all events so far as Ontario is concerned, than that the farming population is the greatest in number and in wealth. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Macdonald), I think, stated this afternoon, in his very able speech, that there were some 600,000 farmers in the Dominion. Will the House spare me a little time while I make a comparison between the farmers and all other classes, as regards number and wealth, in the Province of Ontario. In that Province more people are engaged in the farming industry than are engaged in all the other industries put together. The exact figures are these: In 1886 the farming population of Ontario was 1,144,520, and the number of people in all other lines of life, 674,506, leaving a majority of near half a million engaged in or dependent upon the farming industries over other industries in Ontario. I have found on several occasions that the argument has been used, that while it is quite true the farming population in Ontario is numerically very much greater than all the other people put together, yet the wealth of the manufacturing industry has to be considered. Before dealing with that, however, let me say that in the county I have the honor to represent the farming population is 21,563, or 12,717 more than the entire population engaged

Mr. BARRON.

in other industries. Now, as to the question of value, I find that in Ontario the value of farm lands, buildings, implements and live stock, foot up to the enormous sum of \$939,497,911, or ten times greater in value than the manufacturing industry in that Province. It is only fair that I should say here, because I desire to be accurate, that I have no accurate statistics as to the real value of the manufacturing industries in Ontario, but I find that, in 1881, the value of manufactures throughout the entire Dominion was about \$160,000,000. Taking \$60,000,000 from that, and allowing \$100,000,000 as the value of the manufacturing industries in Ontario, I find that the value of the farming industry is a little less than ten times as great as that of the manufacturing industry, and yet we find hon. gentlemen opposite bowing down and worshipping their God and Mammon and forgetting the interests of the most valuable industry in the Dominion, the farming industry. I will refer to another industry in which I am not interested personally, but as a representative of the people, and that is the lumber interest. I have no accurate statistics as to the value of the lumber interests, but I find that we exported to the United States up to the 30th June, 1887, for the year prior to that, the immense value of \$9,165,987, upon which, as I will explain in a moment, Sir, we paid the enormous amount in duty, based on the average duty imposed for the year ending June, 1886, of over \$1,678,292.21. It must be admitted, therefore, that the removal of the American duty would give an impetus to that trade. When we consider the two great industries, farming and lumbering, I do not see how it is possible for any hon. gentleman to vote against the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford, which is calculated to promote these interests, and to vote instead for the amendment which is calculated to help the vastly smaller industry—that of the manufacturers. Let me say here, and I will be as rapid as I possibly can, I do think the interest of the farmer is served by the amendment of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Take the case of barley. As has been stated to-night already, we exported last year 9,437,717 bushels, the value of which was about \$5,245,000; but I ask hon. gentlemen, did the farmers get that five and a quarter millions? They did not, because they had to pay in duty, \$943,771.70.

Mr. RYKERT. Who paid the duty?

Mr. BARRON. That was answered this afternoon out of the mouth of the leader of the hon. gentleman who interrupts me. If the hon. gentleman had been in his seat this afternoon, I think he would not have interrupted me now, because it was shown that the leader of the Government stated in Cobourg, in 1873, when he was trying to deceive the people with his National Policy, that it was the farmer in this country who paid the duty.

Mr. RYKERT. What do you say?

Mr. BARRON. I say he does, and for this reason—

Mr. JONES (Halifax). What do you say, Rykert?

Mr. RYKERT. I will tell you by-and-bye.

Mr. BARRON. So I find that the farmer loses on that item \$943,000. Then, take beans. We exported an amount valued at \$206,000 to the United States. The farmer had to pay in duty no less than \$19,000. The value of the export of peas was \$331,349, but the farmer did not get that. He received that less the sum of about \$40,000, which he paid in duties. Rye was the same, and wheat the same, and hay the same.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). He got the rye in drinks.

Mr. BARRON. No, the farmer is not so fond of taking drinks as my hon. friend who has just interrupted me. Take the case of horses, and I refer to that, because it shows

how foolish it is to attempt to force a trade in a wrong channel. Last year we exported to the United States the enormous number of 18,225 horses, of which the value was \$2,214,338, but the farmer had to pay in duties \$442,867, and the comparatively small balance of a million and a half was all he got. From Ontario alone, last year, we exported 8,154 horses, the value of which was \$1,136,039, but the duty which the Ontario farmers paid was \$227,207, so that all they got for their horses was \$908,831. But hon. gentlemen opposite say that we should endeavor to cultivate the trade in horses with Great Britain. Any one who takes an interest in horseflesh knows that Great Britain never wants for cavalry purposes more than 4,000 horses in any one year. If that is so, what is to become of the balance of the horses which we want to export? Are these hon. gentlemen aware that the whole number of horses that we sent to Great Britain last year was only 329, with a value of \$38,000? In other words, the Ontario farmers paid in duty on the horses they exported to the United States eleven and a half times more into the American Treasury than they received for all the horses they sold to Great Britain. I think that is a serious matter, and, when hon. gentlemen opposite wish, by their policy, to make the farmer sell to the wrong party, I think that is an unanswerable argument to show the absurdity and gross injustice of the attempt. I shall not waste the time of the House by going into the question of horned cattle, but I may say that I find that Ontario last year sent to the United States, 45,765 horned cattle, the value of which was \$887,000, the duty on which was \$177,000. Again the farmers did not get the value because they lost this amount, \$177,000, in duty.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman say that that quantity of cattle was sent to the United States for consumption?

Mr. BARRON. I say that number of cattle was sent to the United States. If they went in bond, they would not pay duty, and on the cattle I speak of this duty was paid. I say again, in regard to sheep, of which 363,000 were exported last year, the value was \$974,000, but the farmer only received \$779,000, because he had to pay the enormous sum of \$194,000 in duties. I will summarise and will not go into detail, and I am sorry that I was asked to speak at this late hour, because I feel that I cannot do myself justice or do the subject justice; but, in fine, we find that, in lumber, barley, beans, peas, hay, horses, horned cattle, and sheep and so on, we paid last year \$3,672,845 in duties, or a little over \$2 a head for every man, woman and child in the Province of Ontario. I say this is a very serious thing indeed.

Mr. SPROULE. I would ask if the hon. gentleman takes the amount of duty off the price of the article exported, because he seems to have done it all along?

Mr. BARRON. I listened to the Minister of Marine with a great deal of attention—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer the question.

Mr. BARRON. I admit that I did not listen with very much attention to the interruption of my hon. friend, but I did listen to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine. I listen to speakers on both sides of the House in order to learn all I can, and the hon. Minister said, if I understood him, that it was perfect nonsense for the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to advocate such a motion as he did, because he did not follow it up by proving that it would be advantageous if his motion was introduced and carried out in this country. I ask if experience does not prove something, and I ask the hon. gentleman how he can say that unrestricted reciprocity, such as is aimed at by the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), will not bring about the good results

he says it will when he thinks of the item of eggs. I find, Mr. Speaker, that Canada exported of eggs last year nearly 13,000,000 dozen, valued at \$1,821,364. Now, I want again to point out, from an Ontario standpoint, the vast importance, at all events, to the farmer, of unrestricted reciprocity. I find that Ontario exported to the United States, of that nearly 13,000,000 dozen eggs, the enormous amount of 9,228,096 dozen, the value of which was \$1,305,642. There was no duty on eggs, and that accounts for it. Why, the value was more than the export value, to the United States, of beans, peas, rye, wheat and hay altogether, by over \$300,000. The export value in eggs was more than the export value of horned cattle; it was more than the export value of sheep to the United States; it was nearly as much as the export value of horses. Now, I said a moment ago that experience teaches, and it would be unfair for me to put forward this argument unless I drew a comparison. It will be in the recollection of hon. gentlemen in this House that on the 1st January, 1871, the duty of 10 per cent. on eggs, on the other side, was removed. Well, Sir, I find that for the last six months of the existence of that duty upon eggs, the export value from Canada to the United States was the small sum of \$5,403; but the very moment that duty was removed, the export of eggs increased with such enormous rapidity that during the first six months after the 1st January, 1870, the value reached \$290,820, and since the removal of that duty the export value of eggs has steadily increased until, in 1887, it is 337 times greater than it was in 1870 under the 10 per cent. duty. Now, I do think that this small item of eggs, the little article generally given as pin money by the farmers to their wives, affords a complete answer to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and is sufficient to show, to my mind, at all events, that if we adopted the policy of the hon. member for South Oxford and secured unrestricted trade with the United States, a very great increase will be brought about in the export of all our agricultural products. Remove the duty on barley. In 1896, if the export value of barley increased in the same ratio that the export value of eggs has increased, the value will amount to the enormous sum of \$13,114,920, in place of the five million odd dollars in 1886-87. Remove the duty on horses, and the export value in 1896, at the same ratio of increase as took place in the case of eggs, will reach the sum of \$5,540,840, in place of the two million odd dollars in 1866-67. Remove the duty on horned cattle going into the States, and in 1896, at the same ratio, the value will be two million odd dollars in place of \$837,000. Remove the duty on sheep, and in 1896, at the same ratio, the export value will be nearly two million dollars in place of \$974,482 in 1886-87. Now, what does this mean? Why, the very moment we get unrestricted trade, the magic wand of prosperity will touch our land, and I undertake to say that the value of our farm lands will immediately increase by 30, or 40, or 50 per cent. Now, Sir, remove the duty on lumber. I see hon. gentlemen in this House who are engaged in that business, and though I only know of it professionally, I defy them to deny that the removal of the duty on lumber would be a great benefit to the lumber trade in this country.

Mr. SPROULE. They propose to remove it now.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. gentleman used to think it would be a bad thing, but now when he sees the other side are going to do it he says it would be a good thing.

Mr. SPROULE. No, I did not. I said that they proposed to remove the duty.

Mr. BARRON. Well, if he does not say it would be a good thing I am astonished at his ignorance. Remove the duty on lumber and the export value thereof would be, in 1896, twenty million odd dollars, in place of the nine million

odd dollars in 1887. Now, have I any justification for this prophecy?

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. BARRON. Some hon. gentleman says "no." All I can tell him is that he had better read the history of Canada under the Reciprocity Treaty. Does he not know that the volume of trade between Canada and the United States, from 1854 to 1866, increased from over \$20,000,000 to something like \$84,000,000.

Mr. SPROULE. During the American war.

Mr. BARRON. There he is again. The American war broke out in 1860. But to satisfy the hon. gentleman, I will make a comparison prior to the time the American war broke out. I suppose the hon. gentleman will not say that the war broke out before we had the Reciprocity Treaty. Well, comparing the five years before reciprocity with the five years after, I find that our export trade to the United States increased after that date by 124 per cent., and the import trade increased by 85 per cent., and the increase in the average volume of trade by 100 per cent. Now, I want to draw the attention of the Ontario members to this fact: that of the entire exports to the United States of over \$32,000,000, Ontario exported \$20,000,000 of that amount, showing I think, that by reason of her contiguity to the United States, the Province of Ontario is deeply interested in cultivating trade with that country. I was going to touch upon some other items, but by reason of the lateness of the hour I shall have to forbear; but I shall ask the House to bear with me while I endeavor to answer one or two of the arguments made by the Minister of the Interior. First of all, let me say that I believe the farmer is not as prosperous in Ontario as he was a short time ago. I find that the prices he has been getting have been from year to year becoming less. I find that, in 1883, fall wheat was \$1.05; it has been gradually decreasing until 1886 when the price had fallen to 73.6 cents. I find that spring wheat in 1883 was \$1.07. It too has been falling, until in 1886 it had reached the small sum of 72.5 cents. I find in the case of barley the price in 1882 was 57 cents per bushel, while it had fallen in 1886 to 51.3 cents. In the same year, 1883, oats were 38 cents, in 1886 they had fallen to 32 cents. Rye in 1883 was 62 cents, in 1886, 52 cents.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been paying 40 cents a bushel for oats all winter.

Mr. BARRON. Then the hon. gentleman knows better than the books. Peas in 1883 were 71 cents, in 1886 they had dropped to 52 cents. Since 1883 there has been a falling off in fall wheat of 30 per cent., in spring wheat of 32½ per cent., and in barley of 10 per cent. Let me make a comparison. Let me state what the total value of these crops was in 1886 and what the total value was in 1882. I find in the last year, 1882, the total value of these crops, fall wheat, spring wheat, barley, oats, rye and peas, was \$89,682,065, whereas in 1886 it had fallen to \$58,000,000 odd. I take my own county because that is what I am interested in.

Some HON. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I think hon. gentlemen should keep order, as I do not think it is very courteous to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BARRON. I do not think it is very courteous on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. They forget the fact that I am, practically speaking, a young member, and the further fact that I was forced to continue this debate when I did not wish to speak — when I desired to speak on another occasion, when I would not be so hurried; and when the House would be more inclined to listen to me than it is at present, on account of the lateness of the hour. I find that

Mr. BARRON.

the value of all field crops in my county in 1886 was \$2,585,647, but the average for the five years between 1882 and 1886, was \$2,710,144. So far as my own county is concerned, I am sorry to say the value of the various crops has declined under the National Policy. I will take the case of farm land. In my own county in 1886 the value of farm lands was \$12,464,595. That was less than it was in 1885, when it was \$12,582,876. Whereas, in 1885, the value was \$22.27 per acre, in the year following 1886 it had fallen to \$22.11 per acre, the average for the five years from 1882 to 1886, being \$23.15, and so on, with regard to farm buildings. I will not enlarge on the figures for the reason I have mentioned. The total value of land, buildings, implements, live stock, &c., in my county as compared with the different periods was as follows: 1886, \$18,428,136; 1885, \$18,642,995, or \$32.99 in 1885 as compared with \$32.69 in 1886. Next, take the assessed value, in regard to which I desire to make a comparison, because the Minister of the Interior the other night tried to make a point, and he did apparently make a point, although he received a Roland for his Oliver from the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), when he stated that Mr. Blue's book showed the value of the farm lands had increased in Ontario by twenty million dollars in 1886 over 1885. I have no doubt that so far as he went the hon. gentleman cited those figures correctly, but if he had studied them a little further he would have found that the increased value was nearly altogether made up by the fact that the Ontario Government had opened out new districts, Algoma, Nipissing and Parry Sound, and the fact that settlers had taken up farms there would explain the large apparent increase. Let me take the case of the assessed value of rural property. In 1873 it was \$195,387,274; 1878, \$368,910,409, or an increase during the Mackenzie régime of \$73,523,135. Now, what has been the increase during the time hon. gentlemen opposite have held the reigns of power? Take from 1880 to 1885, and I take this period because I have taken five years under the Mackenzie régime. In 1880 the assessed value of rural property was \$374,774,517; 1885, \$416,515,457, or an increase of \$41,740,940, while under the Mackenzie régime the increase was \$73,000,000; or in other words under the régime of Mr. Mackenzie the rural property increased by \$31,000,000 odd more than it increased from 1880 to 1885 under the régime of hon. gentlemen opposite. But hon. gentlemen opposite are in the habit of saying, I think the Minister of Interior did paint it in very glowing colors, that Toronto had increased its assessed value and Montreal also, and the hon. gentleman asked, what did that mean? He said, increased population. Let me take the two together, rural and urban, and make a comparison. I find that between 1873 and 1878, under the Mackenzie Administration, the increase was the enormous sum of \$224,560,925; but under hon. gentlemen opposite between 1880 and 1885 it only increased \$77,271,994. In other words, under the Mackenzie régime the increase in the assessed property in Ontario, taking city, town, village and farm altogether, was \$147,283,931 more than it was between 1880 and 1885 under the régime of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Will the hon. gentleman repeat the first figures respecting the value of real property. I understood him to say that the increase under the Conservative régime was only \$42,000,000.

Mr. BARRON. \$41,000,000 odd.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). What was the urban and rural increase, was it \$73,000,000?

Mr. BARRON. \$77,271,000.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The remarkable fact is that Toronto alone increased during that period about \$46,000,000.

Mr. BARRON. But, in other places there were decreases; and Toronto, as the hon. gentleman well knows, has taken in suburban places. I propose now to take up the question of population. I find, Sir, that the number of ratepayers between 1873 and 1878, under Mr. Mackenzie, increased by 36,864 in the Province of Ontario. Between the years 1880 and 1885 they increased only by 12,666. The ratepayers, therefore, in our Province increased three times as many under Mr. Mackenzie as they did under hon. gentlemen opposite from the years 1880 to 1885. They may say that the ratepayers of the cities and so forth increased faster under their Administration than under that of Mr. Mackenzie. If they will allow me, I will give a few figures from the book quoted by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior himself. In 1873, under Mr. Mackenzie, the urban rate-paying population was 112,065, and in 1878 it was 147,164, or an increase of 35,099. I find, Sir, that under hon. gentlemen opposite, from 1880 to 1885, in 1880 the rate-paying urban population was 151,680, and in 1885, 182,191, or an increase only of 30,511, whereas under Mr. Mackenzie it increased by 35,099. Now, Sir, I will show, I think, from statistics, and allow me to say in this connection that I found the Statistical Record a most useful book that the population of Ontario has decreased since 1881. The population of Ontario, according to that book, in 1881, was 1,925,228. I have no means of finding out from the Dominion returns, at all events, what the population was in 1886, but I do find, from looking at Mr. Blue's book, quoted by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, that in 1886 the population was 1,819,026, or a decrease, taking the figures of the hon. gentleman opposite for the year 1881, and comparing them with Mr. Blue's figures in 1886, of 104,202.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Do you believe that?

Mr. BARRON. Do I believe it? Mr. Speaker, I admit that I have not the opportunity of knowing otherwise than I have proven, and if I had I would take means, the hon. gentleman opposite do not take, to stop the exodus. I can tell you that judging from my own county that I can believe it, because I do know, as was said here by some hon. gentleman in this House, that young men have left my riding and gone to the United States where they earned money and sent it home to pay for their farms. The Tory organ in Lindsay last week told us that a gentleman who went to the North-West and distinguished himself, a gentleman who wears the Queen's uniform, and a young man, has left the town of Lindsay to take up his residence in St. Paul. I can tell hon. gentlemen though they may not believe it, but at all events I conscientiously believe it, that the population in the Province of Ontario is not keeping up to its proper amount, and that it is not keeping up to the natural increase of the population. I see my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior laughing. I hope he will be good enough to bear with me a little while as I will finish soon, and I do not like to very much longer detain the House unnecessarily. Referring, Sir, to the iron industry, I must say that it lies undeveloped in my own riding. We can remember the speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance last year, when he spoke of the large iron deposits in the township of Snowdon which is in my riding. We recollect that on that occasion, that by reason of the increased duty which he then proposed that the iron industry would become progressive and would be a valuable industry in our country. Has this been the case? No. How is it possible that an import duty can increase the output from our mines in this Canada of ours? The hon. the Minister of Finance said last Session that the total annual consumption of iron in Canada was not more than 350,000 tons, which, he said, would require about 750,000 tons of iron ore. Now, Sir, suppose one of our mines turns out the same quantity as one mine does in Michigan, which would be daily about

2,300 tons of ore—if one mine turned out that, and no more, it would supply, as hon. gentlemen can see, the whole demand for the Dominion of Canada for any one year. And if one mine did supply the whole demand, then, I would ask, how are other mines to be worked in other portions of the Dominion of Canada? How are the iron mines of my riding to be worked if the Londonderry Mines down in Nova Scotia can supply the whole annual demand for the Dominion of Canada? I am not alone, Mr. Speaker, in my want of faith in the prophecy of the hon. the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentlemen opposite must be aware that the rank and file of their own friends have not emphatic belief in the policy of that hon. gentleman. Why, Sir, we see them going now to Mr. Mowat and asking him to initiate a policy which the hon. gentleman here has failed to do. They have gone to Mr. Mowat and asked him to bonus mining in order to establish an iron industry. Let me read a resolution of the Board of Trade in Lindsay the other day. The President of the Board of Trade, a most worthy man, who is the President also of the Conservative Association for South Victoria, is a Conservative, the Vice-President I find also is a Conservative, the mover of the resolution is a Conservative, the seconder of the resolution is a Conservative also, and, having no confidence in the hon. gentlemen opposite, they go to Mr. Mowat and say to him in so many words: "We have tried the hon. the Minister of Finance in his policy, and we find that policy wanting and now we come to you." The resolution I refer to as passed by the Lindsay Board of Trade is as follows:—

"Resolved, that the Board of Trade of the town of Lindsay hereby petition the Government of the Province of Ontario to give such assistance by way of grants of hardwood lands to any parties who will undertake to erect and operate smelting works for the reduction of the ores of iron or other metals as will aid in the permanent development of mining and reduction of ores in the Province, with such restrictions as may be deemed necessary in the public interests. And resolved further that a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary to the honorable the Minister of Crown Lands.

Not only do we find the rank and file going to Mr. Mowat in this respect, but we find the first lieutenant in Ontario of the hon. the Premier, asking Mr. Mowat across the floor of the Ontario Legislature to bonus the iron industry in order to bring iron to the surface and to work that industry. Now I shall hurry on and very soon finish.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh! oh!

Mr. BARRON. I find my hon. friend crows over there, but I will not detain the House long. I want to refer to one matter. We have again and again been told that hon. gentlemen opposite are all the time willing and anxious for reciprocal trade. We see it stated in the public press, and especially in the commercial papers, that there is a statute on our books inviting the Americans to give us reciprocity. Now, Sir, if there is one thing which is a monument more lasting than brass to the legislative insincerity of hon. gentlemen opposite, it must be this statute. What does it say? That any or all of the following things, that is to say, animals of all kinds, grains, fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables, plants, trees and shrubs, &c.—I shall not waste the time of the House in reading the whole section—may be admitted free. Although they put that on the Statute-book in 1879, and although these articles have been going into the United States free, hon. gentlemen opposite have maintained a tariff whereby the people of this country pay on trees valued at \$41,921, a duty of \$10,779, and on seeds valued at \$52,759, a duty of \$5,411. The total value of all these articles enumerated in this statute which are imported into this country is \$744,181, on which the people have paid in duties the enormous sum of \$133,471—articles which hon. gentlemen by statute declared should be admitted free into this country when the Americans removed the duties from them.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the people of this country pay that duty?

Mr. BARRON. Yes.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Then how does the producer on the other side pay the duty as well?

Mr. BARRON. There is no duty on the other side on these things; they are allowed in free. I did not say that they paid the duty on the other side. The point I desired to make was this: that hon. gentlemen are imposing a duty on articles coming into this country which are admitted free into the United States, contrary to what they agreed to in their own statute.

Mr. BOWELL. Would the hon. gentleman kindly inform me whether, in quoting the figures in reference to our exportation of cattle, he took them from our returns or from the American returns.

Mr. BARRON. From our returns.

Mr. BOWELL. Then I would like to know how he could know that they paid the duty.

Mr. BARRON. Now, a great deal has been said to-night about the effect this policy would have on our relations with Great Britain. I do not believe Great Britain would object to it at all. Will you let me read a letter which was written by Mr. John Bright to Mr. Aspinall in response to an invitation from the latter gentleman to attend a reciprocity convention at Detroit in 1855. Mr. Bright said:

"The project of your convention gives me great pleasure. I hope it will lead to a renewal of commercial intercourse with the British North American Provinces, for it will be a miserable thing if, because they are in connection with the British Crown, and you acknowledge as your Chief Magistrate, your President at Washington, there should not be a commercial intercourse between them and you as free, as if you were one people living under one government."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have very dear and affectionate ties with the old land, and I should be sorry indeed if the day should ever come when the interests of the two countries would conflict; but I do not think I would be doing my duty to the people whom I have the honor to represent here if I regarded my own private feelings and convictions, and forgot my duty to my people. Though I should be sorry indeed if such a day should ever come, at the same time if it should come, when the interest of the two countries should conflict, the interest that I should vote for would be the interest of Canada. We have heard a great deal about loyalty—yes, lip loyalty. I bow to no man in my fealty and allegiance to the British Crown, but I confess I have no sympathy with the loyalty of some hon. gentlemen opposite, such, for instance, as was displayed the other night by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I must say that I have no sympathy with that kind of loyalty which is always considering the interests of the few and forgetting the interest of the many—that kind of loyalty which is always looking after the interests of the manufacturers, as emphasised in the amendment which has been moved by the hon. Minister of Marine, and forgetting the interests of the vast mass of the people. I confess I have no sympathy with that kind of loyalty which is always affecting peculiar zeal for the prerogatives of the Crown and ever forgetting the liberty of the subject. Before closing, I wish to say a few words regarding the reply of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) to the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald). I am sorry to have to charge that hon. gentleman with not dealing fairly with the hon. member for East Huron. I do not know what hon. gentlemen opposite say of a person who is found only to tell half the story. It will be remembered that the hon. member for East Huron, referring to the exports of fish from British Columbia to the United States, cited the value as given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, at \$186,774. The hon. member for

Mr. BARRON.

Hamilton got up and cited what? He cited the Commerce and Navigation returns of the United States. I do not know, Sir, whether that was a very loyal thing for him to do, to refuse to take the Trade and Navigation Returns of our own country, made up by hon. gentlemen opposite, and to prefer to take those of the United States. But even in doing that, it would have been fair and proper in that hon. gentleman to have read all and not a portion only. Did he not say in answer to what the hon. member for East Huron said that the export of fish from British Columbia to the United States was only one barrel?

Mr. BOWELL. He did not say so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, worth \$4.

Mr. BOWELL. Salmon.

Mr. BARRON. Well, I take salmon, does not the hon. member for Montreal East think it would have been fair in him to have said, also \$20,458 worth of other kinds of fish. I do think that the hon. gentleman, when he quoted at all, should, in justice to the hon. member for East Huron have gone a little further and given us exactly what the book he was reading from did really contain.

An hon. MEMBER. *Suppressio vero.*

Mr. BARRON. My hon. friend says *suppressio vero*. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite know what that is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BARRON. If the hon. gentleman does not know I will tell him. It is suppression of the truth.

Mr. CURRAN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to tell him that it is *suppressio veri*.

Mr. BARRON. I told the hon. gentleman what the meaning of the phrase is.

Mr. HICKEY. It was Prince Edward Island led him astray again.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Prince Edward Island did not lead him astray. He understands a little more classics than you do.

Mr. HICKEY. He did not quote it correctly.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I made the quotation correctly. You did not know if it was correct or not.

Mr. BARRON. I will close my remarks because I know you are all tired. I desire to say that we should take the example in England in more respects than one. It will be in the recollection of some hon. gentlemen—especially the hon. Minister of Customs—in mine, as a matter of history, that in the year 1843 England imposed a discriminating duty in favor of the British colonies, and that in the year 1843 that discriminating duty was removed, and all imports into that country, foreign or colonial, were placed on the same footing. It will be in the knowledge of hon. gentlemen that complaints were then made in Canada from all sources—from the Governors in Council, and from the different boards of trade, and what was the answer made by Mr. Gladstone? I refer to his answer, because I think it expresses the sentiment we should recognise to day, of Canada for the Canadians. He said:

"The interests of Canada have occupied the place to which they are justly entitled in the deliberations of Her Majesty's Government upon this important subject and upon others which are akin to it. At the same time I need hardly point out to your Lordship that there are matters in which considerations immediately connected with the supply of food for the people of this country and with the employment of its population must be paramount."

Just as Mr. Gladstone said then, in answer to the protest of Canada, so say I now that no matter what the effect may be—though I should be sorry indeed that it should have any prejudicial effect on the trade of Great Britain—still, no matter what the effect in that direction may be, if it is

in the interest of Canada that we should have unrestricted reciprocity such as is pointed at by the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford, I believe, in all earnestness and sincerity, that we should legislate solely for the interests of Canada, no matter whether such conflicts with the interests of Great Britain or not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BARRON. I say yes, and I say that I believe our axiom should be that which the right hon. the first Minister gave to us in 1878, of "Canada for the Canadians." I say that, while we must always remember the rose, the shamrock, the thistle, and the fleur de lis, we must not forget that upon our land there grows a noble forest tree, and upon the branches of that tree there grows a maple leaf, emblematic of a true people who believe in the truest sentiment of loyalty, that is loyalty to the true interests of the people.

Mr. CURRAN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1 o'clock a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 21st March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, certified copies of the judgments of the court in the following cases:—

County of Quebec, wherein O'Brien and others were appellants, and the Hon. Sir Adolphe Caron was respondent, the appeal being quashed for want of jurisdiction.

Quebec West, wherein M. A. Hearn was appellant, and the Hon. Thos. McCreery was respondent, the appeal being dismissed.

Montmagny, wherein P. A. Choquette was appellant, and Laberge *et al* respondents. In this case the appeal allowed, the judgment of the lower court was reversed, the preliminary objections being allowed and the election petition dismissed.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House that he had received from the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, certificates relating to the elections in the Electoral Districts of Brome, Missisquoi, Shefford, and the East Riding of Elgin, respectively, in all of which the petitions were dismissed, and the sitting members declared duly elected.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of William Frederick Roome, Esq., to represent the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Middlesex.

KENT ELECTION.

Mr. GIROUARD. In answer to the enquiry made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) yesterday, as to when the papers in the County of Kent election case would be printed, every effort has been made to have them printed, and it is only this moment they have been given to us. They will be distributed at once, and the committee will be called for Friday.

REPRESENTATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BAKER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 55) to amend "The Representation Act," as respects certain constituencies in British Columbia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. BAKER. This is the same Bill that I introduced last year and in the Session before last, and, as there is supposed to be lack in odd numbers, I thought I would introduce it the third time in the hope of carrying it. The object of the Bill is to place certain islands, which I conceive to be in the constituency of Victoria, in that constituency, for at present a doubt exists, though the Minister of Justice has given a decision that the islands belong to the district of Vancouver. The object of this Bill is to remove any doubt as to the constituency in which these islands are actually situated.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BAKER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 56) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: The only reason for the introduction of this Bill is that the necessity for any particular distinction being made between the electoral districts in British Columbia and those in any other part of the Dominion, has passed. There is no longer any necessity for any extended period of time between the date of issuing the proclamation and the date of nomination, or between the date of nomination and the date of election, and there are simply three clauses to expunge anything which makes an exception in favor of British Columbia. The Bill does not in any way affect Gaspé, Chicoutimi or Saguenay. I leave those districts to take care of themselves.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BAKER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 57) further to amend "The Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act," chapter 135 of the Revised Statutes.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the purport of the Bill.

Mr. BAKER. This is simply to extend to the Province of British Columbia the same right or privilege which has been extended to the Maritime Provinces, so that, in cases arising either in the County Court or Supreme Court, where the amount exceeds \$250, whether it arises in the County Court or in the Supreme Court of the Province, the parties may have the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PURSE SEINE FISHING.

Mr. KIRK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 58) to make further provision respecting Fisheries and Fishing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. KIRK. The intention of the Bill is simply to prohibit the use of purse seines in fishing. It is not necessary to give the reasons just now. I will do that when the Bill comes up for the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright :

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment :

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending Trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment :

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining

Mr. CURRAN. I trust that hon. gentlemen will consider the apology I owe them for intruding upon them at this late period of the debate as having been expressed, and I shall at once proceed to discharge the duty that now devolves upon me, in the first place, by alluding briefly to the speech delivered by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) before the House adjourned last night, and then dealing with the question in a general way as briefly as the importance of this debate will allow. Yesterday, this House had the pleasure of listening to a speech from my hon. friend the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), which, for pith and point and power, has seldom been equalled in the halls of the Dominion Parliament of Canada, and the hon. gentleman who followed him, and whom I am now following, I think, by the speech which he delivered last night, made the most ample confession that the speech of my hon. friend from Westmoreland was absolutely unanswerable, and that the arguments he adduced could not be met by him in any way whatsoever. From the beginning to the end of the speech delivered by my hon. friend from North Victoria, he carefully avoided any single argument adduced by my hon. friend from Westmoreland. He made no attempt to refute his speech, and he did not even mention the hon. gentleman's name from the beginning to the end of the address which he delivered. On the other hand, the hon. gentleman told us that it was not his intention to address this House upon the question in a general way, that he was going to confine himself not merely to a provincial view of this question, but was going to confine himself in a very great measure to the view, as I understood it, which would concern his own constituency. Now, I consider that, in discussing a question of this kind, any such line is entirely at variance with the interests of the country at large, is entirely unworthy of the position occupied by a representative of the people in this House, and should be looked upon by the people of this country as utterly untenable when the question before the House has for its object, as has been stated by the mover of this resolution, a complete economic revolution in our country. But the hon. gentleman certainly made a few statements that, to my mind, and the minds of those who surrounded him, must have appeared simply astounding. He told us that the National Policy was a policy for the benefit of the few

Mr. CURRAN.

to the detriment of the majority; and to prove that the farmers were oppressed by it, he said that the number of farmers in Ontario, according to his computation, were 1,144,520. Now, that is an astounding figure, one which I think it will be difficult for the hon. gentleman to carry out by statistics; because, after all, it is not merely in the Province of Quebec that the farming community like to sing

"Vive la Canadienne, et ses jolis yeux doux."

The fact is that the farmers of Ontario have a weakness for the fair sex also; they are not all bachelors, and if we make a computation of five in a family, according to his statement it would give 5,722,600 persons as belonging to the farming community in Ontario, or more than the whole population of the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman also told us that the trade of Ontario and the Dominion, in horned cattle, would be vastly benefited by unrestricted reciprocity. He did not tell us, however, what the effect would be to-day under unrestricted reciprocity; he did not tell us that United States cattle are scheduled in the British market, whilst Canadian cattle are not kept in quarantine, or in any way detained, and are not slaughtered; but he led this House and the country to suppose that he, who was speaking, as he said, not for the country at large, but simply for one agricultural constituency, was not aware of the importance and vital interest at which he was striking, a vital interest to every cattle raiser in the vast Province from which he comes. There are other things which he stated in reference to barley, lumber, and so on, to which, he said, he would invite gentlemen on this side of the House, engaged in trade in those particular articles, to reply; and I shall leave it to some hon. gentlemen who will follow me to deal more particularly with that branch of the subject. He told us, however, that experience was good for something, and I agree with him there, and before I resume my seat, Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavor to establish what experience teaches in connection with this question, not with reference to the constituency that I represent only, nor with reference to the constituency that the hon. gentleman represents, but how this scheme will affect the people of the Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific; and I believe that the experience that I shall bring to bear on this subject will be satisfactory to the overwhelming majority in this House. We have also had allusion made, in the course of this debate, to the terrible state of things in this country at the present time, by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and that hon. gentleman's sympathies went out so far, almost, as to cause him to shed tears over my native city of Montreal. He quoted from the speech of Mr. Drummond, at the board of trade the other day, concerning the assumption by the Government of the Lake St. Peter debt. He did not tell us frankly what was the occasion of the speech, but he sought to make it appear to the people of Canada, not that the sections of the country which are supplied from Montreal as a great distributing centre, would be improved by the assumption of that debt, but that by unrestricted reciprocity the great end which those people are now clamoring for, would be attained. He did not tell us that he was one of the persons who stood up in this House only last Session and denounced the idea that the Government should assume the debt of Lake St. Peter. He did not, for one moment, refer to figures to show that inter-provincial trade has done a great deal for the St. Lawrence route, and he very carefully avoided stating that he was bound during the present Session, as a patriot, to relieve the suffering city of Montreal, and to change his attitude from that which he occupied during the last Session of this Parliament. We have had the same story repeated over and over again with reference to the want of statistics, we have had statements made that the country was going back, was going to the dogs, that the children were not attending school, that the

country was far from being in a prosperous condition. I do not intend at this moment to enter, at any length, into the discussion of that branch of the question; it has been already amply dealt with. I shall merely give some statistics from the Roman Catholic institutions of Lower Canada, since these are considered of such immense value by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have a statement from one of the school commissioners, who act jointly with the clergy, because there are both clergy and laymen on the Catholic School Board of Montreal. I refer to my friend Mr. Edward Murphy. He sends this statement:

"I send this statement to show the progressive increase in the school attendance. From 6,403 in 1877, it increased to 7,005 in 1881. From 7,316, in 1882, it increased to 9,931 in 1884. This is the attendance at the Commissioners' Schools. There are, of course a great many other schools independent of the 'Commissioners', but the report of the Commissioners shows an increase in school attendance from 6,405 in 1877, to 9,332 in 1884, or 55 per cent. in seven years."

Now, we have also had from my hon. friend the member for Rouville (Mr. Giguant) a complete answer to the charges that were made by the hon. member over this resolution. I can supply figures in support of his argument, with reference to the City and District Savings Bank, perhaps the best institution to judge by in this country, as the deposits there do not average more than \$200 each. At the time the National Policy was inaugurated, there were but \$1,000,000 deposited in that institution, by about 20,000 depositors. To-day, the deposits in that bank have swollen to \$8,000,000, by about 40,000 depositors. These facts, and others to which I might point—the fact that, when the National Policy was inaugurated, we had 1,500 dwellings, shops, and other buildings vacant in Montreal, and to-day we have not one single house fit to live in or one tenement unoccupied—show that all the lamentations on the other side of the House are entirely unfounded and gratuitous. Leaving that branch of the subject, and proceeding as rapidly as I can to the general consideration of what is now before us, I cannot do so without referring to one or two speeches that have been made here, and which I think were calculated to do great harm in this community. It was sought by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dessaint) a few days ago, and by the hon. member for Monmagny (Mr. Choquette) last night, to impress upon a large section of the people of this country, upon the whole French Canadian people, that there were members on this side of the House who were their enemies and who had launched forth against them on the floor of Parliament observations to the effect that the French Canadian people who have emigrated to the United States were hewers of wood and drawers of water. Mr. Speaker, I feel that every hon. member who heard the observation made by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) is aware of the fact that his interruption was during the speech of the hon. gentleman, the introducer of this resolution, when he said that if we were to carry out the policy of unrestricted reciprocity not the French Canadian but the whole Canadian people would become hewers of wood and drawers of water to the people of the neighboring republic. But whilst we deprecate the introduction of such subjects into a discussion of this kind, whilst we deprecate appeals to race sentiment and race prejudice, it is fair, it is right, perhaps, that we should show, if there be any such thing as fanaticism in this matter, where that fanaticism lies, that we should point out to those interested in knowing, what is the object and design of the great apostle, and of the leading apostle, perhaps, of this great movement now said to be on foot. I refer you, Mr. Speaker, and the House to the statement made in the public press by Mr. Goldwin Smith, only a few months ago, when urging the people of Canada to adopt a policy of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. He said:

"It is said Quebec is against commercial union. If she is, it is not on any commercial grounds. It is because the dominant and tithing

levying priesthood of Quebec want to keep its domain in a state of isolation and shrinks from any increase of intercourse with the religious equality and free opinion of the American republic."

That was the statement published and sent broadcast through the country, and yet we find hon. gentlemen opposite trying to fight an imaginary foe, while they have a real and genuine one right before them if they wish to attack him. Perhaps it may be said that this was a slip of the pen, that Mr. Goldwin Smith, the apostle of this new political gospel that is going to regenerate the Dominion of Canada, did not really hold such sentiments. Let me read to the House what he said on September 6th, 1887, only a few months ago:

"While I have watched the action of the unifying forces which draw us toward our kinsmen in the United States, I have also watched the growth both in bulk and in intensity within our own political border of a French nationality as alien to us as anything can well be, which seems fatal to our hope of a really united Canada."

That is the statement made by this apostle of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. There is an opponent whom hon. gentlemen opposite can fight if they feel disposed to fight with some one, and lest there should be any mistake as to the position of this great statesman, who has come here to do so much for Canada, whose words and whose writings and publications have never once been repudiated, either by the smallest or the largest man on the other side of the House, I shall read a further quotation to show exactly what his sentiments are respecting one and a half millions of the inhabitants of Canada. He said:

"In truth our one chance of modifying the French element and arresting its growth into an alien nationality, appears to be to open it to the full influence of the English-speaking continent, which may be strong enough for the work of assimilation, while that of British Canada alone has proved to be too weak. The very reason which makes the ecclesiastics of Quebec recoil from commercial union with the republic ought to make us the more ready to embrace it."

That statement was also published broadcast throughout the country; and yet we have hon. gentlemen opposite rising and working themselves into a terrible rage in regard to an imaginary insult, but not one of them has a word to say in condemnation of the utterances of this great commercial unionist and unrestricted reciprocity advocate, nor have his words, as I have already said, ever been repudiated or condemned by a single leading man on the other side of politics. Having thus dealt with that episode of this debate, it now becomes my duty to examine as to what is the position occupied by hon. gentlemen opposite. In my opinion they must feel very much in the position of the pagan priests of old. If they never speak when they pass by, they must smile at one another when they consider the variety of notions with which they have been trying to bamboozle the people of Canada; how they must wink at one another when they take into consideration the various transformations through which they have passed in only one short year. Really, it strikes me that the hon. gentleman who has charge of this resolution must have been studying the works of the late lamented Artemus Ward. We know that Artemus tells us in his book that among the greatest objects of interest he possessed was one wax figure which did very good service indeed. In the morning he exhibited it in the character of George Washington, in the afternoon it was made to do duty as Louis Napoleon, and in the evening it was exhibited to an admiring audience as Judas Iscariot. We have had a similar process going on on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have had the policy of hon. gentlemen exhibited to the people as quite a harmless little object, it had no harm in it, there was nothing connected with it that would for one moment disturb the great industries that had been inaugurated in Canada and that had grown up under the National Policy. By their policy they declared that the National Policy, which has become fixed, was not to any appreciable extent to be disturbed. That was proclaimed throughout the length and breadth of

the Province of Ontario; and, during the last election, lest there should be any mistake upon the minds of those who were engaged in manufactures, the then leader of the Opposition was brought all the way down to Montreal to make his profession of faith there, face to face with those engaged in the great manufacturing industries of the country. And the then leader went there lest there should be any mistake about it, lest there should be any misinterpretation, and he said in effect: "I am not going to have any mistake or misinterpretation, and I will just read you my Malvern speech over again." That was the first phase, and the next one, a little while after, is, that we find Mr. Goldwin Smith, we find Mr. Wiman, we find the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, we find the hon. gentleman who sits beside him, and we find a whole host of gentlemen on the other side of the House in a new transformation scene with their policy of commercial union. Commercial union was the only thing that would save the land they said, commercial union was their policy and they were going to stand or fall by it. In fact I heard the hon. gentleman who has proposed this unrestricted reciprocity resolution declare at Hastings, in the County of East Northumberland, in the month of January last, that as a Privy Councillor he was prepared to advise Her Majesty the Queen to sanction the introduction of commercial union as the policy of this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I said no such thing.

Mr. CURRAN. That will not do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It will do.

Mr. CURRAN. That will not do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And I call upon the hon. member to withdraw the statement. The hon. gentleman wholly misunderstood and misinterpreted me if he says I said anything of the kind. I said nothing of the kind. What I stated in my address and what I said was the same as I said here the other night, that I would most undoubtedly advise Her Majesty, if she called on me for advice, to adopt the policy laid down in this resolution—in the words of this resolution.

Mr. CURRAN. There was no unrestricted reciprocity then. Nobody was talking of unrestricted reciprocity at that time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh! oh!

Mr. CURRAN. Very good: I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but I am going to make my own statement too.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We accept your statement.

Mr. CURRAN. Exactly. At that time the *Toronto Globe*, that gave inspiration to my hon. friend the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and on the strength of which article the hon. gentleman no doubt made his great speech—on the 14th of September, the *Toronto Globe* had declared in the most emphatic language that nobody but a fool would think of unrestricted reciprocity. It could not be carried out. It would not be accepted by the Americans. And that article is there in black and white to refer to. The official organ of those gentlemen on the other side has declared that, and any one can see it who wishes to take the trouble to read it. That, then, was the position of affairs only a short time ago. But still later what was the condition of affairs? Surely gentlemen on the other side will not deny that which has taken place here in the presence of several members of Parliament. The hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) put upon the Table of

Mr. CURRAN.

Parliament a resolution to be proposed by him embodying commercial union as the policy that ought to prevail for this country. But, gentlemen, was he not sat upon? Was he not compelled to withdraw his resolution? Had he not to allow that policy to fall, in order that gentlemen opposite might come before the country with the policy which, only a few months ago, was declared to be utterly unworthy of the consideration of sensible men? Now we are told that there is a very marked difference,—a very, very marked difference indeed—between commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. What that difference is in the results I should like somebody to show, because we have not seen it pointed out yet. One thing is certain, that unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States means, so far as those two countries are concerned, commercial union; that is, free trade between them. Nobody can deny that. In case they should I shall again quote the gentleman for whom I have a great weakness, Mr. Goldwin Smith. Speaking on the 27th September last:

"He made a speech," says the *Globe*, "of an hour's duration in which he clearly showed the general advantages that would ensue to Canada by the adoption of commercial union, which practically meant unrestricted reciprocity or absolute free trade between Canada and the United States."

This is Mr. Goldwin Smith's definition of the thing; and the other day, in a letter written for the purpose of fortifying the hon. gentleman who has proposed this resolution and written for the purpose of giving them nerve to go on and carry out their views, he said—on Saturday last only:

"There seems to be a nervous disposition to drop the name 'commercial union'—"

Mind you, those gentlemen never had that name before, they never had that policy; but he says here he must avoid it because there seems to be a nervous disposition to drop the name "commercial union." Mr. Smith continues:

"—and to adopt unrestricted reciprocity in its place. I should myself have preferred continental free trade, had we not been told that the phrase 'free trade' would raise theoretic questions which were not involved and which it was our policy to avoid. Commercial union, as I understand it, differs from unrestricted reciprocity only in more clearly including mutual participation in the fisheries and coasting trade. It was adopted, I believe, in direct contradistinction to political union, and made for the special purpose of guarding against any such idea."

You see they want to throw dust in the peoples' eyes—

"However, the name has now become thoroughly current in England, in the United States and in Canada, and is imbedded in all the literature of the question. An attempt to change it will look like the hauling down of a flag, and would not propitiate opponents who are already crying out that unrestricted reciprocity, like commercial union, is annexation in disguise."

That is a statement of their own apostle. It is the statement of their own adviser, the man who does all the writing for them, and tries to get up the sentiment in the country. They may try to shuffle out of it as they like, but there they stand, convicted by their own best witness. Now, up to the present time, we have had in this House a very strange discussion on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have been told that they are now proposing to introduce an absolute economic revolution in the country, a revolution, which, it is admitted, is going to ruin a great many people, a sad result which, the hon. gentlemen opposite say, cannot be helped, because no great revolution of this kind can be carried out without hurting some one. We are to risk all the invested wealth in manufactures in this country, which have been fostered under the National Policy—wealth that was put there under the solemn promise of Parliament that that would be its policy. We are to do away with all that for a prospective benefit; and what argument have we had on the other side to bring us to that frame of mind? We have had statistics, we have had gentlemen of great skill and ability taking a number of figures and tossing them about, endeavouring to make it appear from their standpoint that such and such

results must flow from their speculations. But strange to say, Sir, on a question of this kind which involves such mighty interests, we have not had one appeal to history. Not one parallel has been cited from the history of the past, at least not on the floor of this House, although it was done in some parts of the country. Now, I think such a mode of argument was never adopted before. When any great movement of this kind was proposed in any deliberative assembly in the world, something has been done to show what have been the results of like movements in the past. Not to weary this House with examples, I shall merely draw your attention to the great speech delivered by the Hon. Mr. Gladstone, in 1886, when he introduced his Government of Ireland Bill. On that occasion he went over the whole history of Europe. He took every country and showed how such a measure as his had been carried under such and such circumstances, going from Norway and Sweden down to Austria and Hungary, and showing by historical parallels what they might expect to realise from the measure he had laid before the House. We have nothing of that kind here, Mr. Speaker; but throughout the country, when these gentlemen were talking commercial union, although they deny it now, there was a parallel sought to be drawn between the position of Canada and the United States, and the position of Scotland and England at the time of the Scottish Union. Is there a gentleman in this House who has not read their speeches, and who does not remember this argument having been advanced, not only by Mr. Goldwin Smith, but also by the hon. gentleman who has proposed this resolution? Now, I do not think it necessary to detain the House very long in discussing a question which must be familiar to all; but I shall take this opportunity of showing that there is no parallel whatever between the two cases. Whatever hon. gentlemen opposite may say, Canada is not a beggarly country; Canada is not a country that is reduced in any way to great straits. The people of Canada to-day are in a fairly good condition at any rate. We have no mendicancy here to speak about; we have no people in the throes of despair. Every honest man who wishes to earn an honest day's pay by an honest day's labor can earn that honest day's pay.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. CURRAN. Well, if you have any in your constituency, I have none in mine; and throughout the length and breadth of this country, there is no honest, sober, industrious man, who wishes to work for his living, who cannot make a good living.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How do a million native-born Canadians leave Canada, then?

Mr. CURRAN. I am going to tell the hon. gentleman in a few moments if he will allow me. I am going to point out to him that a million native Canadians would never have left Canada if Canada had the good fortune to have adopted the National Policy ten years before we did. There are three French Canadians in the United States to every one of any other origin, and the great majority of those went there, many of them taking their wives and families with them to work in the factories, and they have remained there and form a very large portion of the industrial population of the United States. That is the reason those people have gone there, and if they have gone there, and if others have gone since the adoption of the National Policy, it is because that policy has not enabled this country even to the present day, although it is making great strides, to recover from the soup-kitchen policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. But, to continue my argument, although hon. gentlemen do not evidently like the reference to Scotland.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We object to calling Scotland a beggarly country, and I think the Premier would do the same.

Mr. CURRAN. I am quoting from Lecky's history:

"The commercial clauses of the Union laid the foundation of the material prosperity of Scotland, and they alone reconciled the most intelligent Scotchmen to the partial sacrifice of their nationality. The country was, indeed, reduced to a condition of chronic famine, and the emancipation of Scotch trade had become a cardinal object of every patriot. . . . The Treaty of Union, however, as it was finally carried, was drawn with great skill and with much consideration for the weaker nation. It provided that the land tax should be so arranged that when England contributed £48,000, or rather less than a fortieth part, that in consideration of the heavy English debt by which the taxation of the whole Island would be increased, an equivalent of about £400,000 should be granted to Scotland."

Which was equal to six years of the annual revenue of Scotland, both from excise and customs. Now, I contend that there is no parallel whatever between the case of Canada and the ease of Scotland at the time of Union; but I think I can establish a parallel which cannot be denied. I think I shall be able to show that these hon. gentlemen who have been going about the country asserting that Canada is in the position of Scotland, and that this country would be benefited to an enormous extent by the influx of American capital, and by the opening of their market to us, are merely repeating here the arguments that were adduced by Castlereagh in the Irish Parliament in order to induce the people to give up their national parliament, and become commercially as well as politically united with England, and enjoy the great benefits of unrestricted reciprocity. If anybody will take up Plowden's "Historical Sketch of the Irish Nation" at the time of the Union, he will find the *ipsissima verba* of those gentlemen falling from the lips of Castlereagh himself; and I think the spirit of that unfortunate statesman, which is most likely in a very tropical region just now, must be still more disturbed by the fact that these gentlemen are plundering and plagiarising his ideas, and not giving him credit for them. "The Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation," by Barrington, sets forth, in a very concise form, the arguments used at that time. He says:

"At present, it must suffice to state the abstract points on which the arguments of Government for annexation were founded, and those by which they were so ably and unanswerably refuted: First, the distracted state of the Irish nation; secondly, the great commercial advantages of the Union, which must eventually enrich Ireland by an extension of its commerce, the influx of British capital, and the confidence of England in the stability of its institutions, when guaranteed by the Union; thirdly, the Government presses with great zeal the example of Scotland, which had so improved, and became so rich and prosperous after its annexation; a precedent which must convince the Irish of the incalculable advantages which must ensue from a similar incorporation."

Those are the very advantages which are set forth by hon. gentlemen opposite, to be derived by us from unrestricted reciprocity:

"The enormous commercial advantages that would arise if we had access to the great markets on the other side, and the enormous amount of capital that would flow into the country from the more wealthy people with whom we are asked to have that unrestricted reciprocity."

What does Mr. Barrington say about this?

"The second ground of argument used by the supporters of the Union, great commercial advantages, appeared still more fallacious. Its deception was too palpable to deceive the most ignorant of the people."

In the same way, the argument used here in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, based on the same supposition, is too palpably deceptive to hoodwink even the most ignorant man in the Dominion of Canada. Mr. Barrington goes on to say:

"The crafty prediction that English capital would flow into Ireland when a Union was effected, was a visionary deception. The third and most deceptive argument of the supporters of the Union, because the most plausible, was the precedent of which, at that period, flowed in full tide upon the public of Scotland, and the great advantages derived by her in consequence of her Union. Of all the false reasons, misstated facts, fallacious promises and unfounded conclusions that any position ever was attempted to be supported on, the arguments founded on the Scottish precedent were the most erroneous, and no deception was ever more completely and fully detected than by the speeches made in the Irish Parliament in 1799 and 1800, and in several able pamphlets. First, as to the matter of fact, Scotland and Ireland in their relation with England, stood on grounds diametrically opposite to each other on every point that could warrant a Union on the one side, or reject it on the other."

And the writer goes on to point out that, in point of fact, never had Scotland, up to that time, representative institutions such as existed in Ireland and such as exist in Canada to-day. Therefore, there is no parallel whatsoever in that case. But we have, I say, in the first place, with regard to the comparison and the parallel I am about to draw, the contiguity of Ireland to England and that of Canada to the United States. We have, in the second place, a similarity as regards population. They were then something over 4,000,000 in Ireland, and we have 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 people in Canada to-day. In the third place, the Irish Parliament had adopted the protective tariff, just as we have adopted the protective tariff of the National Policy; and we have the other point, that the people of England desired to make Ireland a slaughter market for their goods, just as the people of the United States desire to make Canada a slaughter market to-day. I contend that we have more ground for a parallel. We have in the history that preceded the Union of England and Ireland, exactly a parallel case in the conduct of England towards that country as compared with the conduct of the United States towards us. For years the people of Ireland were anxious to have free commercial relations with the people of England, just as for years the people of Canada were knocking at the doors of our neighbors and asking them for free commercial intercourse. That commercial intercourse was refused by England. Laws were passed by the British Parliament striking at the woollen industries of Ireland; and England refused to have commercial intercourse with Ireland until 1782, when by the aid of the volunteers and the political exigencies of the period, Ireland obtained her own independence, and her industries began to prosper by the adoption of a national policy for the protection of her home industries. These industries were thus brought to the highest state of perfection. On the other hand, while the United States could not pass laws which would have operation in this country, they did pass legislation which was intended to affect us in a most detrimental manner. They abolished our first Reciprocity Treaty, the Elgin Treaty. Our hon. friends opposite sent the late Hon. George Brown down to Washington to ask not merely reciprocity in natural products, but to a large extent in our manufactures as well. But the Americans refused to have anything to do with him. They later on refused to renew the Washington Treaty, and last, but not least, as an evidence of the spirit that actuates them in their dealings with this country, they passed a law of non-intercourse, thus showing that a large section of that people were disposed, if possible, to crush Canada and make of her a slaughter market for their surplus productions. Therefore I claim that the parallel is established on all those points so completely as to defy contradiction. Now, we have in Canada to-day certainly as large a number of manufactures and as varied a series of industries as any country could expect to have in the short time during which the National Policy has been in force. But, I would ask, what was the effect in the past of the national policy upon the Irish people during the existence of the Grattan Parliament. I will take my quotations from the Loyal Repeal Association's Report, which Daniel O'Connell presented to the people of Ireland in these words:

"Fellow countrymen, I dedicate these reports to you. They were written by one of yourselves for the benefit of all. They have met the approbation of the National Repeal Association, and therefore I have no hesitation in recommending them to your perusal."

Later on, he proceeds to state in a general way that which I shall endeavor to prove from the statistics I hold in my hand—that from the year 1782 until the Treaty of the Union, Ireland increased in prosperity, her commerce largely extended, her agriculture augmented, her manufactures improved and increased, her people daily became more

Mr. CURRAN.

prosperous and her gentry and nobility became enriched by the prosperity engendered on every side. What were the particular branches of trade and commerce that were specially benefited by this national policy in Ireland. I shall begin by making some quotations from section 1st, entitled the woollen manufactures. It goes on to speak of the early woollen manufactures of Ireland, and to show, what I have already pointed out, that the jealousy of the neighboring country was aroused by the great progress that Ireland was making, and it gives here an extract from the address of the Lords, stating that the growth and increase of woollen manufactures in Ireland had been and would be ever looked upon with great jealousy. And they asked that this may be the occasion of very strict laws "totally to prohibit and suppress the same." These laws having had their effect, the National Parliament was called upon to re-establish those industries, and what did they do? The report goes on to say:

"After the glorious era of 1782, when, by an unparalleled effort of national energy, Ireland had shaken off the shackles from her trade, and achieved her legislative independence, the rapid advances she made in commercial and manufacturing prosperity are undeniably recorded. In ten years after, there was found to be in the city of Dublin sixty master clothiers, having 400 looms engaged in the making of broadcloths; 100 in the making of cassimeres, and employing 5,000 persons on these fabrics. A stronger proof of the prosperity of these times, and of the deep interest which England has or ought to have in Irish prosperity, cannot be adduced, than the fact that, although home manufacture was thus extensively promoted, the market of England had to be resorted to for supplying the demand arising from the better condition of the people. In 1782, the quantity of broadcloths imported into Ireland was 362,830 yards, and in 1790 the quantity of broadcloths imported was 653,899 yards. Meantime, the fostering guardianship of the Irish Parliament was constantly devoted to the encouragement and protection of the native manufactures. In 1785 they granted a sum of £5,000 to be expended in distributing looms, carding machines and other implements, and the establishment of woollen markets, and a further grant of £4,000 was made to pay apprentice fees with children to manufacturers. Other extensive grants were periodically made for the encouragement of cotton and silk manufactures."

And so on down to the end of the chapter. When we come to the particular places in which these industries sprung up, and where thousands upon thousands of people, under the national policy which was then inaugurated, found employment, and found plenty and prosperity for the country at large, we find that in Dublin:

"It is ascertained from authentic documents that in 1800 there were in Dublin 91 master manufacturers in the woollen trade, and these 91 master employers kept 1,122 looms busy in the making of broadcloths, druggets and cassimeres; and the total number of hands employed in all branches were 4,938."

What was the result, only a few years afterwards, of that unrestricted reciprocity between the two countries, with all the barriers removed? They had gone in, as we are now asked to go in, with the neighboring nation. There was a protective policy in England at that time, as there is one on the other side of the line now. They were invited to go in, to have all the wealth of England poured into their lap, and to have their manufactures increased, to see them raise their tall chimneys to the skies, and to obtain prosperity throughout the length and the breadth of the land. What was the result?

"There are not more," he says, "than 250 woollen weavers employed in Dublin and its vicinity, and their average earnings for the last three years amount from 8s. to 10s. per week, making allowance for periods of idleness. At present—that is in 1840—there are not more than 12 master manufacturers, and the aggregate number of persons employed by them 682, in all branches."

Then the wool combing business employed a host of men in a separate manufacture altogether. The carpet manufacture was a most prosperous industry.

"At the period of the Union there were in Dublin 13 master manufacturers, having 109 looms, which gave employment, between weavers, spinners, dyers, helpers, &c., to 720 individuals."

They go on to say that the result of this unrestricted reciprocity with England, this commercial union with England, had effected the trade so much that it could hardly be said

to exist at all. That was many years ago, and to day it does not exist at all. In regard to the stuff and serge manufacture, they say :

"We find that at the period of the Union there were in Dublin 25 master manufacturers, having 1,120 looms, which gave employment to an equal number of weavers, and about 370 additional operatives, being 1,491 persons. At present there is but one master manufacturer of this article in Dublin."

That is, at the time these reports were printed. Then they say :

"Another branch of the woollen trade was the flannel manufacture, the principal seat of which lay in the county of Wicklow; and it flourished to such an extent as to induce the Earl of Fitzwilliam to erect at a cost of £3,500, an extensive market place in the town of Rathdrum, which he called Flannel Hall, solely for the exhibition and sale of this article. There were 12 fairs held annually at Rathdrum, and the average number of pieces exhibited at each fair was from 1,000 to 1,100 pieces. This manufacture gave employment to at least 1,000 looms, and, allowing for preparatory processes, many thousand persons. In some years after the Union, the manufacture began rapidly to decline. It was ascertained that in 1823 there were only 400 looms at work, 300 in 1826, 200 in 1827, 150 in 1828, and 100 in 1830. In this latter year (1830) The Flannel Hall was closed, and in 1832 only 30 looms could be counted, and in two years afterwards there was not a vestige of this formerly important and remunerative branch of industry. The flannel manufacture also gave employment to a class called 'finishers.'"

And they were wiped out as well as the rest. I may quote to you from Cork and its vicinity to show that there were 41 employers in the year 1800, engaging 457 looms, and, allowing for operatives of various classes, the number of persons deriving wages was at least 2,500 in the city of Cork. "In 1834, there were only two master manufacturers left who were employing 256 persons. The trade is now completely gone. The extensive factory of Mr. Lyons is converted into a bleaching green," as the result of this commercial union.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is what Nova Scotia says.

Mr. CURRAN. We will see what this book says as to unrestricted reciprocity, and we may hope that Canada will guard against the same thing. To go on to Limerick, it says :

"About 40 years ago there were in Limerick more than 1,000 woollen weavers, who were in constant employment, and in the enjoyment of comfort and independence. At present there are not 70 weavers in the city, and even these are scarcely able to provide a scanty subsistence."

In regard to Bandon, it says :

"This town was famed for its manufacture of camlets, cord and stuffs. The camlet trade was originally the staple of the town and neighborhood, and flourished about 50 years ago. The manufactured article was almost entirely exported to Lisbon, from whence the most remunerative returns were always made, producing over £100,000 a year. In 1835 a small mill for spinning woollen yarn, used in the manufacture of a fabric called Welbore, had been erected in Bandon, but the number of hands employed in it is inconsiderable, and the demand not sufficient to enable the proprietor to keep the concern regularly at work. The village of Bunniskean, about 7 miles west of Bandon, gave employment at one time to several combers; at present there is not one in the place. In fact the only branch of the woollen trade in existence in this district is that of freize for the country people."

The whole of the great industry, the finer work which gave employment to the skilled hands, had entirely disappeared at the time of these reports. In Kilkenny :

"At the period of the Union, there were no less than 56 manufacturers, principally engaged in the manufacture of blankets, for which fabric Kilkenny gained an unrivalled character. These employed among them all 333 looms, and in the various processes of the woollen manufacture there could not have been less than 3,000 altogether employed. At present there are not more than 100 employed. In 1800 there were 40 of the looms engaged in making superfine blankets, then technically called 'twelve-quarter blankets.' But such was the effect of the Union that in three years afterwards everyone was thrown idle, and has since remained so. According to the returns appended to the Revenue Commissioners' report above referred to, there was in Kilkenny in 1822 twelve master manufacturers, employing among them 926 persons. The merino factory produced superfine cloths, which sold so high as from 26s. to 34s. per yard. The value of cloths made at this factory had reached £40,000 in one year."

These were the industries which were to be more progressive and more prosperous under the Union with England,—

"Carrick-on-Suir was famous from an early period for its ratteens and freises, having largely experienced the bounty of Parliament up to 1796 or 1797, in nurturing these manufactures. Even the finer descriptions of cloth were made here with a success."

He goes on to give the same tale of woe with regard to that industry as with regard to all the others. He says :

"However, immediately after the Union, advantage was taken of a want of a domestic legislature, and influence was put to work whereby the standing order for obliging the military on the Irish establishments to be clothed here, was not only evaded, but in a short time totally rescinded, and supply thrown open to the competition of overpowering British capital and machinery. Mr. Moore retired; his successor followed his example, and from 400 to 600 persons were by that step immediately thrown out of bread. Henceforth the manufactures of Carrick presented but a sickly and faded existence. The amount of capital then invested exceeded £80,000; at present there are but 100 persons partially employed, and the wool-combing business has already altogether disappeared."

In Roscrea, they were exactly in the same condition :

"About 1800 the manufacturers became centred in the hands of a few master manufacturers, and one of them employed beyond 600 persons, about three or four hundred more may have been engaged by others. This trade continued to flourish till the period of the peace, and soon after 1815 began to decline."

And so it goes on. Mr. Crotty was examined before the Assistant Inquiry Commissioners in 1834, and he gave the following testimony :—

"Six years ago 1,000 persons, of whom 600 or 700 were females, were employed by me in Roscrea or its immediate neighborhood. The females spun the worsted, and the men combed and wove the wool; the latter earned 1s. 8d. a day at combing and about 1s. 1d. a day at weaving; the women could not make more than 1½d. a day; but even this small sum being well applied, and for the most part to their own clothing, had a marked effect upon their appearance in general; all are completely destitute and the husbands are wandering about looking for work."

That has been the effect of unrestricted reciprocity with a great market and a rich country, in so far as the woollen industries are concerned. The cotton manufacture in Dublin is exactly in the same condition. We find that the same results have happened with regard to this great industry in Ireland, from the effects of unrestricted reciprocity. The condition of the cotton manufactures in Dublin at the time of the Union was as follows :—

"There were 55 master manufacturers engaged in the fabrics of cords, calicos, checks, shawls, fustians, muslins, dimities, &c., and several of them also combined the business of spinning."

"There were from 40 to 50 minor manufacturers, keeping from five to ten looms going, as undertakers for the larger manufacturers. The total number of looms kept in work by the foregoing are computed upon the most accurate account, to have been 8,000, and the number of operatives to whom they gave bread in the various processes, was upwards of 14,000."

Now, these people were all wiped out. In calico printing the same result took place, and I want to point out particularly to hon. gentlemen here what the direct result of it was, and what the direct result would be here with regard to certain manufactures. What happened with regard to calico printing? The calico printing was an important industry. They tell us :

"This particular branch has been carried on to a great perfection, so much so that the Irish prints have often commanded a preference in the London market."

And yet he says :

"It is a humiliating reflection that these very choice prints must be represented as London prints to secure a sale with the better classes. Nay, more, within the last four or five years our printed calicoes have been extensively exported to the American market, and put up in boxes, and labelled in imitation of French packages, and then sold as French goods."

That was the effect of unrestricted reciprocity with this great and prosperous country, that was overflowing with capital; the effect was that these people actually had to put false labels upon their goods; they could not label their goods as their own, and in order to get rid of the little remnants that were left, they had to sell them almost under false pretences. In Bandon, the same thing took place in regard to cotton prints. There were 2,800 cotton

weavers engaged in the manufacture of the various branches. In Belfast the cotton trade is entirely wiped out. In 1799 :

"There were 2,000 calico looms at Balbriggan at full work, making calicoes for printing. There were also from 400 to 500 cord looms in that town, and the adjoining parishes of Ardeath, Clonaboy, and Garristown. There were several eminent manufacturers here. Now there are only 226 looms employed in Balbriggan, and the average earnings for each does not exceed 6s. per week."

That was the result at the time this book was published. They had been reduced down to that extremity, and now I am told they have disappeared. Now what took place in the silk manufacture, an industry that was carried to the highest perfection? The tales given here with regard to that industry are appalling, and ought to cause serious reflections to those hon. gentlemen who are advocating unrestricted reciprocity with Canada. By a report made at the time it appears that in 1775 the artisans of the various classes employed numbered 5,840.

"In some years afterwards, the trade suffered a very considerable depression, which arose chiefly from the general use of muslins; but it was afterwards revived and the imports of raw silk nearly doubled. At the time of the Union, after various fluctuations, we find its condition to have been as follows:—

"There are 72 master manufacturers, engaged in various fabrics of broad silk, tabbinets, velvets, silk waistcoatings, handkerchiefs, crapes, persians, lining silks, modes, sarsenets, &c., and ribbons. The custom was to give out the materials to the weavers, who wove it in their own residences, the members of their family assisting in the preparatory operations. Besides the foregoing employers, there were innumerable minor undertakers, then termed "Chamber Masters," having from two to six or eight looms, and among the entire there could not have been less than 2,500 broad looms. In the ribbon line there were from 800 to 900 single hand looms, and 200 engine looms. In the ribbon branch there were at least 1,500 people employed; in the broad silk line, at least 5,000. In both not less than 6,500 persons were employed. The fourth report of the Irish Revenue Commissioners, state the number of looms in 1833 at 1,560, and the number employed from 3,000 to 4,000. In 1834, by an accurate account taken, the numbers were found to have fallen to 537. In 1838, by the report on hand-loom weavers, they are stated at 400, viz., 310 on broad silk, 280 on tabbinets and tabberas, 39 on velvets and 32 on ribbons. At the present day the whole number of broad looms in actual work is 250, viz., about 170 on tabbinets, and the residue on velvet, waistcoatings and serges, together with ten or a dozen ribbon looms. There were besides, within the year subsequent to the Union, seven proprietors who carried on the business of silk throwing, and who gave employment to 230 females, earning from 2s. to 7s. per week. Some years ago, large capital was expended in establishing silk throwing mills in the Liberty, with improved machinery. Within the last six years, they employed upwards of 200 females. The mills are now silent."

In the hosiery the same result took place, and we have now at the end of this report the remarks made by the great O'Connell by whom these reports were dedicated. He says :

"Political economists have been much puzzled to fix upon tangible reasons for the wide-spread miseries of Ireland. At one time they will have it that Ireland is not suited for manufactures and can prosper only as an agricultural country; at another, that her miseries and failures are owing to her turbulent spirit, and the insecurity for life and property consequent thereon; at another, all mischiefs must be owing to excessive population. Then, again the religion of the people is arraigned as the sole cause of their poverty—with a thousand other equally wild and fallacious theories; while almost universal Ireland proclaims that all her woes and miseries are owing to the hateful Union which took away her resident nobility and gentry, deprived her of the countenance and care of a Domestic Legislature, and subjected her to every species of impoverishment and neglect. One of the most fatal effects of that measure upon our trade and manufactures has been the premature withdrawal of the protecting duties; whereby Ireland, emancipated by the drain of her resources for four-and-twenty years, was suddenly left open to a fruitless competition against the overwhelming capital and influence of England."

That is the conclusion of this report which, I think, must have produced an effect upon the minds of every hon. gentleman here. But let us find what was the effect upon the people? How did the people fare when the bloated manufacturers were disposed of? The people had, no doubt, been told that the farming interests of the country were suffering, that there was a lot of bloated manufacturers and monopolists living upon the vitals of the people of Ireland, and, if these were swept away, the people would prosper, that their misfortunes would disappear, that great wealth would tumble into their lap, and that the

Mr. CURRAN.

agriculturists of Ireland, and all those who were not interested in those protected industries, would be benefited by the change. We have a report stating the result of this change of policy. In the report of the Sick and Indigent Roomkeepers for that year, we find the following appalling statements :

"The mass of human misery which fell under the province of this charity to relieve, has been unparalleled. In the year 1826, 6,497 families, containing 24,262 persons, have been relieved; hundreds were on the eve of perishing from actual starvation, and the dreadful weight of fever and other malignant disorders, the consequence of the poverty and want which arose principally from a general stagnation of trade and want of employment in various branches of manufacture, particularly the woollen, cotton and silk, in that part of the city called the Liberty. It is impossible to describe the appalling state of privation in which these poor artificers were found by the inspectors.

"The committee were reluctantly obliged to lay aside innumerable cases of distress, which were entirely out of their power to relieve, and early in the spring vast numbers of the artificers in the branches of trade above alluded to, were seen in the streets in the deepest state of despondency. Their appearance exhibited evident proofs of poverty and starvation."

Another report says :

"Even the employers themselves felt the depression; and many were involved in the common ruin—they could hold out no longer. The Roomkeepers' Charity was at last obliged to be resorted to, and applications were numerous from persons who had heretofore been in very comfortable circumstances."

Another report says :

"There have been local causes of distress which operated to increase our numbers considerably, pressing with peculiar severity in 1825 and the immediately following years. About this time a very serious, and in its progress at least, a very distressing change was taking place in many important manufactures in the city. These manufactures had given employment to multitudes in Dublin, and although many families have emigrated to England to obtain work, yet they have left behind them multitudes, more particularly females, deprived of their usual mode of employment.

"It is not for this committee to follow these manufactures through their different gradations, as they fluctuated, or as they declined; this committee has simply to put forward facts and it does so when it states that of forty-five establishments that had been engaged in the woollen manufacture (in 1821), all, with the exception of twelve houses, and their dependencies of human labor, had ceased to exist; and that in the summer of 1829, of what little that remained of those who derived their maintenance from these manufactures—3,289 persons in the silk trade, 1,969 of the cotton trade, and 1,193 of the woollen trade, making altogether 6,451 persons,—were all out of employment, and in the extreme state of destitution."

We have it upon the authority of these reports that there were employed in those various manufactures at the time when the people were sought to be induced to change their fiscal policy along with their political status, not less than 150,000 people who were directly making their living and acquiring a competency out of the manufactures of the country. But, as I said a moment ago, the people of Ireland at large were told that if the then condition of things were changed the people would have the wealth distributed among them, and the agricultural classes would benefit largely by the change. Now, what was the result in Ireland? I find it was described as follows:—

"The number of agricultural laborers in Ireland is computed by the Poor Law Commissioners, at 1,170,000, and they assumed that one-half of these, being 585,000, are out of employment for thirty weeks in the year, and as these have 1,800,000 dependent on them, the two numbers make 2,385,000 persons to be provided for thirty weeks in the year."

I do not wish to read at greater length the reports upon this point; but we have in this volume evidence that must convince every man who has the slightest regard for the experience of history, and when we read this tale of woe it should be one of warning to the people of Canada when they are told that the only thing they have to do is to go into commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity with our great neighbor alongside of us. The industries of Ireland and everything connected with Irish prosperity was engulfed in the prosperity of the larger nation; and are we to be told after the experience of the past, after what we have seen in this country, when, previous to 1878, Canada was made a slaughter market for surplus stocks of manufactured goods on the other side of the line—are we to be told, does it

require any one to tell the people what would again be the result if our markets were thrown open? Why, the result would be what it was formerly only in a more acute degree. It may be said that that misery which came upon the people of Ireland could never prevail in this Canada of ours. But such a statement cannot be made in my presence; I have seen what can result. I have seen in Montreal with my own eyes strong men and willing men, with good stout hearts, who were willing and desirous of earning their living, obliged to go to the soup kitchen and there ask for that charity which they were obliged to accept to their humiliation. We have seen men who have been earning previous to the advent into power of hon. gentlemen opposite, as has been stated on public platforms by workingmen in Montreal, over and over again, men earning \$2 and \$2.50 a day, and what was left open to them? To earn 60 cents or 70 cents a day, digging in public works around the canal basin, endeavoring to earn a miserable subsistence. Some of these were workingmen who had organised before that time and had held mass meetings to establish hours of labor, men who previous to the downfall of the Government led by the present Premier had stated that workingmen must work only eight or nine hours a day, and yet afterwards when hon. gentlemen opposite had assumed the reins of power and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) directed the fiscal policy of the country, those workingmen were going about saying: "For God's sake give us work for any number of hours either day or night in order to save our wives, children and ourselves from starvation." That was the result. It is all very well for the hon. gentlemen opposite to tell us that the question of unrestricted reciprocity has sunk down deep in the hearts of the people. But I can tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that so long as the mover of this resolution is in public life never again will the people accept from him the fiscal gospel that is to lead them to salvation. And now what have we heard from one hon. gentleman opposite after another, what has been the burden of their song? Has it been one of hope, of aspiration? Why, no. It has been a wail, and that wail has been echoed and re-echoed from one mouth to another all along their line until finally the people of this country, listening to their wail, have grown weary, and their wailing and wailing has caused them to be deservedly nicknamed the banshee party of Canada. We have been told, and told with a great deal of force, all that our country offers to us in the future. We have been told by the hon. gentlemen opposite, in the course of the most elaborate speeches, that great benefits would accrue to us from commercial union with our neighbors, which they say does not involve political union; but their preaching is entirely at variance with what they say their practice will be. We know that we have now a great country. We know that the advantages of this country have not been by any means overdrawn by the beautiful pictures that have been presented to us by the patriotic speakers during this debate. We know very well the hon. gentlemen opposite cannot take from the hearts of the Canadian people the hope within them that this country is going to be great and prosperous. We know that we have to-day as good a country to live in, as fair a country to live in, as any people on the face of the earth. We feel that to-day we are in the golden age. Whatever changes may come, whatever changes time may bring, there is one thing perfectly certain: it is that we can never be freer, never be happier, never be better off than we are to-day. It is needless to enter into any lengthy observations with respect to this country. We glory in its wealth not only above the soil in its great forests, not only on the soil in its magnificent returns to husbandry, and not only beneath the soil in mines and minerals. We have hope for our country, and we have great aspirations for its future. We do not mind what may

be the political grievances of those who have pessimistic political views; our desire is to remain as long as we can as we are. The position that we now occupy may be too beautiful to last, but at all events as long as we can make it last we shall make it last. It is not our desire to destroy the good feeling which exists between us and the people on the other side of the line, but we feel that we have a destiny of our own; we feel that when we shall have passed from our present condition we shall take our place amongst the sisterhood of nations as an auxiliary power to the great Empire of which we now form part. We feel that Canada is our home and that all our interests are centred here. We do not desire to have the arguments prevail which have been set before us by the other side, but we mean this and simply this, that we shall not sell our birthright for a mess of pottage. We are not, Mr. Speaker, to be lured away, to sacrifice all our hopes and aspirations. No, Sir, we have a higher and a nobler prospect for this country and for ourselves. We and our children after us shall remain

"Here in Canadian heart and home and name
This name which yet shall grow
Till all the nations know
Us for a patriot people,
Loyal to our native earth,
Our own Canadian land."

Mr. WELSH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the very able speeches which have been made on this question from the opposite side of the House and from this side of the House too, and I begin to feel very nervous in rising to make a speech. We have had a great deal of professional talent and we have a great deal of legal talent as well, so that you will hardly expect me to occupy the time of the House for a very long time. I wish just to touch on a few points and leave the remainder of the argument for somebody else. Reciprocity has been a part of my political faith for the last 40 years, and as I grow older my opinions grow stronger in favor of reciprocity, in favor of free trade, if possible; but if free trade is out of the question I will go for reciprocity. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think this reciprocity treaty might have been carried eight years ago, but I think there have been obstacles thrown in the way, as has been shown by the gentlemen on the other side of the House, to obtaining reciprocity. That is to say we have a large national debt. Eight years ago we had a revenue of some \$18,000,000 and an expenditure of about the same amount. In Canada to-day we have an expenditure of \$36,000,000 and a revenue of about the same. I want to say that this National Policy was introduced in this House not fairly and squarely as protection, but it was introduced as a readjustment tariff. Hon. gentlemen who are supporters of the present Government stated positively before the country that there was no idea of placing protection on the country, but that it was simply a readjustment of the tariff and that it was done for the purpose of obtaining reciprocity. I remember well when the hon. the Finance Minister speaking at Charlottetown, P.E.I., declared to the people: "Gentlemen of Charlottetown, if you want reciprocity support us in the National Policy for two years and I will guarantee you reciprocity then." Eight years have passed over our heads since that time and what is the prospect now? There is no more prospect; indeed not as much of obtaining reciprocity now than there was then. I would rather this discussion on reciprocity had been cut off altogether at present, or that it had taken place after the discussion on the fishery negotiations. The hon. the Minister of Finance has been at Washington, and, perhaps, he has opened the door to our obtaining our wants. It appears that the commissioners have removed certain irritable matters connected with the fishery negotiations, and, in my belief, it is a very opportune time for the people of Canada to let the people of the United States know what our views are. Now, Mr. Speaker,

I will just read a letter here to show that what I say is true. Here is a correspondence between the right hon. the leader of the Government and Mr. Boyd :

" Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

" The Government press here state that you propose to raise the tariff generally to 35 per cent. Can I contradict this ?

" JOHN BOYD."

This reply came promptly this morning as follows :—

" TORONTO, 19th July.

" To JOHN BOYD, St. John.

" It is an absurd falsehood ; neither at London nor elsewhere have I gone beyond my motion in Parliament, and have never proposed an increase, but only a readjustment of tariff.

" JOHN A. MACDONALD."

Now, I am in favor of the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I believe we can obtain reciprocity now. The only objection to reciprocity appears from the other side. They say: "We are willing to have reciprocity, only do not touch the National Policy." I have listened to every speech delivered from the other side of the House, and the whole cry is: "Don't touch the National Policy." That National Policy was put on the country not for the purpose of raising money for revenue, but merely for the purpose of readjusting the tariff and of compelling the Americans to give us reciprocity. Well, I do not think the other side of the House have carried through their policy. Now, I will make some remarks on the speeches I have heard from the other side of the House, and let me say that I think my friend the Minister of the Interior made a very moderate speech from his standpoint. He said in one place that the prices assimilate very much between the United States and Canada, quoting I think as proof of this from the Toronto and Buffalo markets. I do not suppose he was far out of the way in the statement he made there, and I am not going to object to it. I am going to come to that by-and-bye, when I allude to the speech made by the hon. the Minister of Marine. It is said there is only one step between the sublime and the ridiculous, and when I listened to my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) yesterday I found that he pitched a tune here and that tune was "God save the Queen." If there is any gentleman in this House who can pitch the tune any better than he has done, we should all join in on both sides of the House and sing it well. But is that the question? It calls to my mind a thing that happened in my experience. I was once Commodore of a Regatta Club. We had a regatta in the harbor, and the first day was for sailing boats and the second day for rowing boats. The band on the cutter struck up the music before we started on the regatta. I had an eight-oar gig, and I got a crew for stroke practice. I had a boatswain who had been for many years at sea with me, and when the band on board one of the yachts struck up "Rule Britannia," I was quite surprised that this man fainted. I said: "What is the matter, Peter?" And he said: "I am very faint." I said: "What made you faint?" "Well, sir," says he, "the last time I heard that tune of "Rule Britannia" I will tell you where it was. It was out in Van Dieman's Land, and I went on shore in a boat to the convict's settlement. I saw six convicts chained to a wheelbarrow wheeling dirt up a plank and singing "Rule Britannia." I claim to be just as loyal as any man in this House, but if you bring the farmers and fishermen of this Dominion to wheel dirt up a plank, you cannot expect them to whistle "Rule Britannia." I am not going to be very positive in any of my statements, and if any of them are not correct I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will correct me at once. Now, I say that 75 per cent. of our population are engaged in agriculture and fishing. How many are engaged in manufactures—in those home industries hon. gentlemen talk so much about? Are there more, on the average, than ten in every hundred? Well, if we have to bear the heavy bur-

Mr. WELSH.

dens of protection for those ten men, the ninety have to pay the cost. More than that, if we could get the proposed reciprocity arrangement with the United States, those ten men engaged in industrial pursuits would profit more than they have ever profited yet, because now they must manufacture only goods enough to supply the home demand, but under reciprocity they would have larger markets and larger scope for their energies; and I for one feel that the manufacturers of this Dominion are of that Anglo-Saxon race who are able to compete with the world, if you only give them a chance. But while you are protecting them, as you say, I believe you are doing them an injury. My hon. friend from Halifax said the other day that the principal cotton manufacturer in New Brunswick is anxious to have this resolution carried through, so that he may be able to extend his business. Now, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) last night, gave us one of the strongest proofs of our need of freer commercial intercourse with the United States, that have been given on the floor of this House. I have always understood that our blue-books were intended to be quoted from, and were accepted as authorities by hon. gentlemen opposite. But what did we see last night? We saw the hon. member for Hamilton get up and ridicule the use of these blue-books on the floor of this House, and where did he go to get the information to contradict one of our own blue-books? He had to go to the United States. I compliment my hon. friend on proving our case. As to the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Curran), I tell you I was astonished. God bless my soul! If you want any man in the world to advocate our cause in this House, he is the very man who has done it. He says the Union of Ireland with England has ruined the country, and the Union of Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick with Canada has ruined us all. Allow me to warn the Government that if they want to bring Newfoundland into Confederation, they should keep the hon. member for Montreal Centre out of the way. If you do not, they will be sold; and if there is a warning for the people of Newfoundland on the face of the earth, they got it to-day in my hon. friend's speech. Gentlemen, these are facts, and it is for you to say whether they be true or not. I state to hon. gentlemen on that side of the House that if I say anything they do not agree with, let them say no, because if they do not say no, I will say they all agree with me, everyone of them. Now, some time ago my hon. friend for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) spoke in this House about these duties, and here is the statement he made:

" You have upwards of 40,000 carpenters upon whose tools, food and clothing, you propose to lay a duty of at least 20 per cent.; what compensation have you given them? Their wives and children, for whom they must provide, number 160,000; how are you helping them? It is not in your power to give them any help. To them your policy is worse than the policy of the 'fly on the wheel.' You can do nothing for them. You are doing much that is to their detriment. Let us see, Sir, what the Finance Minister does for the blacksmiths of Canada. In 1871 there were 15,694. Now there cannot be less than 20,000. They represent a population of 100,000 souls. What have you done for these people? You have taxed their tools 30 per cent.; you have taxed their steel 10 per cent.; you have taxed their iron 17½ per cent.; you have taxed their horse-shoe nails 30 per cent.; you have taxed their coal 50 cents per ton; you have taxed their bread and meat; everything they wear; you have taxed all they use to make their houses decent and their families comfortable. There is not one of them whose burdens will not be increased by at least fifty dollars a year."

And this is his closing argument:

" This is a tariff to make a very few rich and a great many poor."

Now, I was always opposed to the National Policy, and I oppose it still. We hear a great deal on that side of the House about the difficulties of getting commercial reciprocity, and the injury it will do to the National Policy. The amendment proposed by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine, just says: "Anything you like, only don't touch the National Policy."

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. WELSH. I think so. Now, the hon. Minister of Marine speaks with mathematical precision; and I do not think the hon. gentleman had any trouble in crossing the *pons asinorum*. But let me tell that hon. gentleman that there are a good many asses' bridges that he has not crossed—bridges in marine's strategy, if not in farm strategy. What does the hon. gentleman say? He said that he visited Prince Edward Island last summer; he paid it a night visit, as I understand—and if I am not correct in what I state, I hope the hon. gentleman will contradict me. He visited the Island about seven o'clock in the evening and left in the morning. I do not know why he went to Prince Edward Island, but he seemed to have found out something during his visit, for he referred, in his speech, several times to Prince Edward Island. He found out that we had a savings bank, and that we had \$2,000,000 deposited in it. I do not know why he came to the Island, and why he should have visited it at night. I wonder if he had any design on that money. I do not know what else he came for, but the hon. gentleman will explain in due course, I have no doubt. As a sign of the prosperity of the Island, he quoted the amount we had in the savings bank. Did he tell you, Sir, who the depositors were? No, he did not; but, at all events, I will say this, that any one who points to money lying idle in a savings bank as a sign of the commercial prosperity and activity of the country, does not know what he is talking about. It is not a sign of commercial prosperity that a large amount of money should be lying idle, but it is a sign of commercial activity and progress when money is in active circulation and bearing a fair interest. Let us take up some of the statements of the hon. gentleman and see whether they will hold water; let us see whether they will bear out the mathematical precision with which the hon. gentleman sought to invest them. He found out something else during his short visit to our Island. And what do you think it was? Oh! he said, the Canadians are still marrying and giving in marriage; we hope for better times, there is some chance for him yet. I cannot say whether it is a maid or a widow; but if the latter I would give him the advice of Weller, in "Pickwick," to his son: "Samivel, beware of the widders." "Coming events cast their shadows before."

Mr. FOSTER. In your case they have not cast any shadow yet.

Mr. WELSH. When the hon. gentleman has consummated that alliance, of which he has given us a hint, it will take some of the mathematical precision out of him. He also spoke about the farmers, and the rapid rise of values in land, and he contended that if we had commercial reciprocity the value of land in the Island would not improve. Were the hon. gentleman a school-master, and were he to tell that to a lot of school boys, they would chase him out of school. The idea that reciprocity would not improve the value of our lands is too absurd to be seriously entertained for a moment. It would improve them, I say, probably 300 per cent. And my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior also gave us his views on this question, and I will deal with both those hon. gentlemen together. They told us that the farmers in this country were well off, and that the farmers in Prince Edward Island in particular were making fortunes. I will give my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior 100 acres of the choicest land in the Island, and I will call it the Interior farm. I will give the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries 100 acres of the best land alongside it, and call it the Marine farm. And a little way off, with a wall between, I will take 100 acres myself and call it the Reciprocity farm. Now, I am going to state what is the truth, and I am sorry to have to say it; but if those hon. gentlemen, who talk so glibly about the prosperity of our farmers, had to work their lands and support their families, even if

they had the finest crops, and obtained the highest prices that were paid last year in the Island, when for their potatoes, after hauling them six or seven miles through a foot deep of mud, they could only get 13 cents, and for their oats 26 cents, they would find the reality considerably different from the picture they draw here. The hon. the Minister of Marine spoke of some statement made in this House as "atrocious blunders." Will that hon. gentleman tell me he could support a family on the produce of his farm, when he could only get 18 cents for his potatoes and 26 cents for his oats? Would he call that prosperity? While I, on my Reciprocity farm, would be getting 47 cents for my potatoes and 45 to 50 cents for my oats. This is what reciprocity means in the Island. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may have crossed the *pons asinorum* in college, but he certainly has not crossed it in farming. He has a good deal to learn in that line yet. I speak a little warmly on this subject, but I am a farmer myself, representing a population of 55,000 people, most of whom are engaged in agriculture, and I must say that those 55,000 will compare favorably with any 55,000 people on the face of God's earth. I would be negligent in my duty, I would be ashamed to hold up my head in this House, if I were to sit silent here and not give utterance to my sentiments. What is the reason that six members from Prince Edward Island are sent to this House opposed to the Government? What argument can be stronger than is afforded by their presence here? I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that, so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, we must have reciprocity, or the people will become impoverished. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) made the statement, that while previous to 1878 the people of the Dominion could not get employment, now every man in the Dominion is employed. I said "no," and the hon. gentleman hedged himself by referring back to Montreal, his own constituency. He ought to have apologised for the statement he made with reference to Prince Edward Island, but he did not. He hedged himself back, and I am glad he got into his own shell. I am now speaking for the people I represent, and in that respect we are on an equal footing. I do hope that things will come right. My hon. friend took up another important point. The farmers he said went away in the winter to earn money for their families, and came back on their farms in the spring. I pity the firm, when the farmer has to leave it; when he has to leave his wife and children, his cattle, his oxen and his sheep; what is to become of them in his absence? I suppose they are to live during the winter like the bears, by sucking their paws. My hon. friend must know that no man can farm on that system, and if he has found out instances of that kind, he has discovered more marvellous things than I ever could find in Prince Edward Island. I know of no farmers on the Island who leave their farms in the fall to work abroad all winter and come back in the spring, and therefore I can refute that statement as far as my knowledge goes. The Minister of Marine said, in that speech to which I have referred:

"The other section of the people went away because they wished to earn ready money, they went into the industrial centres in order to earn it. They found no industrial centres in Prince Edward Island. If after the farming season had passed, and they wanted to earn something for the crowded family, the quickest way they could find to earn it was to take boat and rail and go down to the manufacturing towns of Maine, to the manufacturing towns of New England, and earn their wages during the winter, coming back in the summer to work upon their farms."

Now, I hope the hon. gentleman will look over that and consider it. Now, I am going to come to another little matter, and we will have a little talk about that. Here is something of the marvellous kind. The hon. gentleman goes on and says:

"Sir, in the former time ships went to the country for raw sugar. The raw product was taken to Great Britain, and British ships took the

freights upon it. That sugar was carried on British railways to British refineries, and British railways had their profits. British workmen worked up the sugar, and the wages were paid to British people."

What sympathy was there for England there ?

"Then it was put in cars and steamships and sent to St. John, Halifax, or Montreal with the maximum of cost; and that, Sir, went into the figures upon which the total imports were based. That was the case with 95 per cent., if I mistake not, of the sugar consumed here. To-day of the whole sugar consumed in this country 96 per cent., if I mistake not, comes raw from the places where it is grown; it is brought into our own country, it is carried upon our own railways, worked up in our own refineries, and all the added cost put upon it goes into the pockets of our own people."

Cheer now. Cheer, boys, cheer. Here is the statement of the Minister of Marine, who says that all this goes into the pockets of our own people. I will show where it goes—

"That, of course, makes a vast difference. So it is with the cotton trade and the woollen trade."

And so he goes on,—

"Well, Sir, there is another question that is necessary to be put: If our trade is decreasing, how do you explain this fact? In 1875 the total registered tonnage entering into and out of the ports of this country, excluding coasting vessels always, was 9,537,000 tons, in 1876 it was 9,911,000 tons, in 1887 it was a little more than 14,000,000 tons. Did the vessels come in simply for pleasure; were they simply beating about upon the wild and yeasty waves?"

By-the-bye, that puts me in mind of something. During his visit to the Provinces, I believe the Minister of Marine found the waves very yeasty. I am told that he found the waves so yeasty that he did not stay there very long. I am told that he threw up everything except his pay, he was so disgusted with the yeasty waves. That may be so or it may not be, but at all events he did not stop there long. He says:

"Did the vessels come in simply for pleasure; were they simply beating about upon the wild and yeasty waves, making port now and then for the purpose of getting entered and cleared; or were they here on business and to carry on the commerce of the country? The latter evidently."

I say it is a most extraordinary thing and I apply to every hon. gentleman on that side of the House, as well as on this side, that we should have more tonnage now than we had five years ago when our imports and exports are decreasing. How does that tonnage become manipulated in this manner? Will the hon. gentleman have the candor to explain that in the right manner? I think I have the right clue to this. A steamer goes from Montreal to New Brunswick, she is entered at the port in New Brunswick, she goes to Nova Scotia and she is entered there, she goes to Prince Edward Island and she is entered there, and so on, so that one ship is made to represent half a dozen. Why does not the hon. gentleman get up in a candid, honest manner and explain these things? Why should he leave these matters open to have them explained in this fashion? I know that I have had to send vessels of my own three different ports within a few miles of each other, and they are entered in each of these ports, and they may be entered in half a dozen ports in a year, and thus this increased tonnage would appear. It is impossible that we can employ increased tonnage when our exports and imports are decreasing. Now, what about this sugar, the price for which goes into the pockets of the people? Before I touch on that, however, I want to refer to a paper, the *Prince Edward Island Agriculturist*, of Summerside, of the 12th March, which gives a summary of the prices in the markets of Prince Edward Island, as follows: White oats, 28 cents a bushel; black oats, 27 cents a bushel; early rose potatoes and shenangoes, 20 cents a bushel, and so on. Now, there is no man who would dare to challenge that statement in regard to the prices of produce in Prince Edward Island. Now, we will come to the matter of sugar. I find by the returns that there were 200,466,000 lbs. imported into this Dominion last year for home consumption, at a cost of \$486,062, which would be equal to about 2½ cents a lb. I find that the duty amounted to \$316,752, or nearly

Mr. WELSH.

1½ cts. a lb. There is a little over 4 cents a pound on the sugar landed here duty paid. That sugar is sold for about 7 cents, I think, in Canada. Where do the other 3 cents go? Will any hon. gentleman tell me? My hon. friend the Minister of Marine says it goes into the pockets of the people. I tell him that it comes out of their pockets. Can any one deny it? I have bought sugar in England, good brown sugar, not refined, for 2 cents a pound.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. WELSH. Who says "no?"

An hon. MEMBER. Echo.

Mr. WELSH. I would be very sorry to make a statement in this House that would not dare contradiction. I say that you can buy refined sugar in Glasgow for 4 cents a pound. What did they do in Montreal when these combines put up the price last summer? They sent to Scotland and brought out the sugar and paid the high duty on refined sugar and undersold the combines, and yet we find a gentleman of his high position in this House to-day telling the five millions of people in this country that that money goes into the pockets of the people of this Dominion. I say no, it comes out of their pockets, and I hope I have convinced the hon. gentleman that the people of Prince Edward Island are laboring under great disadvantages. They are not in a state of rebellion, it is true, but, if they were treated in the manner in which that hon. gentleman treats them for long, they would give you more trouble than the North-West does. I may compliment some of the members of the Government, and especially the Minister of Public Works, with whom I have had a great deal to do since I have been on the floor of this House, and I may say that I have been treated by him in the most courteous, honorable and gentlemanly manner, and I believe he would stretch a point if necessary to benefit the people. If the other members of the Government would do the same, it would be better for them. When a man comes here representing the people, and places their wants before the Government, I like to see the members of the Government treat him with respect and consideration, and look into the wants of the people, and try to redress their grievances. But, Mr. Speaker, these high and mighty men that we have in the departments keep us dancing at their heels, or waiting in the ante-room, and we can get no satisfaction out of them. I must say that I for one, will not give them a chance of doing it again if I can help it. Well, now I come to the Marine Department, and there is a lot I want to say about that.

Mr. MITCHELL. Let him down easily.

Mr. WELSH. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Tupper) to-day made a shout about our shipping. Well, there is a most extraordinary thing. The United States have protected their shipping until it was almost nowhere. They were the second flag in the world, and since they adopted a policy of protection their ships are almost wiped off the sea. What is the result of our National Policy to our shipping interests? Our marine interest, I think, is second to none in this country, but since the National Policy has been in operation, our shipping has fallen off to the amount of six million dollars. The earning power of six million dollars has been lost since that policy was introduced. I believe this to be a fact, and as no hon. gentleman contradicts me, it must be allowed to be a fact. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made no effort to assist us. The Government of this country, while protecting every other industry in the country, are neglecting the marine industry. We are handicapped in various ways. Where do those ships that we have left find employment? Will the Minister of Marine or any hon. gentleman on that side answer me—

where do the ships that we have now get employment? Seven out of ten get employment in the United States.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. WELSH. I say, yes. Who is it that denies it? I will take his name down. Now what do we see on the Intercolonial Railway, that great national highway. That railway has got more work than it can perform, and it appears that the more work it has, the more money it loses. It is a most extraordinary thing. I think there must be some leak in this ship when, although the work is increasing, the loss also is steadily increasing. What is the loss to the taxpayers of this country on the money invested in railways? From a rough calculation that I have made it amounts to over \$14,000 a day. That is the amount of money the taxpayers of this country have to pay in interest on the money invested in railways. I think if that Intercolonial Railway was left to its ordinary traffic, a fair, profitable traffic, it would pay, but they undertake to bring coal up for less than it costs, and they are running the railway at the expense of the people of this Dominion in order to ruin the shipping interests of the St. Lawrence, and to injure the laboring population of Montreal and Quebec. We have plenty of ships, and if the Government had let the ships perform this work of bringing up coal, to Quebec and Montreal—

Mr. MITCHELL. It is only the Tories who do that.

Mr. WELSH. Now, I am going to ask my hon. friends opposite, if they lived down in Prince Edward Island how they would like to pay a duty of 15 cents on potatoes, a duty on oats and on most everything else we have to sell? If this duty was taken off don't you think that the poor man would have a little more money in his pocket and be able to support his family better? I tell you, Mr. Speaker, my heart bled last November in Prince Edward Island. I had a ship loading with potatoes for the United States. I have seen poor farmers come hauling twelve bushels of potatoes seven miles through one foot of mud, and getting only 18 cents a bushel. I thought to myself, I don't know how you support your family, I know it must be hard. And yet this glorious protection! Hurrah! We are a happy people, and all that. Rule Britannia! Yes, rule Britannia! How can you expect these people to whistle "Rule Britannia" who have such hard work to make both ends meet? I do not want to go under the flag of the United States. I am proud of being a British subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELSH. Yes, "hear, hear." But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I have not heard any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House refute a single statement made by the hon. member from South Oxford. His resolution stands there still. Now, the Minister of Marine has moved an amendment. Let me read it:

"That Canada, in the future as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various industries and interests of the Dominion, which was adopted in 1879, and which has since received, in so marked a manner, the sanction and approval of the people."

Now, is that not just the way every hon. gentleman on that side has spoken? National Policy and protection. If the Americans will give us anything for nothing, we will take it; and if they will not, we won't have it. Now, I know the people I represent expect something different. I would not dare to go back to the county I represent and tell the people I had done nothing towards getting them a better market. I trust that better times will come for this Dominion; I believe better times are coming for this Dominion, and that a change is going to take place. I do not know in what way it will take place, but I believe

41

it will come. I hoped, before this debate came on, that the Minister of Finance would have laid the fishery negotiations before the House. I have considerable faith in that hon. gentleman, and I believe he was the right man in the right place. I trust that before long a brighter era will dawn upon the people of this country. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Macdonald) spoke of the farmers of his district, and I think he spoke fairly and well as to the wants of the people. I have not yet heard the hon. members for Manitoba express their opinion as to what that Province requires. I do not know whether New Brunswick sends any farmer as a member of this House; if it does, I should like to hear his ideas in regard to this matter. If there is a farmer here from Nova Scotia I should like to hear from him; if there is a farmer from Cape Breton I should like to hear his ideas. I know very well my ideas on the question, and every hon. member must know that before any of us were born Prince Edward Island was known in history as the garden of British North America. We grow immense crops there, and if we had reciprocity the quantities of our root crops would be more than doubled or trebled. The value of our lands would increase; our farmers' sons would not go away to the United States and to other places but would stay at home, and there is plenty of land in the Island for three times the population we have there. How can you expect young men to stay at home when a farmer cannot give his son sufficient for his labor to provide food and clothing; but give the farmers fair prices for their produce, and their sons would have an opportunity of settling and remaining in the country. Do you think under such conditions they would want to leave? No; there is in every man's breast a feeling that if he can by any possibility make a living and prosper in his native home he will not leave it. I hope the House will give the matter fair consideration, and I hope also that the Government, who have listened to me very attentively, will consider the wants of Prince Edward Island. As I told them last year, we are suffering, we are laboring under great disadvantages, we are shut out from the world during five months of the year, our business has all to be done within a few months, and moreover our harbors, our piers and other works are not attended to in any respect whatever. In fact, we are almost totally neglected. Because Prince Edward Island sends here six members to represent her wants and grievances here is she to be coerced?

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELSH. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) does not like coercion. What did we see here a short time ago? A Conservative paper in Prince Edward Island denounced the Government in stronger terms than I have denounced them, and there was good reason for it. Do not tread on the worm or it will turn. If the Government had treated that Province fairly I would not have been here, and I doubt if one of the hon. gentlemen who now occupy seats on the floor as Island representatives would have been here. I bring our wants to the notice of Parliament, to the attention of hon. members from every section of the Dominion, from British Columbia to the confines of the Atlantic, and I hope they will be attended to as they ought to be. I am satisfied that if this resolution is carried and we have reciprocity, a new era of prosperity will come to the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. WELSH. Some hon. gentlemen say "no." How do you know? I say I hope so—I believe it. You may not believe it; I cannot answer for you, and you must answer to your own consciences for your own belief.

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

After Recess.

UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 20) relating to the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I promised an hon. member who desired to oppose this Bill that it would not be taken up this evening, and I therefore hope it will be taken up at another time.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It must be taken into consideration that if other Bills are read the second time to-night they will take precedence before this Bill in the committee.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do not be alarmed, the Session will not be very short.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman forces us to go on with the Bill we shall have to discuss it for the hour, and it will be better for him not to proceed with it. There might be an understanding arrived at that would prevent any opposition to the second reading, and I would certainly advise my hon. friend not to insist on taking the second reading now.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Then, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that if the Minister proposes to object to the Bill, there is no use in moving its second reading. Under those circumstances of course I am obliged to submit, and I submit with the best grace I possibly can.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is better, perhaps, that the Bill should stand over. I had some little experience in North Renfrew last summer—not a satisfactory experience as far as results are concerned—but, I got my experience in another way as to how public business is done and as to how elections are carried and the influences that are at work there. It has just struck me in connection with this bill, and with what people said, that it would be better to let it stand. My hon. friend I had the honor to meet, but did not succeed in beating; yet I discovered that there are ways which are dark which my hon. friend understood, and that certain things were reported to me to have been exercised on certain influential men in that county which this Bill looks to me to be the outcome of. If the hon. gentleman takes up that Bill I hope he will give us a little information on it. I do not want to take him by surprise, but I propose to make some little enquiries about the objects of this Bill, and about the promises made to individual members forming part of the chartered names in that Bill. I trust that the hon. member will be able to give us some satisfactory information.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I trust when this Bill comes up for its second reading that I shall be able to give such explanation to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, as will satisfy him and this House that it is a perfectly proper Bill. I desire to resent the insinuation which the hon. gentleman has made regarding my conduct in the election. If there were any ways that are dark and tricks that are vain, the hon. gentleman himself knows more about them than anybody else.

Mr. MITCHELL. It may be all very fine for him to say so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. You will get order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move the adjournment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You cannot, you have spoken.

Mr. WELSH.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will any person move the adjournment.

Mr. McMULLEN. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want the right hon. gentleman to understand that he cannot choke me off when he likes, and he will find that out too before the Session is over. I simply want to say in reply to the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) that I heard some remarks in connection with the intended improvement of the Ottawa River, and about things which had been guaranteed to certain gentlemen in that riding.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Did you hear them from me?

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear them from you? You are too cunning to tell that. You know your own interest and you know how to go about it. You know the old Pontiac railroad in which you got \$11,000 or \$12,000 and you did not tell about that. You even denied it. However, I wish merely to give notice of this to the hon. gentleman that I may not take him by surprise.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I do not think, Sir, that the hon. gentleman could ever take me by surprise. I shall always be prepared with every measure I submit to this House to defend it if it requires defence. I certainly am ready for the hon. gentleman either here or in any other place that he chooses.

Motion for second reading withdrawn.

MERCHANTS MARINE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. CURRAN. I ask the favor of the House to resume the adjourned debate for the second reading of Bill (No. 11) to empower the Merchants Marine Insurance Company of Canada to relinquish its charter and to provide for the winding up of its affairs. I believe the gentlemen who objected the other night have withdrawn their objection and are satisfied that the Bill should have a second reading.

Mr. MITCHELL. I took exception to the second reading of that Bill on the ground that another director and myself who were in the House never heard anything about it. Since that time the president of the company has written me a letter explaining that it was an oversight he had committed and explaining the nature of his Bill. I, therefore, withdraw the objection.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 32) to incorporate the Dominion Plate Glass Insurance Company.—(Mr. Holton.)

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Pontiac and Renfrew Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 43) to amend the Act incorporating the Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 44) respecting Bonds or Branch Lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed debate on proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright, on amendment of Mr. Foster, and amendment to amendment of Mr. Jones (Halifax).

Mr. COCKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that anyone on whom it devolves to answer the extraordinary speech made by the hon. member who addressed us before recess, is entitled to the fullest sympathy of both parties in this House, for there was no point on which the hon. gentleman did not touch, there was no point which touching he did not adorn, and no point which, having adorned, he had better not have left untouched. It seemed to fall in very

much with the fancy of the hon. members on the opposite side of the House; it seemed to be something after their own hearts; they enjoyed it, and I am sure we also enjoyed it to some extent. It was a heterogeneous mass of statements. The hon. gentleman ensconced himself in a coat-of-mail by assuring us that unless we cried "no" to every statement he made, it was understood that we should say "yes." He wandered over every point that had been taken up in the exhaustive debate which has been in progress in this House during the last five or six days. He told us—and that makes it difficult to answer any of his points—that we must not think he is always addressing us, because he is often humming the matter over to himself, or he is musing over it, or he is still on the *pons asinorum*, and unable to get off. He was able, in the midst of his lucubrations, to give valuable advice to the hon. Minister of Marine and to forecast his future. He was able to give advice worthy of Mr. Sam Weller with reference to widows and matrimony. He was able to view the whole Dominion from his little Garden of Eden (Prince Edward Island), with an adamite or preadamite instinct, and he considered that the whole tariff of this Dominion should be arranged on the basis of pleasing Prince Edward Island. Last Session we heard a great deal of Prince Edward Island. In fact, I thought of moving a resolution, after hearing so much about Prince Edward Island and the North-West, that Ontario was still a part of this Confederation, and intended to remain a part of it. He said: What can you say against this policy of unrestricted reciprocity? Why, there are six members from the Garden of Eden who are all here ready to represent it; there is not a single man from that Island sent to oppose it; and how can you men from Ontario and the far west oppose it? He might have added that there were sixteen members from Nova Scotia out of the twenty-one whose views might be heard. But my hon. friend, with a charming innocence, viewed the whole Dominion through the little eyeglass of Prince Edward Island, and seemed to consider that outside of that there was no creation. However, I must give him credit for his honesty of purpose. He stands forth, Sir, as a noble man who will not be tampered with, for when in the Garden of Eden the tempter held forth to him the promise of alliance or office, when the Third Party stood forth and tried to help him, he scorned the proffered aid, and I have no doubt the Third Party on this occasion, or the gentleman who represents the Third Party—for they are one, in a unity that can never be broken—was greatly disappointed. It was a grand compliment to my hon. friend when the leader of the Third Party made the first advance known in history to take him into his Ministry. Perhaps, I am doing my friend injustice, for I remember the other day a distinct offer being made to the gallant member for Victoria, B.C., to enter his unique Cabinet. At least it seemed to me a kind of insinuating serpentine way of his doing it, when he suggested that perhaps the hon. member was speaking as a future Minister. Well, Sir, I cannot understand how that Party could be driven to seek extraneous aid. I am sure his views run so closely on a line with those of the Opposition that the two may be merged in one, so that the Government are placed in the terrible predicament of having to face not only the whole loyal Opposition party, but the great Jupiter Tonans himself in addition. I must leave to others who live in the immediate neighborhood of Prince Edward Island to answer many points, because I am unable to deal with them. I have never been in that Garden of Eden; I never saw the serpent; I never saw the act of the tempter. But, I believe, the hon. gentleman who rose up at the same time as I did, and who so courteously yielded the floor to me, will be able to deal more particularly with the points brought forward by one of the hon. six from Prince Edward Island. I am relieved from replying to the hon. gentleman because his arguments all proceeded on the one ground into which we have slipped

in the last day or two in dealing with the question of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, and consisted of a steady, continuous attack on the National Policy. Now, I am a young member of this House, but I think it is unreasonable, nay, it is positively indecent for hon. gentlemen opposite, thirteen months after we have been returned by our constituencies where the National Policy was endorsed by the people, to bring up the question again for discussion. In the name of common sense let us leave something as settled, so that the mercantile community may not be deranged and capitalists may not be deterred from investing their capital in the Dominion of Canada. I had hoped that this question, which is the greatest that has been brought before the Dominion Parliament since Confederation, would have been discussed in a tone free from party spirit, and that both parties would have entered upon it with a determination really to sift it and see what was good in it for our common country, and if we found anything valuable in it to adopt it. I reciprocate very heartily the declarations made by one or two members on this side of the House that they desire to enter on this discussion in that spirit. But when I heard the hon. member for South Oxford in his opening sentence declare that this was a party question, and that he intended to consider it on that basis, I was more than disappointed. I should have thought that an hon. gentleman accustomed to party warfare as he is, would have tried to hedge a little more than he did, and to see if there was no means by which he might be able to open a door for others to join him on a broad statesmanlike basis. But he seems to have no conception, he seems to have no idea of a party acting in a body for the common welfare. He seems, on the contrary, to have ever before him the charm of office and to direct all his actions accordingly. Now the hon. gentleman said that he voiced the opinions of the Liberal party in this Parliament. I question very much whether he did really voice the opinions of the whole Liberal party. I recollect well the time, not very long ago, when the leader of the Liberal party (Mr. Blake), in his celebrated speech at Malvern, told us that he was not speaking as a private person, but that he was, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has said of himself, fully impressed with the weight of the words he was about to utter. I can recollect that well; and I can recollect also of his telling us, when he went in for a partial adoption of the National Policy, that he was voicing the opinions of the whole Liberal party "including the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)." I should like to have had from the gallant knight the first exemplification in his speech of thorough unrestricted reciprocity in this regard; I should like him to have been in the position to tell us that he voiced, not only the opinions of the Liberal party in this Parliament, but that in this Liberal party he included the hon. member for West Durham. Apparently he was not able to say so. The debate had proceeded but a short time when we found a variance in the party. We found that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had a very different idea of reciprocity from that which was held by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). They had a lively minute between them. It is not for us to arrange family quarrels, and it is proverbial these things will occur even in the best regulated families; but although it may be that in a multiplicity of councillors there may be wisdom and prudence, I have never heard the pretension advanced that there is wisdom in a multiplicity of leaders. It would have been better for the Liberal party, if, before they came to this House and asked us to undo all that has been done in the last eight years—it would have been better for them if, before they came to this House and asked us to uproot this policy which, happily for the country, has its roots too deep to be torn up by them, they had been able to compound their own differences and have presented here a solid and

unbroken front. But the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) opened as usual with this prolonged wail of woe, woe, woe now is the day of lamentation. He told us that the country had lost \$500,000,000. Well, I said to myself, God be thanked that I live in a country that has been able to lose \$500,000,000, and still has its banking capital overflowing, its deposits in savings banks rapidly increasing, a railway communication unequalled in the world, and a canal system unsurpassed. I said if my country can afford to lose \$500,000,000 in those twenty years, and still be able to be in that position, what a wonderful country it must be. However, after the hon. gentleman had told us that the country had lost \$500,000,000 in the last 20 years, my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) actually informed us that the increase in the value of farm lands in Ontario between 1873 and 1878 had been \$160,000,000. We were told also that, in 1886, the increase was \$30,000,000, and that between 1883 and 1887 the increase in Ontario in the value of farm lands amounted to \$106,872,301. Then came the wail about the loan societies, and then the wail about the decrease in the rate of interest; and one hon. gentleman assured us that if the loan societies have less money loaned out than in previous years, it is because the people will not have any dealings with them on account of their outrageous charges. Now, I am a director of one of the largest loan companies in this country, and in another that does a very large business. And I boldly deny *in toto* the charge that respectable loan companies—I know not what kind of loan companies my hon. friend may have been connected with—charge exorbitant rates. The truth is the rates have fallen one and a-half to two per cent: Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the farmers will not go to the loan companies, but that still their mortgages are larger than ever. Where, then, do they get the money? I know how difficult it is for companies now to place their loans, and how they are obliged to give larger and larger percentages, year after year, to those who place the loans; and yet despite all that, despite the fact that rates of interest are going down, the farmers, we are told, are increasing the load of their indebtedness. Well, if they are, my experience tells me that while the farmers may be diminishing their loans which they have made from the various loan companies, they are having them taken up by their own brother farmers, at slightly lower rates, thus saving the commission paid to the companies. We find that the whole mortgages of the loan societies for the whole of the Dominion amount to only \$81,798,288, which is only about 8 per cent. of the farm value in the Province of Ontario alone, and we have learned also that of the payments in default, including capital and interest, there was in 1886 only four and seven-tenths per cent. in default, or 70 per cent. less than in 1880. I am tired and sick to death of hearing our countrymen maligned; and then I find that, not content with mourning the condition of our own fair and beautiful country, the gallant knight from South Oxford must needs, with his lips full of mock loyalty to the grand old mother country, depict to us the sad condition in which he says she lies. What were his words. He tells us:

"I know that, in what I now say, I am but expressing the views of some of the ablest and highest of British statesmen, when I say that one great peril that threatens the British Empire in this day is the state of most dangerous isolation into which she has come. What is her position to-day in the view of some of the ablest of her statesmen? It is that she has not a friend of a high class power in the world to-day."

Then he goes on to tell us that she is hated by France on account of her action on the Egyptian and the Suez Canal questions. He tells us that she is not favored by Germany, that Austria-Hungary looks on her with an unfriendly eye, and that Russia is ready to pounce upon her. He represents her as prostrate before us,

Mr. COCKBURN.

and he says: There is your mother country lying prostrate; let us put a finishing blow to her; let us see if we cannot ruin her commercially; let us throw in our lot with those who oppose her, and see if we cannot direct a deadly blow at her vitals. Then, when he has depicted England in this miserable depleted condition, he says: Now is the time for Great Britain to form an alliance with the United States. He seems to have the extraordinary idea that the United States are in the business of knight errantry, to hunt up distressed females or nations and form alliances with them. He seems to think that the United States are willing to forego the Munroe doctrine, and that seeing England in this condition, bloodless and almost lifeless, they will make it their business to leap to the rescue and save her from an untimely end. He seems to think that out of a philanthropic sentiment, they will depart from the Munroe doctrine of non-interference in European conflicts and complications with which they have no concern. But, not content with that, he then proceeds to deal with Canada and with reciprocity, and to point out the position which it occupies. Now, I am not going to discuss this question of unrestricted reciprocity, but I simply want to show that, from the figures given by the hon. gentleman himself, the question is really outside of practical politics. I am not going to read many documents or to make many quotations to show what effect it will have on our trade, but I simply wish to take the statements given to us by the hon. gentleman himself, and then to ask you what you consider will be the chances of unrestricted reciprocity. He tells us that it is notorious that:

"Our position in comparison with that of the United States has, in 20 years, been reversed, and reversed enormously to our detriment. Twenty years ago our taxes were one-third of the taxes of the United States; 20 years ago our debt was one-third of the debt of the United States."

Then his eyes glistened with joy as he said:

"To-day, by the last returns I have here, our debt is two and a half times, as nearly as may be, greater per head than the debt of the United States; and the necessary taxes which the United States require to raise for the purpose of carrying on their government are one-third less than the necessary taxes the people of Canada require to pay. Then, Sir, the European market, to which we formerly looked, is dwindling from us, so far as we are concerned."

He tells us also that the United States is in this happy position, that:

"It would be in the power of the United States Secretary of the Treasury, if Congress gave him the authority, to raise either the whole of the customs revenue in either of these three ways: He might maintain the existing tax on sugar and impose a very small income tax indeed, and raise all the revenue he wanted; he might maintain the tax on sugar and impose a very small *ad valorem* duty and raise all the revenue he wanted; or he might maintain the present taxes on a very few articles and make his trade list free."

So much for the United States. That is the position he says they are in. They are in a heaven-born position; everything perfectly smooth—everything moving nicely—a mere stroke of the pen will free them from duty—in one year they actually raise enough revenue to cover the whole debt of the Dominion of Canada—and then he turns to Canada, and says that Canada is in a wretched plight. As the member from Prince Edward Island told us, our young men are fleeing from Canada as from a plague. The hon. gentleman tells us that three out of four of our immigrants leave us, that one out of four of our native population flees from us, that nothing can save us from a revolution except, perhaps, unrestricted reciprocity. That is the picture he presents to us. There is no hope, he says. He sees none. We may be able to hold on for a little while, but, unless we get this unrestricted reciprocity, this commercial union, Canada as a nation will cease to exist. I ask you, putting these two sides of the question, the view he gives of the United States, as successful under every aspect, as a people bounding with joy and with success, is it rational, is it common sense for us to imagine that these people are going to join their fortunes

with ours and to be dragged down by us into the gulf of despair? If we were prosperous, if we were, as he says we were twenty years ago, there might be some reason in the proposal, but that we should go to them and say: Gentlemen, have mercy on us, we are on our last legs, we know not what to do, we are poor miserable sinners, look down with mercy on us and lift us from the quagmire into which we are sinking—is it reasonable to ask people to make a bargain, and such a bargain with you, when he tells you that the people of that country are bounding towards free trade, that they are in a position to compete with the motherland, that we are not in a position to compete with the motherland, that we are dragged down by duties; when he tells you all this and asks you to go to the United States and beg them to join with us, he is asking what no American citizen will consent to for a moment. I had the pleasure of being in Washington lately for four or five weeks, and I was so far honored as to have accorded to me a seat on the floor both of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and there I had an opportunity of conversing more or less intimately with friends of my wife's family, and there we were able to speak freely on various matters, but I assure hon. gentlemen opposite that I have yet to meet the man in the United States who is prepared to discuss this fad of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, except on the well understood basis that real political union is to follow.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) What does Mr. Bayard say?

Mr. COCKBURN. You have the letter of Mr. Bayard. Is the hon. gentleman so abject in his poverty that, Lazarus-like, he is going to be content with the very crumbs that fall from the table, and to imagine that they are equal to the sweet bread and the piece of solid roast beef which is on the table. You must be hard run when a polite expression from the Secretary of the United States is construed to be a solemn invitation. If you imagine that, why, then, if you met a friend on the street who said: "I should be glad to see you some day at my house to dinner," he would find you there every night. Have we no dignity? Are we so low that we must crawl in the dust to men who are no better than ourselves, men of the same blood and of the same race? When hon. gentlemen opposite tell me, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, that he considered one Canadian equal to six immigrants, and when we know that we have lost \$500,000,000 and scarcely feel it, it is enough to prove that we belong to a country of which we have a right to be proud, and we have no need to go round and take Mr. Bayard's coat tails and say: Do you mean that statement to be an invitation to us? Let us have more pride in our own country. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be unhappy unless they are miserable. There is an ecstasy of woe and there is an ecstasy of joy, but for the first time in my life I have seen the two combined in one. The debate has been exhaustive, and it must have been doubly exhausting to them on account of the conflicting emotions which they have experienced in regard to what caused us joy, the bounding up of our revenues, the increase in the wealth of our farmers, the development of our railways, the glorious future which awaits us. We are now in the position which the United States were in twenty-five years ago, but some of us are always tearing up the plant to see whether it has sprouted yet or not. We must have faith in our country, and it is only when we have faith in our country that we can hope to make our country great. No country was ever proud of its men unless they were first proud of their country; unless you have in yourselves the spring of national life, unless we are true Canadians, proud of our position, proud of our ancestry, proud of the great country from which we are sprung, on the highway to become an auxiliary kingdom of that great mother country, we shall never rise to the dignity of our position, we can never make the country

grander than ourselves. Water can never rise higher than the source from which it sprang. I say, therefore, that hon. gentlemen opposite have given us no ground to believe that the United States themselves would accept this proposition of unrestricted reciprocity, or reciprocity, rather, restricted to one power, and that a foreign one. The thing is impossible, impracticable. The beauty of the thing is that these gentlemen argue all along that the United States, those 60 millions of people, those people who are enjoying a god-like existence, who pay their \$2 for their broiler and 80 cents for their butter, and care not a cent what a thing costs, who are revelling in wealth, when we come before them in rags and tatters, then, forsooth, they will open their arms and clasp us in their embrace. The absurdity! Now, with reference to another point I wish to bring under your notice, I shall show that there is, in Great Britain, all the market that we can desire. I find that the British imports for 1887 were \$1,800,000,000, or nearly \$6,000,000 for every week day. I find that the United States imports were \$692,000,000, or 38 per cent. of the British. I find that the total exports and imports of Great Britain with her Empire amounted to \$800,000,000, and the total exports and imports between Great Britain and foreign nations amounted to \$2,210,000,000, or a total of \$3,000,000,000 of trade, or \$10,000,000 every week day, against a total of the United States of \$1,382,000,000, or \$4,450,000 per week day. I find that the United Kingdom imported of wheat and flour, \$130,000,000, of which Canada sent \$3,000,000; that they imported of butter and butterine, \$40,000,000, and we supplied only \$600,000, a quantity that is not one week's supply for the British market. I think, therefore, that there is room for us to enlarge our output in that market. Of live animals for food, Great Britain took 35 million dollars worth, and we supplied 20 per cent. Can we not supply more? Of bacon and ham we practically supply nothing. That market is exclusively in the hands of the United States. In cheese we do well, because we supply 6 millions out of the 20 millions imported by Great Britain. In raw fruit we do wonderfully little, because we send them only \$41,000 while they import 17 millions. In eggs—that is the great point. I do not wonder those gentlemen think so much of eggs. I think they have this extraordinary idea imbued into them, that if you only keep eggs long enough at 13 cents a dozen, they will become broilers worth \$2 each, and I am sure the eggs will be no staler than the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite, certainly they could not be more rotten. Well, then, we have before us the export of eggs into the United States, and, to use the grand words of the gallant knight from Oxford, let me be exact, "\$1,820,948 and no cents." Why, gentlemen, the whole of that import is not the import of six weeks for the mother land. Last year she took 15 million dollars worth of eggs; she took for every month a million and a quarter dollars; and if we could only get broilers up in England to the same price that they are at Mr. Wiman's house in New York, you would then be able to make enormous fortunes, and every farmer would be prosperous, and live and die in the bosom of his family and be happy ever afterwards. Now, Sir, for ham. We do very little in ham; but in England they take 10 million dollars' worth. In beef we do little, although they take 10 million dollars' worth. In fresh butter we do nothing. The Yankees do the butter—and the butterine, perhaps; but 10 millions are taken there. In fresh mutton we do nothing, although England takes \$7,500,000. In preserved meats we ought to do a great deal, but we do very little indeed, although there is a market there of 5 millions. In fish we do only \$1,900,000, although they take 7½ millions, and we allow ourselves to be beaten in this market by the United States. Now, I say here is a market before you, a market in which we are not brought into competition with the people of Great Britain. We

are talking about our market with the United States. It is not a market in the sense of exchange. They talk of 60,000,000 of people who will furnish us a market, as if there were sixty millions of imbeciles resident in the United States who do not know how to manage their own business, who, as soon as 5,000,000 stalwart Canadians walk across the border, will clap their hands across their knees and find a refuge in the Atlantic or the Pacific, or in the bosom of the anywhere. We forget that in taking in this market of 60,000,000, we are only making a market of 65,000,000, and that that ground is already occupied by these people, and so far from extending our interests, we would inevitably contract them. Is there any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House—I will give them credit, at any rate, for looking after their own pecuniary interests; I think, in a matter of that kind, they would be singularly patriotic—I ask is there any hon. gentleman on that side of the House, who, supposing a treaty of this kind were made to last 5, 10, or 20 years, would be prepared to invest in Canada his entire property in machinery, implements, and all that goes to constitute an active factory, and depend upon the American market when, by putting this same investment, we will say \$1,000,000, in the United States, he could, whatever turned up, be always sure at least of the possession of a market of 60,000,000 of people? Do they expect that the United States, in their career of prosperity, verging, as we are told, towards free trade, will make such a treaty as that for 1, or 5, or 10, or 20 years, I do not care whether with Canada or with any other country? You will find that the United States can enter into no treaty of such a kind. They distinctly refused to enter into such a treaty with the British Commissioners recently. It has been their settled policy, and it will remain their settled policy. They will not tie their country down in this way, especially at a time like this, on the eve of a Presidential election. My hon. friend opposite said this was a nice time to bring forward this question. Why, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says a child in arms would have known better. Those hon. gentlemen brought, three or four months before the Presidential election, a much greater question before the people, and if a child in arms should be able to decide against the one, a child unborn should be able to decide against the other. So much, then, for the British market and the opportunities which it offers us. We find there a market which, compared with the United States market, furnishes on imports alone an advantage of 62 per cent. There is another aspect of this question which has not been examined in the House, and to which I desire to direct the attention of hon. members. I have prepared tables of the total values of imports of merchandise entered for immediate consumption and withdrawn from warehouses for consumption for the year ending 30th June, 1887. I find that the total value of United States imports free and dutiable was \$683,218,980. Now, let us see how this immense volume of trade is distributed and let us compare together the manner of distribution of trade in the United States with the manner of distribution in the Dominion. In regard to the American trade we find that out of \$683,000,000 odd no less than \$450,070,946 or 65·85 per cent. is entered in the port of New York. Boston follows next with \$61,000,000; the two together represent 75 per cent of the total imports of the United States. Then comes San Francisco with \$40,000,000 or 5 per cent, Chicago with \$12,000,000, a beggarly percentage of 1·77. We have been told by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to look at those great and rising towns on our southern border—"look at Chicago, Buffalo, Detroit and Cleveland." I have looked at them and this is the result: Chicago imports only 1·77 of the total imports; Buffalo, ·82; Oswego, ·59; Detroit, ·26. Here are the figures:

Mr. COCKBURN.

TOTAL FREE AND DUTIABLE.

TOTAL VALUES of Imported Merchandise entered for immediate Consumption, and withdrawn from Warehouse for Consumption, during the Year ending 30th June, 1887.

United States—\$683,418,980.

Name of Port.	Entered for Consumption.	Percentage.
New York	\$450,070,946	65·85
Boston	61,018,330	8·80
San Francisco	40,330,100	5·90
Chicago	12,112,275	1·77
Buffalo	5,650,856	·82
Oswego	4,021,464	·59
Detroit	2,522,551	·36
Pittsburg	1,211,107	·17
Niagara	354,641	·05
Sandusky	53,681	·008
Erie	29,682	·004
Cleveland	726,438	·10

Let us now look at Ontario, the figures in regard to which are as follows:—

TOTAL FREE AND DUTIABLE.

TOTAL VALUES of Imported Merchandise entered for immediate Consumption, and withdrawn from Warehouse for Consumption, during the Year ending 30th June, 1887.

Dominion of Canada—\$105,639,428.

Ontario { \$42,671,419, consumption.
\$ 8,016,822·16, duty.

Name of Port.	Entered for Consumption.	Percentage.
Belleville	\$326,923	·21
Brantford	366,955	·34
Berlin	746,025	·70
Brockville	532,197	·52
Clifton	1,007,986	·96
Cornwall	806,477	·76
Fort Erie	744,983	·70
Galt	320,575	·30
Geolph	554,104	·52
Hamilton	4,405,765	4·17
Kingston	1,167,304	1·10
London	2,590,409	2·45
Ottawa	1,766,996	1·67
St. Catharines	746,160	·70
St. Thomas	371,308	·35
Sarnia	528,621	·50
Toronto	20,611,305	20·00
Windsor	922,871	·77
Woodstock	313,307	·30
Quebec { \$43,785,740, consumption. \$ 9,788,437·70, duty.		
Montreal	37,821,183	35·50
Quebec	3,381,857	3·20
St. John's	399,072	·38
Sherbrooke	945,860	·90
Sutton	299,097	·28
Nova Scotia { \$6,854,287, consumption. \$1,757,400·92, duty.		
Halifax	4,856,089	4·75
Pictou	336,644	·31
Yarmouth	450,696	·43
New Brunswick { \$5,658,021, consumption. \$1,347,205·26, duty.		
Fredericton	342,636	·32
Moncton	691,050	·65
St. John	3,575,781	3·38
St. Stephen	593,388	·56
Manitoba { \$2,012,183, consumption. \$ 508,947·62, duty.		
Winnipeg	1,936,872	1·83
British Columbia { \$3,626,139, consumption. \$ 883,421·53, duty.		
Victoria	3,087,493	2·92
New Westminster	381,989	·36
Prince Edward Island { \$604,218, consumption. \$153,861·46, duty.		
Charlottetown	505,536	·48
North-West Territories { \$152,421, consumption. \$ 13,609·18, duty.		
Fort McLeod	452,421	·43

Here is the summary: That 75 per cent. of the whole United States imports are entered at New York and Boston alone; that the great city of Chicago commands only 1-77 per cent of that trade, that Buffalo on our border, that is set up for our imitation commands only .82, and Cleveland .10, and Detroit .86; while the Canadian trade is distributed throughout the whole Dominion so that nine of our ports show proportionately a larger amount of imports than are to be found entered at Chicago. At no less than 27 of our ports are the imports larger than at Detroit. Out of those 27 no less than seven import absolutely, not relatively, greater values for consumption, while 15 in Ontario alone of those show imports relatively of greater value for consumption. I draw attention to Detroit, Buffalo and Cleveland as being great lake cities on our border, and because we have been taunted with the immense progress that they have made, and because they have been held forth to us as examples for us to follow. We see by this table that while the proportion of population in the United States as to Canada is as twelve to one, its import trade is only six and a half times as much as ours; so that under commercial union or reciprocity we would be offering them a market of 5,000,000 of people, each of whom consumes foreign products to the value of \$22 per head in exchange for a market in which the people consume only \$11 per head of the population. We can, moreover, hope to displace only a very limited portion of their foreign products. We cannot hope to displace more than a limited portion in a country of such vast extent, for it is well known that there are series of circles within which trade has to be done. We do not do trade with St. Louis or New Orleans but with nearer cities, and while we would be giving up our market where the consumption per head is \$22 per head for imports we could hope to displace only a very limited amount of their foreign produce, they meanwhile hoping to displace a very large amount of ours to the detriment of our customs income. We see this conclusion: that, in case of our pooling the customs revenue on the basis of population, we would receive only \$1 for every \$2 now paid to us; we would, in fact, suffer an annual loss of \$5,000,000. Then look again at another fact. Imports and exports must follow the same lines. A ship that comes to discharge her cargo at a certain port does not go to another port to take home her cargo, unless she fails to obtain it there. So that this would destroy our shipping—that shipping which has been spoken of so lightly amounts to 240,000 tons for each 1,000,000 of inhabitants, while that of the United States amounts to only 70,000 tons for each 1,000,000 of inhabitants. Our market would be New York. We saw the effect of that long ago when the Mackenzie Government took off the differential duties on tea, and at once the great importing houses of Montreal transferred their business to New-York and converted their large establishments in Montreal into mere offices. So soon, however, as the differential duties were restored they dropped their offices in New York and resumed their large establishments in Montreal. Hon. gentlemen who are not connected with the south as I am, and who, perhaps, have not had their attention drawn to it, are, perhaps, not aware of the fact that within the last eight months no less than \$100,000,000 have been invested in the south for the development of industries there in cotton, iron and so forth. Those industries in the north are beginning now to fall behind, and the manufacturers are seeking for some other market, hoping to make a dumping-ground of Canada by the aid of the Opposition. Mr. Townsend has brought forward a grander proposal of a Zollverein of the whole American continent, which is to take in not only the greenhorns of the Dominion of Canada but of Mexico and the South American republics as well. This continent is to be one vast Zollverein, one unrestricted reciprocity, one commercial union, and the whole manufacturing is to be done by our Yankee friends for the benefit of the Americans

and the American republic. That is the way Mr. Wiman and others, with their vast interests in America, are trying to arrange that the whole trade of this country should go to the Americans. If they can get 75 or even the whole 100 per cent. of our trade in the city of New York, the property of Mr. Wiman and others on Staten Island will become of a value greater, perhaps, than one can imagine. I understand this. I see in those manoeuvres of Mr. Wiman and others a deliberate attempt to entrap us into a scheme which I am sure the farmers of Canada are much too wise to fall into. The last point to which I wish to draw attention is the great difference in the character of our imports since we adopted the National Policy. I shall read you—and the mere reading I think is sufficient to prove the statement—the quantity and value of the under-mentioned articles of raw material imported into the country during the fiscal year ended the 30th June, 1879, and the year ending 1887. I bespeak the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this, because if they consider those figures they will see at once the style of the revolution in our trade and the basis of the foundation upon which our Dominion is resting and which we are determined shall continue:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT of the quantity and value of the undermentioned articles of raw material imported into Canada during the fiscal years ended 30th June, 1879 and 1887 respectively:—

Articles.	Imported into Canada.			
	1879.		1887.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	Lbs.	\$	Lbs.	\$
Bristles		31,581		72,781
Furskins		125,528		478,149
Grease for soap stock.....		59,021		100,534
Hides, raw		1,202,890		1,961,134
Rennet		19,656		25,716
Silk, raw		35,558		143,521
Wool, unmanufactured.....	4,978,758	841,173	12,038,693	1,875,651
Broom corn		78,717		133,392
Hemp, undressed		199,179		535,759
Tobacco, unmanufactured..		744,304		1,328,703
Cotton wool	9,720,708	934,047	20,971,070	2,933,877
Dying or tanning articles..		99,253		144,594
Gutta serena, crude		133,214		398,587
Jute cloth, not pressed.....				127,061
Copper in sheets		65,449		144,091
	Tons		Tons.	
Pig iron.....	15,503	231,811	48,558	613,946
Total 16 articles.....		4,851,376		11,017,446

That is not exactly what I want to draw your attention to, for there is something beyond that. I ask gentlemen who are familiar with manufacturing what value they will place on the crude article and what value is represented by the article when manufactured? They tell me it is as one to three, and when gentlemen on the other side begin telling us and flaunting in our face that the imports in such a year amounted to so and so and this year only amounted to so and so, I say God be thanked for this, because it is to me a direct proof that we have changed our mode of importing goods, and that formerly what we imported as a finished product we now import as the crude material, and in its manufacture we give employment to men and children and enable our own people to enjoy the fruits of honest labor. Those figures which I have read show us the change that has taken place for the better in our country, and show us that money is earned and spent in this country, making the homes of our farmers and our artisans comfortable. However little gentlemen opposite may think of our farmers—for they have denounced them before the whole country as bankrupts, and have told us they are in the hands of

mortgagors and that they are bankrupt—I say that the hon. gentlemen opposite have insulted the farmers of the Dominion of Canada. To return to this point, I wish again to draw your attention to the difference between the imports of articles in 1879 and 1887, and to point out that this difference represents to our artisans in the labor market a gain of \$18,489,234 in solid gold. This money has been earned by our artisans and by our farmers, and spent among them, and it has gone to grease the wheels of industry in the Dominion. It ought, I think, to prevent hon. gentlemen opposite from going down on their knees and from cringing to a foreign, a hostile, power I might almost say. We are now, as those returns show, very much in the same position in which America was not very many years ago. I ask you, have you ever found an American who was ready to decry his country the same as some people do in Canada? Look around you and see if ever the Americans sought to ally themselves with a foreign country? Have you ever found, among the people of that country, a wail of lamentation on the condition of their country? I say that, looking to the United States, we should take example from its people who are proud of their country, and they have no more reason to be proud of their country, God knows, than we have to be proud of ours. I think that in morals, in stamina, in intellectuality, in descent, in vigor, in manliness of character, in all that constitutes a man, we can stand up before them and say: "I, also, am a man." But hon. gentlemen opposite cringe and say: "We are not men; we are in a miserable plight; for God's sake come and take us out; we have no saviour; we cannot save ourselves." Look at the progress we have made since 1879, in eight short years, which are in the history of a people but as a speck in eternity. Do not imagine you can create a nation and call it into existence by a mere fiat? We have now been confederated twenty years, and thanks to heaven, we have had at our head a man who fully appreciated the greatness of his country's destiny, who never hesitated when the occasion came to stand forth for Canada first, Canada last and Canada forever. I was ashamed to hear a member tell us the other evening that when it pleased God to gather him to his fathers, then the Conservative party should become disorganised, and they should have a chance of coming into this Garden of Eden, the garden for which they have been longing for so many years, the garden they saw before them but fourteen short months ago, and laid out so pleasantly with Ministers and portfolios that never came into existence. They have my sympathy. I can only hope that as they grow older they will grow wiser; that as they see the country progressing and Canada leading in the van, they will take a more hopeful view of our future. They can see now for the first time the opening up of our great North-West; for let us remember, while there have been exoduses in every country in the world, we have not had a fair chance beside the United States until the last two years of taking our immigrants directly into our land of promise. Hon. gentlemen might have known that in the history of the development of our population there was something else to consider than this mere misgovernment they talk about. They might have learned that this same flight of people to the United States took place at the time that country was groaning under taxes infinitely heavier than ours, and with a debt infinitely heavier than ours, a debt that did not represent public works and works of improvement, but simply the price paid for shedding their brothers' blood. I hope when hon. gentlemen opposite take all these matters into consideration, they will reflect and come to the conclusion to stop seeking madly, in their eager desire to clutch office, to grasp at every straw that presents itself. Otherwise they will do harm to the great Liberal party—a party that I consider essential to the welfare of the country; for in every free constitutional state there must be two parties. But to continue the course they took

Mr. COCKBURN.

before the last election and that they are taking now, can only result in destruction to the party and in injury to our own beloved country.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The fact is, on this question we are almost two to one in this House, and the hon. gentleman opposite must expect a double speech from this side once in a while in order to give an opportunity to all who wish to speak. I will not weary the House very long, simply because we have had a large number of speakers, and spent a good deal of time over this question. Members from the Maritime Provinces have been challenged now and again by some hon. members opposite as to what their people think of unrestricted reciprocity. I am happy to state that I am here to-night representing one of the finest constituencies and one of the fairest valleys in the Maritime Provinces; and I also represent some of the finest and most intelligent farmers in those Provinces or in the Dominion of Canada for that matter. One of the members from Prince Edward Island who has lately taken his seat gave the House some idea of what it was to be a married man. If I mistake not, he stated that after a man became married, he would lack some of his mathematical precision. Well, I should say, judging from the speech of that hon. gentleman, that he had been rather too much married, especially when he began to talk about that little Marine farm, that little farm of the Interior, and that little farm of Reciprocity, which he was going to set up in that Garden of Eden, Prince Edward Island. He said they would sell on the Marine farm and on the Interior farm potatoes for 18 cents a bushel, and oats for 26 cents a bushel, "but on my Reciprocity farm," said he, "I will get 70 cents for my potatoes, and 45 cents or 50 cents for my oats." Now, he must have rather taken advantage in some way of the Marine and Interior farmers, for if he is going to get 70 cents for his potatoes, or 45 or 50 cents for his oats, with a duty of only 15 cents on the one, and 10 cents on the other, taking for granted that the farmer is going to pay the duty, I would like to know how he brings 18 up to 70, and 26 up to 45 or 50. I think that shows that the hon. gentleman, according to the principle he laid down himself, has been rather too much married. He also says that shipping has fallen off since the National Policy was introduced. Well, perhaps it has fallen off. I know that fewer ships have been built in Annapolis and King's and other places along the coast. But the reason simply is that wooden vessels had to give way to iron steamers. We are no longer shipping in wooden bottoms but in iron bottoms, and we cannot count this change as an evidence of lack of progress. I remember the time when we used to build ships in Annapolis and send them out to the different ports of the world, and for years the only thing we would see of those ships would be the drafts sent home. Not much of that business is done now, simply because iron steamers are taking the place of wooden vessels. So, I do not think the hon. gentleman has made much on that point against the National Policy, for it is impossible to pretend that it is owing to the National Policy there has been a falling off in ship-building. Now the National Policy was accepted by the people in 1878. Previous to 1878 the people saw they had a do-nothing Government to deal with. Deficit after deficit was being rolled up, and the laboring classes in the country were without employment. The National Policy was introduced as a means to furnish work to the laborers, and to be an incentive to business and progress in Canada. The people accepted that policy in 1878, and when they were asked again for their verdict in 1882, they again gave their verdict in its favor. Between 1882 and 1887, the Opposition party accepted the National Policy. They tried all kinds of policies for themselves. They tried one policy in Nova Scotia, they tried another in New Brunswick, they

tried another in Quebec, they tried different policies in every Province throughout the length and breadth of Canada. They had not a single policy to cover the wants of a large majority of the people, but they had resort to different policies in the different Provinces in order, if possible, to gain an election in each. Notwithstanding that the members of the Opposition, by the mouth of their leader, in his celebrated Malvern speech, accepted the National Policy as their policy, the Canadian people would not trust that policy in the hands of those hon. gentlemen who were taking it up at the last moment, when they saw the policy was being successful, but decided to continue their confidence in those who had inaugurated it. Hon. gentlemen opposite did not catch the people in 1887, and when, on the 22nd February the returns came in, that celebrated majority, which was heralded in the *Morning Chronicle* and telegraphed all over Canada, especially to the North-West Territories and those constituencies that had to make their elections later, was found to have dwindled down to a feeble minority. Hon. gentlemen opposite, seeing that they had been defeated at every turn, seeing that the people will not trust the National Policy into their hands, have been, with the assistance of some people over the border, framing a policy to catch the votes of the electors in the far distant future. That policy had become commercial union. One of the exponents of the Opposition in Nova Scotia boldly stated upon the hustings, at one of the bye-elections, that heretofore his party had no policy. They had, he said, no real genuine policy, but they have got one now, and it was commercial union. This was to be the panacea for all our evils; this was to be the remedy for all our hungry looks, and they tried the commercial union fad for all it is worth. They boomed it in Nova Scotia upon every hustings, in every bye-election, and it failed. They evidently had not decided to take up another policy until they met here two or three weeks ago, because it is a notorious fact that an hon. member of the Opposition had upon the Order Paper a notice that he would move a resolution in favor of commercial union. That notice has disappeared from the Order Paper, and this resolution of unrestricted free trade with the United States has come up in its place, evidently showing that the Opposition only combined upon this policy two or three weeks ago. Now, they say it is absolutely necessary that we should adopt this new policy. They say Canada has been ruined, that the majority of Canadians are farmers, and that, therefore, we must take care of the farmers in preference to the other classes engaged in other industries. I desire to protect the farmers in every way possible. I am the son of a farmer, and I believe in protecting every individual when it is necessary he should be protected. But I contend that, so far as the farmers of Annapolis and King's are concerned, they do not want protection. I was fairly astounded when I heard the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) state here that the farmers of the Maritime Provinces had no hope, but were in despair. I would like to see him come down to Annapolis and to King's, and tell the farmers there that they are in despair. I believe I can prove to this House that this statement of the case is not correct, and I will prove my assertion out of the mouth of the farmers themselves. I will prove by the farmers themselves that they are not hopeless for the future, and that although they are willing to enter into trade relations with any country that will be of benefit to them, rather than sacrifice their own country, rather than sacrifice the industries of Canada, they will do very well and get along successfully without the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that this policy of theirs is universally accepted by their party, but I rather think there was some disagreement somewhere when we were told by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that he would not advocate the abolition of all railway subsidies and public

works, and that he would not advocate direct taxation in any measure. How does the hon. gentleman propose to raise money for these subsidies and public works without direct taxation? The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that, even if it leads to direct taxation, he will prosecute this policy, and he says that direct taxation is not such a bugbear as it is at first supposed to be, that taxes by assessment are a great deal better, that the poor man will be able to pay taxes more equitably under the laws of assessment than under the system by which taxes are imposed now. I take a decided exception to that, and I say, and I think I can prove, that the poor man is not taxed at the present time, but that it is the rich man, that it is those who enjoy the luxuries of life, who are being taxed now and not the poor man. If the taxes were imposed under the assessment laws, and especially under the assessment laws of Nova Scotia, I am quite convinced that it would be the poor man who would bear the burden of the taxes, and not the rich man. I say that it is upon the luxuries of life that the taxes are now levied, and these are some of the items. First, there are jellies and jams, \$21,853. Surely the poor man can do without those. Jewellery, \$482,043. The poor man can do without those. Musical instruments, \$389,699. The poor man can do without those. Optical instruments, \$66,788. Well, the poor man does without those, even if he needs them. Paintings and drawings, \$73,447. Perfumery, &c., \$21,999. Pickles and sauces, \$160,282. Silks, \$2,305,392. Fancy soaps and powders, \$76,579. The poor man will make his soap from lye and soap grease, and good soap it is. Spirituous liquors, \$1,617,044. There is no need for the poor man to take those. Tobacco, \$411,313. There is no necessity for the poor man to indulge in tobacco. If he must have it, and the liquors, let it be upon his own head. Watches, \$503,565. Books and printed matter, \$1,008,766. Baking powders, \$102,517. Printed music, \$60,564. Christmas cards, \$84,168. Surely the poor man can do without those. Carpets, \$43,052. Watch cases, \$26,569. Cider, \$12,524. Cocoa and chocolate, \$50,145. China, \$485,498. Embroideries, \$134,097. Fancy goods, \$1,579,988. Foreign fruits, \$1,609,252. Furs, \$634,021. Gloves, &c., \$363,007. Gold and silver goods, \$238,431. All of these show that it is not the poor man who bears the burden of the taxes but the rich, and those are the people who should pay the taxes in this Dominion. If you were to have direct taxation, and that as carried out by the assessment laws of Nova Scotia, it would be the poor man who would pay the bulk of these taxes. In Annapolis county, this is the way in which it works, and I know that it is the same in every other county in Nova Scotia, particularly when you get a Grit revisor on the assessment list, who will put every poor man he wants to vote for his side on the list at \$300 personal property, no matter whether what he owns is worth \$175 or not; but, if there is a rich man who owns \$10,000 worth of property, he is assessed at about \$2,000. These are facts, and I defy contradiction, and it is well known in the Province of Nova Scotia that that is the way in which it works. In that case it is the poor man who pays the tax, and not the rich man at all, and, therefore, it would be a great evil for this country to have the taxes levied in that way. As far as the Province of Nova Scotia is concerned, I do not think that that Province, and especially my constituency, and the constituency of the member for Queen's (Mr. Freeman), and the member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), would like to see the abolition of the railway subsidies. This is the time when Nova Scotia should be regarded with reference to railways. Railways have been constructed throughout every Province with the exception of the Maritime Provinces, and now is the time when we should have railway subsidies if they are to be given to us at all, and I do not think the hon. members opposite from Nova Scotia would agree to have the railway

subsidies abolished. The same thing is true with regard to public works and public buildings. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that the time had come for something heroic to be done, that there was a crisis at hand, that Canada was ruined, that the whole earth was becoming sick and famished in Canada while everything was green and beautiful in the United States, and it rested upon the member for South Oxford to do that heroic thing, whatever it was. He says the National Policy is a failure and Canada is ruined. Do you think for a moment that you are going to make the people of Canada believe that? Do you think that you can make them believe that this fair Dominion of ours is ruined? Do the people who deal out the funds to us when we want to make a loan on the London markets think that Canada is ruined? And that is the true test of the ruination of any country. If your credit is not good, that is the indication of ruin. If a person applies for a loan on real estate, what is the first thing the person to whom he applies does? He enquires into the character of that party, he enquires whether the farm is of sufficient value to warrant the loan, he asks whether that man is able and willing to pay his interest when it is due, he enquires into everything that should be enquired into, and he enquires very particularly, because these money lenders are people who have their eyes open to all these matters, and are very determined that their money shall not be lent out on worthless security. What do the lenders of money in London say? We know that Canada is the first of the colonies of Great Britain as far as her credit is concerned. Her credit was never better than it is to-day, and still the hon. member for South Oxford says we must do something heroic because Canada is being ruined. It is the most absurd statement that any man could make. Then they say that there is no inter-provincial trade. I have heard that stated time and time again, and I heard it stated throughout the length and breadth of Annapolis county. The Attorney General and other members of the Local Government said that there. They said: When do you find the ships of the Maritime Provinces turned towards Upper Canada, as they call it, that is Ontario and Quebec? They hardly acknowledge that Nova Scotia is in Canada at all. I tell them that we have inter-provincial trade, and that it is increasing year by year and day by day. To be sure, the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), crept behind the fact that we had no actual statistics of inter-provincial trade, and he thought he was safe in reference to that and could make almost any assertion he liked in regard to inter-provincial trade. There was a gentleman, however, in St. John, N.B., who looked into this matter very thoroughly. He corresponded with the different establishments throughout the Maritime Provinces, and he discovered the facts as accurately as could be done without appointing a commission and going to each of these establishments separately to get the figures. His statement does not relate to the Maritime Provinces, but to Nova Scotia alone, and here are the amounts of goods that Nova Scotia sent to Ontario and Quebec in 1885:

Sugar, refined.....	\$1,104,354
Iron.....	474,221
Coal.....	700,000
Cotton manufactures.....	288,000
Skates.....	36,600
Nova Scotia Forge Company.....	87,000
Canned milk (Truro Co.).....	12,000
Hats.....	14,000
Woodenware, Round Hill Co., Annapolis... ..	3,600
Leather.....	43,000
Fish, over.....	38,000
Cordage, about.....	40,000
Woolen goods.....	6,000
Total.....	\$3,144,675

These figures are for 1885, and have materially increased for the last few years. When the Attorney General of Nova Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

Scotia saw fit to go down to the county of Digby in a bye-election, he stated upon a platform that there was nothing sent up to Ontario and Quebec from the Maritime Provinces. Very impolitely, I confess, he was contradicted by a gentleman present from Digby, a fish merchant. "You lie, Sir," said he, "for I sent \$10,000 worth of fish this year, and I expect to send as much more next year." So in the town of Digby alone \$10,000 worth of fish was sent to the Upper Provinces. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jones) at this moment corrects me, and says there are \$18,000 worth sent off from Digby alone to Ontario and Quebec. There is also the item of oysters, which, it seems, is becoming quite a trade between Nova Scotia and the western Provinces. Thus it will be seen that Nova Scotia sends *per capita* to its population, \$6.66 of goods to Ontario and Quebec, and they, in return only send \$2.15 *per capita*, although Attorney General Longley has often exclaimed against the Montreal and Quebec drummers coming down to Nova Scotia and getting the money out of the people. So I think that demonstrates beyond doubt that the contention of the hon. member for South Oxford about the lack of inter-provincial trade, is incorrect. Then they talk about the exodus. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen when and where in the world there is not an exodus? When in the history of Nova Scotia, when in the history of New Brunswick, when in the history of Canada, when in the history of the New England States themselves, was there not an exodus towards the west, or an exodus toward some other country? Even as far back as 1853, the Hon. Joseph Howe had to meet this question of an exodus. He was leader of the Government at that time, and those who were on the Opposition benches, in order, I presume, to turn up the old gentleman's toes, politically, on that occasion, thought they would find an exodus somewhere, and they got a committee, and that committee made an investigation, and they did discover an exodus. They went so far as to say that the exodus amounted to this: If the present system is maintained—the policy of the Government at that time—the population will be thinned down to the aged and infirm, and others who, in consequence of poverty, and the peculiarity of their circumstances, have neither the means nor the ability to leave the country. That was the kind of exodus that they kicked up in 1853. It was a far greater exodus than the hon. gentlemen opposite dare to assert takes place from Canada to-day. They admit that there are some people living here to-day who are not aged and infirm, and not too poor to leave the country. How did that venerable and eloquent gentleman at that time meet these people? He made a speech from which I will read an extract, and after that speech there was not another word said about the exodus. He entirely squelched them, as I am convinced the hon. gentlemen opposite will be squelched after this question has been fully ventilated:

"I read this report with deep sorrow and regret. I feel humiliated to see a Nova Scotian seeking to put on the journals of the Legislature what I believe to be a piece of systematic misrepresentation and defamation of his country. We may see in the newspapers denunciations of the position, character, commercial resources and advancement of our Province; and I believe these have greatly disheartened our people, setting them at variance with their condition and country, and leading them to believe that there is something abroad and beyond our borders infinitely superior to anything that can be found at home. This, however, does not justify a Legislature in stamping with the seal of official authority these aspersions; in sapping the springs of vitality and energy that alone are left to quicken or animate them; and by a steady, persevering system of self-abasement inducing an utter absence of all hope. Sir, I believe that this Province is as progressive, as forward in the race of civilisation and improvement, as half the countries that may be compared with it on the face of the earth."

Cannot the words of that old man, eloquent, be repeated at the present time? Can we not also say that Canada is as progressive, that she is as well looked after, that she is as far advanced in the race of civilisation, as any other country in the world, aye, and more than the majority of

the countries in the world? I consider that Canada was never in a more progressive state than at the present time. Do these hon. gentlemen think that the people of Canada are going to forsake the substance to grasp at the shadow? Do they think the people of Canada will imitate the dog that was crossing the stream with a bone in his mouth, and grasping at the shadow he saw in the water he lost the bone? No, the people of Canada have more faith in their country. It is the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition that have no faith in their country, or pretend they have not. They look with hungry eyes upon this country, they are hungry themselves, they are undergoing a famine. All Canada to them is sick and famished. Hungry is the air around them, hungry is the sky above them, and the hungry stars of heaven, like the eyes of wolves, glare at them, so ardent are they to creep over to the Treasury benches. Now, they tell us that there is a depreciation in real estate. I do not believe it. I do not think that the majority of the people of Canada believe it, and I will do the hon. gentlemen opposite the credit of saying that I do not think they believe it themselves. I would like the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) to go down into the counties of Annapolis and King's and attempt to buy a farm. I rather think he would need another Government fee of \$47.50 a minute to buy it. So far as the Annapolis valley is concerned, I know it is not true, and I think what can be said of that valley can be said of the Province of Nova Scotia, that real estate has not depreciated in value. Perhaps in some localities, for local reasons merely, there may be a depreciation. Take, for instance, the rock-bound coasts of the Bay of Fundy, in my constituency, or in the county of the hon. member for King's. Property over there may have depreciated in value, and why? Simply because we have got the iron horse rushing through the valley and diverting trade from those great waters, and consequently there is a depreciation in property there. But where there is depression in one section of the country there is a bulging out in another. How can hon. gentlemen opposite say that our farmers are in despair? I have said what I think of this matter, but I will now show what the farmers think about it. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) declared, and he rolled it under his tongue as a sweet morsel, that we have no statistics with regard to these matters. But we can get good information from the reports of agricultural societies throughout the Provinces. When I heard the assertion of the hon. gentleman in regard to the condition of the farmers I said: Can this be true? If it is true it is beyond all my experience. I decided to examine the reports of the agricultural societies and ascertain what they said in regard to this question. In the Province of Nova Scotia there are about 92 of those societies, and if the hon. gentleman can take those reports from 1884 down to date, and find anything in them that is indicative of despair, I will relinquish my position in this House. It is just the opposite that is the case. The Nictaux Agricultural Society reports:

"Resolve to expend 10 per cent. of their funds in books on agriculture. They take now a number of books on 'Apple Culture,' 'Farm Drainage,' 'Hain's Talks on Manure,' 'Manual of Agriculture,' 'The Farm and Stock Manual.'

"A. BECKWITH,
"Secretary."

That does not look as if the farmers of Nova Scotia were going behind, and if farming did not pay they would enter some other business. The farmers of Nova Scotia are not fools. But farming in Nova Scotia does pay, and therefore they are making themselves perfect in farming, and in Annapolis and King's counties they are entering into it as an art. Paradise Agricultural Society reports:

"Everything apparently prosperous. No complaints. A large sum of money expended in bonuses to parties buying thoroughbreds. The directors reported that they and the members of this society dwell with pleasure on the interest manifested, and the advances made in the past,

in the improvement of stock and general farm crops. We are pleased to report favorably on the condition of the crops, the autumn being exceptionally favorable in the ripening of the fruit, for which our orchardists are realizing fine prices both at home and abroad.

"WALLAOE YOUNG.
"ARTHUR MORSE.

"The meeting adopted this report.

"B. R. BALCOM.
"E. S. MORSE."

That does not look like despair! The Eastern Annapolis Agricultural Society reports:

"Good crops; good harvest season.

"JOHN CONLON,
"Chairman of Directors.
"A. B. PARKER,
"Secretary."

No despair about these people; they have faith and hope in their country. The Laurie Agricultural Society—named after the hon. member for Shelburne—reports a gradual improvement in the breeding of shorthorn Durham, and also that they have good reason to believe that it will only be a short time before scrub bulls will be scarce in the eastern end of this county. It adds:

"The members of this society have sold cattle and calves this year which have been reported and as yet have had no equal in the county. Cattle weighing 3,950 lbs., and girth, 8 feet. Calf 5 months old, girth, 4 feet, 6 inches. Cattle here in ten years, since the organisation of this society, have improved 50 per cent.

"A. A. FORD,
"Secretary."

Annapolis Agricultural Society:

"The president, Joseph A. Bancroft, Esq., reported that there had been some progress made in agricultural matters.

This society has had the advantage of the valuable services of G. B. McGill, Esq., a graduate of the agricultural department of the Normal School of Truro.

"A lot of agricultural literature purchased, also thoroughbreds."

In Antigonish county there is the Bayfield Agricultural Society. It reports:

"Thoroughbreds purchased, and agricultural literature."

North Grant Agricultural Society's report is replete with satisfaction and bright hope. Their stock is improving, also their crops, and they are investing largely in agricultural literature. In Cape Breton county, Sydney Agricultural Society reports importations of thoroughbreds, and adds:

"We are satisfied that industry and close application would make this a first class farming and stock-raising county.

"DUNCAN MCKENZIE.
"R. McDONALD."

Then there are reports from Stirley Agricultural Society, Agricola Agricultural Society, Earltown Agricultural Society, Brookfield Agricultural Society. In Digby county, we have a report from the Hillsburgh Agricultural Society. Weymouth Agricultural Society says:

"On the whole, we have abundant reason for thankfulness to the Beneficent Ruler of the universe for the many rich blessings which have crowned the year."

There are also similar reports from Guysborough county, Halifax county, Hants county, Inverness county. In Lunenburg county the Bridgewater Agricultural Society says:

"Are pleased to report a continual growth."

The Centreville Agricultural Society reports:

"Thoroughbreds and works on agriculture."

There is a report from Chester Agricultural Society, also from Lunenburg Agricultural Society, which says:

"Sent crops to Indian and Colonial Exhibition."

Similar reports come from Balmoral Agricultural Society, Lower Stewiacke Agricultural Society, Springside Agricultural Society, Londonderry Agricultural Society. For Cumberland county we have reports from Malagash Agricultural Society, North Shore Agricultural Society, Went

worth Agricultural Society, Maccan and Nappan Agricultural Society, Amherst Agricultural Society. Minute and Beaconsfield Agricultural Society reports:

"Thoroughbred stock and books."

Wallace Agricultural Society says crops a good yield; prices of cattle and sheep improving, and end with gratefully acknowledging to the Bountiful Giver of all good our peace and prosperity. Among the agricultural societies, Annapolis, 1886, Clements Agricultural Society reports:

"Recognising the kindly providence of another year, we acknowledge our obligations to the Giver of All Good for health, peace and prosperity in our midst.

"C. PURDY,
"President.
"W. V. VROOM,
"Secretary"

Clarence Agricultural Society reports that:

"All their bills, owing to former extravagance, are paid, and they want an exhibition.

"ADALBUT WILKINS.
"Z. W. ELLIOTT."

The Clements Agricultural Society report prosperity and an advance of price in turnips, and close their report with this:

"We are reminded of the general good health which we, as a community, have enjoyed, and for the peace and plenty which surround us, and humbly and gratefully acknowledge our thanks to the Giver of All Our Good.

"C. PURDY,
"President.
"DOWE POTTER,
"Vice-President.
"W. V. VROOM,
"Secretary."

The Central Agricultural Society, King's county, reports:

"We are thankful we can again report a year of prosperity, with good crops and fair prices."

Take every one of these reports, and I challenge any hon. gentlemen to go over them with me and to find in any one of them during the last three or four years anything contrary in any respect to what I have stated. But I can show even a better report than that. I can show the report of the Agricultural Society of the county of King's, its 97th annual report, for the society has been in existence 97 years. It would well repay hon. gentlemen who remember the base libel that has been telegraphed through Canada and the United States, that the farmers of the Maritime Provinces are in despair and without hope, to read the whole of these reports. The report of the King's County Agricultural Society, speaking of the potato crop, says:

"For years the crop that overshadowed all others in this valley, since the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, and the imposition of a duty in 1866, have gradually taken the second place—apples now leading. In the political agitation which has recently visited us, there is no doubt that potatoes and reciprocity were greatly mixed up in the minds of our farmers. The old days of a dollar a bushel held a fond place in their memories. Reciprocity for King's means simply a free market in the United States for potatoes. This, it is believed, would be a panacea for all our ills; but we should remember that times are changed, and were potatoes free to-day, it is morally certain that the price could not exceed half a dollar unless the potato bug or rot destroyed our neighbor's crop. The product of their own farms in the different States is now sufficient to keep the price down to something like the value of the article, and they are also now brought over to the United States from Europe. Our farmers must make up their minds to raise them for about 30 to 35 cents, and this can be got without going down on our knees to beg reciprocity from the United States Senate. This crop rotted badly last season in some localities, but there was an average crop of sound tubers which are not rotting in the cellars. Returns for last year (1886), show that fully 230,000 bushels were shipped from this county; and, for 1886, 40,000 bushels were shipped in November, and vessels are now loading at different ports. The price is 30 cents. The varieties grown are: Prolifics, Burbanks, Early and Bolton Rose; Beauty of Hebron, and Garnet Chili. The last named variety is entirely free from rot."

He tells of the prices of turnips, pears, plums, small fruits, live stock and apples, and it will well repay any one to read that, but I will not weary the House with it. He refers to the prices of all farm products, and says:

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis.)

"If all farm products were compared with those of other places: Hay, \$10 to \$12; potatoes, 30 cents; oats, 40 to 50 cents; apples, \$1 50 to \$3 50; beef, \$5 to \$7; butter and eggs, 18 to 25 cents. These prices compare favorably with those of any farming State in the Union, and the price of purchased supplies is equally favorable. In the States granulated sugar is quoted at 6½ cents by the barrel. In Halifax it costs 6½ cents; and circle A, equally white, and as good for any purpose, 8 cents. We pay less than half the prices paid in New York for our tea and coffee. Flour was never cheaper; cottons, boots and shoes, nails, everything manufactured, cheaper in proportion than our farm products. On the whole, the year has been a decided success, agriculturally, in King's. We have lived twenty years without reciprocity, and nearly as many years as a Province of the Dominion, and I fail to see 'blue ruin' in this county in the face of the above facts."

Does that look like despair; does that call for any heroic method?

"With buyers from New York and Montreal coming down here to buy our apples in preference to their own; with London, Havana and Bermuda open markets for our farm products, and with the international, intercolonial and inter-provincial trade which we now have, and that which will be built up in the future as a happy result of the Indian and Colonial Exhibition, we can live twenty years more without reciprocity, if necessary, and still advance and prosper. I have no patience with those narrow-minded pessimists who are continually crying out there is something rotten in the state of Canada; who can see nothing but ruin in the country, and are preaching discontent among the people. Where is this ruin? Who and what is ruined? Look at our churches and school-houses, our houses and barns, our improved breeds of cattle, sheep and swine; our farming tools and implements, our fine horses and carriages, our pianos and organs, our tweeds and silks, instead of home-spun and linsey-woolsey; look at the source of wealth which procures and maintains all these things—our broad acres of dyke, fertile uplands, and productive orchards; try to purchase one of these farms, and compare the price with that of even ten years ago. Count the people's money in the savings banks, their life insurance policies, the cash spent for missions and benevolent purposes, for business and pleasure, for rum and tobacco, and then talk about ruin if you can."

This is the report of a farmer, and the report of the King's County Agricultural Society, and the report was adopted and accepted by them.

Mr. KIRK. Who writes that?

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The directors of the King's County Agricultural Society, and it was reported in the Journals of Nova Scotia in 1887, and the Nova Scotia Government is a Grit Government, your own friends. I may just say here that I have had a report from Annapolis that the apples sent to London, not to the United States, by the last steamship have realised the highest price in the market, 40s. sterling per barrel. Perhaps the hon. gentleman thinks that this is the only report from that county, but I will give him a still later one for 1887, which has just come from the Legislature which is now sitting in Halifax, and from the same Grit Government down there. I will turn again to the same society, the King's County Agricultural Society, and it is the 98th annual meeting this time. I will only take some extracts from it, and I will place it in the hands of any hon. gentleman present who may read the whole of it if he likes:

"I will reiterate here that there is no place in the whole world where both the climate and the soil are better adapted to agricultural pursuits than in King's county, and indeed throughout this whole valley. The farmer is absolutely certain year by year of a fair return from seed sown and labor expended."

"Our crops as a whole are a good average. The hay crop is fully a third more than last year, and the apple crop a third less, but both are of exceptionally good quality."

"Too much attention cannot be given to the dyke and hay crop in our district. It is really our most important crop, and, indeed, may be said to be the most important crop in our Province. Three thousand acres of dykes, the most valuable land outside of cities on this continent, and a large area of upland, are exclusively devoted to this crop in our district, and upon the product of these acres the wintering of our stock depends, and upon the stock depends the proper fertilisation of our orchards, and the land planted with other crops. And this is largely the case in the whole Province. The last census gives one-fourth of the cleared land in Nova Scotia occupied by the hay crop, and also more than half of the land cropped. Grass grown for hay covers 520,000 acres of the most valuable land, yielding about 600,000 tons, worth nearly \$6,000,000. These figures will give you some idea of the value and importance of the hay crop. I would remark just here that our farmers could make a large saving in their fodder if the hay-cutter was more extensively used, and the straw cut with the hay and fed with provender and meal, as is done in the old country. The straw would then become as valuable as hay, the stock would eat less and

thrive better. This is no theory, but a fact which is being proved in the experience of some every winter."

"Oats.—This, the only grain appraised to any extent here, will be ten per cent. below the crop of '85 in quantity and quality. Farmers know that it does not pay to raise wheat when prime flour can be bought for \$5 25 per barrel."

"Potatoes.—The potato crop is far away our most important 'root crop,' and every precaution should be taken to preserve it from evils, especially as our potatoes, like our apples, are the very best grown in the world—dry, mealy, and excellent in every respect. The principal varieties grown are: Prolifics, Burbanks, Farmers' Pride, Beauty of Hebron, Prince Alberts, and Garnet Chilli. The last-named is the soundest growing potato raised here, but does not command quite so high a price as the white varieties."

"Turnips, &c.—Next to potatoes, turnips and mangolds are raised in quantity for feeding to stock in the winter; the drought last year prevented the seed from germinating and threatened to destroy the crop altogether, but a second sowing came on nicely and there is a good crop. Parsnips and carrots are an average crop."

"Small Fruits.—If small fruit growers could plan to irrigate in dry seasons, I believe it would pay. Strawberries must have plenty of moisture after the fruit once forms. Currants, gooseberries, and raspberries yielded fairly well, and they are beginning to occupy an important place with some of our farmers. Mr. Newcomb, at the Landing, sold sixty dollars worth of raspberries of the Red Antwerp variety from a small patch. Mr. Jones marketed 60 bushels of gooseberries, and a quantity of raspberries, and red and black currants, which, with his strawberries, will probably exceed in value all the other products of his farm. There is money in this, there is no doubt, for there seems to be no difficulty in finding a ready market at 8 to 10 cents a quart."

"Tomatoes.—Mr. Patterson, of Acadia Villa, made an experiment of this popular and delicious fruit. Of one-sixth of an acre he sold \$60 worth, finding a market in Wolfville and Halifax, and had as many more green and ripe left. He thinks he could double this off the same land by ripening earlier, but at \$60 the returns would be \$360 from one acre. Here is another chance for our farmers. I have observed that tons of tomatoes have been raised in different parts of the country this year. Mr. Patterson's were very smooth, deliciously-flavored tomatoes, and were preferred in Halifax to the American tomatoes even at double the price."

"Apples.—The apple has become the most valuable and important of all the products of our valley. The farmer, who, fifteen or twenty years ago, planted an orchard in spite of the opinion of many around him that he was doing a very foolish thing, and wasting valuable land, because there would never be a market and remunerative price for his apples, was a wise man in his day and generation, and has to-day a fortune and an independent income. I am told this same Mr. Byrnes who raised the plums, sold his whole orchard at \$2.50 a barrel, and will realize \$2,000 for this season's crop, and like results are being realized on a smaller scale all through this district and this valley. Judge Weatherbe asked one of our members what he would take to allow him to cut down a certain tree in his orchard. After thinking a minute, he replied, 'I should want \$30 at least.' Now multiply the trees on an acre (40) by \$30 and the result is \$1,200 as the value of an acre of orchard in bearing. Let us take it another way. Trees at fifteen to twenty years old are good for four barrels of apples a year, worth, at a moderate calculation, \$1.50 per barrel, or \$6 for each tree, and forty trees to the acre will give the interest on \$1,000 at 6 per cent. from an acre. As a gentleman stated at the last meeting of the Fruit Growers' Association, 'the planting of an orchard in King's Co. is the best investment on earth.' As a proof that he had the courage of his convictions, this gentleman, Mr. Bigelow, has purchased a tract of land near Wolfville, and is preparing to plant some hundreds of trees in the spring. In the east end of the district, Mr. J. B. North is planting a large orchard, and, just around us, Mr. George Johnson, Dominion Statistician, who resides in Ottawa, and has seen the good things of the whole Dominion, has purchased some 20 acres of land at \$60 an acre, and Mr. T. E. Smith has furnished the trees from his nursery, and is at present superintending the planting of 1,100 of the most approved varieties. Mr. Bigelow prefers planting in the spring, but Mr. Smith is planting this fall. Which is right? Mr. J. W. Borden purchased a farm adjoining his father's this spring, and planted a number of acres with apple trees."

"These are a few of the new orchards, and there is scarcely an old one that is not being enlarged; fully double as many trees have been planted this year as were growing the year previous, and if we keep on doubling the area of our orchards yearly, the valley will soon be a magnificent orchard from end to end, and, in another decade, we shall have the 1,000,000 barrels for which there is already room in the English market, and, with ocean steamers loading at Kingsport and at Horton Landing next season, when our wharf will be built, the freight and expenses should be reduced one-half."

I may say here that Annapolis Royal has already a deep water pier and frost proof warehouse constructed specially for the shipment of fruit on the London market.

"The yield of our orchards this year will fall short of the immense crop of '86 at least one-third, but the quality is superior and the price one dollar a barrel higher, so that the returns will fully equal those of last year. Gravensteins sold last year for \$1.50; this year the price for the Boston market and in Halifax was \$2 to \$3. Other varieties were sold for \$2 and \$2.50, and latest quotations from London range from 14 to 16 shillings for Greenings and Baldwins up to as high as 20 shillings for Ribbons."

"Prices.—The prices of all farm products are good, and everything manufactured much cheaper in proportion than the produce of the farm, and this happy state of affairs must bring prosperity to our farmers, and hence to all classes who are more or less dependent on the farmer. Hay is worth \$9 to \$12; beef, \$5 to \$8; oats, 40 to 50 cents; apples, \$1 to \$3; butter and eggs, 18 to 25 cents; potatoes, Chillis are being shipped at Wolfville for Bermuda at 40 cents, and I have no doubt 50 cents will be paid for them to go to Montreal and United States."

The next is the report of the Yarmouth County Society, and you know there are a great many men in Yarmouth supporting the opposite side of the House, and surely they would not report anything but what was true. With reference to the exhibition the report says:

"Fruit was very fine, but there were not as many entries as in 1886, there being 199 as against 245 last year. Had all our growers contributed as they might, we would have had such an exhibit as would have surprised our neighbors from Annapolis. We are told by our fruit growers that it is useless to increase the apple crop, as we have no market; our answer to that is to cut out your soft fruit, graft the best kinds of hard and long keepers, and the day is not far distant when steamers will be at our wharves to carry the surplus stock to England or elsewhere."

"We confess that we were disappointed at the show of manufactured articles; while it is encouraging to be told that our mills are being run day and night to fill orders, that Montreal merchants are waiting for the Yarmouth tweeds; that the product of the cotton mill goes to every part of the Dominion; that the organ factory has 24 men at work and, in addition to supplying the local demand, is filling orders for Ontario; that the harness makers are so driven with custom work that they have not time to make a set of harness for exhibition, yet it is discouraging to those who have labored to aid in making a reputation for our county and exhibitions not to receive the hearty co-operation of the manufacturers."

"Among the few firms who always aid is 'The Burrell-Johnson Iron Co.;" this company has never allowed any demand upon their time to interfere with their making their annual show, and the large exhibit of new and improved stoves, filing as it did, about 200 feet in length, aided much to make our exhibition complete and attractive. We hope that our next exhibition will be a more complete illustration of our motto, 'Typical Industries'."

"Your committee is of the opinion that fisheries had better be eliminated from the prize list. Under the head special, we find evidence of thought and inventive genius. Mr. Sherman and Mr. Grant both exhibit agricultural implements, which are adapted to the use of farmers, and, if some capitalist would co-operate with such men, there might be another workshop established which would furnish employment, and keep more of our young men at home."

I do not think there is anything very discouraging in those reports that would warrant any gentleman in saying there was a necessity for some heroic measure, if we wish to save Canada from being ruined. Now, perhaps, hon. gentlemen opposite will contend that I have not given sufficient proof to support my contention that there is considerable progress down there. Well, I can give them the further proof. I can give them the speeches of the Lieutenant Governors of Nova Scotia, from 1883 to the present, and every speech is redolent of the fact that the people in the Maritime Provinces are progressing in agriculture. In 1883 the Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia said:

"I congratulate you on the progress of the Province during the last year. The conditions of trade have steadily improved throughout the world, and the industries of Nova Scotia have enjoyed a fair share of the prosperity thus created."

Some hon. gentlemen are not content, when they are in the cold shades of Opposition, that a fair share of trade and progressiveness should be enjoyed by the country. They want to go in leaps and bounds, to use the language of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and I will show that hon. gentleman in a few moments in what way the farmers of Prince Edward Island have progressed by leaps and bounds. I will show him that their progress in agriculture has been healthy and steady up to the present time, notwithstanding any assertion of his to the contrary. The Lieutenant Governor continues as follows:—

"An abundant harvest, fortunately combined with a brisk and steady market for agricultural produce, has made the year one of more than usual prosperity to that great body of the people which is engaged in agricultural pursuits. During the year a special branch of this industry—for which our western valley is peculiarly fitted—has been placed on a footing which warrants the belief that, in the future, the produce of the orchard will form an important feature in our provincial exports. In this branch of agricultural industry the Province has no reason to fear competition from any quarter."

And it was in 1883 the Americans thought fit to take off their duty on this particular branch of agriculture, but, notwithstanding that, there has not been any greater trade with the United States than there was formerly. In fact, I think the contrary is the case, and that the increase of trade has been with England. Then, speaking of the progress of the fishery business, he says:

"I am glad to be able to inform you that the fishery—another of our leading industries—has, on the whole, been attended with success during the past year."

And this is put in the mouth of the Lieutenant Governor by a Grit Government. The Lieutenant Governor says further:

"It is with much pleasure I am able to inform you of the great development of the mining interests during the year. A brisk demand for the produce of the collieries has swollen the output of coal beyond that of any former year, and, from the preparations that are being made at the various mines, we may anticipate satisfactory results from the operations of the year upon which we have entered. The development of a business which not only affords employment to the large classes employed in mining and in shipping, but at the same time contributes to swell our local revenues, is well worthy of our fostering care and attention."

I wonder what developed that coal trade in Nova Scotia, if it was not the National Policy. Then I have extracts from the speeches of the Lieutenant Governor in 1884, 1885, 1886 and 1887 which I will hand to the reporter, as I do not wish to weary the House with reading them.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman proposes to hand in his extracts to the *Hansard* reporters. That would be establishing a very vicious practice, one which was objected to the other evening. I am not objecting to the hon. gentleman more than to any other hon. gentleman, but I wish simply to state that an understanding was arrived at long ago not to allow this practice, which would be very mischievous. In a discussion of this kind, we would have no means of knowing what the extracts contained, and no opportunity, when listening to the hon. gentleman, of answering what he has not seen fit to read.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course if the objection is taken, it is well taken. Of course it is contrary to the practice of Parliament for hon. gentlemen to hand in extracts of that kind. They should be read if they are to be put in *Hansard*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). We did last year, in one or two cases, allow tabulated statements to be handed in to the *Hansard* reporter by the hon. the Minister of Finance, but on these occasions the statements could not be intelligently followed if read, and it was thought necessary to have them printed. That rule would not apply to extracts generally.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). If the hon. gentleman had been in his seat at the time, he would have heard that it was at the request of an hon. member on the opposite side that I thought of putting the papers in the hands of the *Hansard* reporters. I will, however, proceed to read them. In 1884 the Lieutenant Governor made the following speech:

"I congratulate you that we meet under circumstances which claim the expression of our gratitude as a people to the Supreme Governor of the Universe."

"The year has been one of gratifying activity in many of the branches of industry in which our population is engaged. If the commercial outlook for the moment is less satisfactory than might be desired, we may reasonably hope that by the exercise of that industry and prudence which so largely characterise our people, the prosperity of the Province will be fairly maintained."

I have not the extracts of 1885, but the speech then was of the same congratulatory nature. In 1886, the Grit Government of Nova Scotia put in the mouth of the Lieutenant Governor a speech of which this is an extract:

"A more than usually favorable season enabled our farmers to gather an abundant harvest. The output of our coal mines was but little less
Mr. MILLS (Annapolis).

than that of the previous year and the product of our gold mines was larger than for many years before.

"I notice with pleasure that the important industry of fruit growing is receiving increased attention. Efforts which have been made during the year to establish and extend the reputation of our fruit in the markets of the mother country have met with gratifying success; collections of the products of our orchards were placed in competition with those of other countries and won the highest praise."

In 1886, this was placed in the mouth of the Lieutenant Governor:

"The varied industries of our Province were prosecuted during the past year with considerable vigor, and the results in some departments were highly satisfactory. The agriculturists, who form the largest part of our population, were favored with a good season and an abundant harvest."

"Our fishermen were fairly rewarded. Mining operations have been extensively carried on and the outlook for the present year is encouraging."

"I notice with pleasure increased activity in gold mining operations. Old districts are being extensively worked, new ones are being opened up in several sections of the Province, and there are many indications that practical miners and capitalists have great confidence in the gold mines of Nova Scotia as a field for industry and investment."

Then there is the following extract from the speech of the Lieutenant Governor in 1888:—

"In welcoming you to the scene of your legislative duties, I am glad to be able to congratulate you on the fair measure of prosperity enjoyed by your Province during the past year, while in some quarters exceptional conditions have operated unfavorably, as a rule the labors of our people, in the various branches of industry, have been remunerative, and there has been an improvement in business which, it is hoped, will continue."

"I have particular pleasure in calling attention to the activity that prevailed in mining, an industry of great importance not only because of the capital and labor engaged in it, but also because of its value as a contributor to our provincial revenues."

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, the same kind of an address was placed in the mouth of the Lieutenant Governor of Prince Edward Island in 1886. He said:

"It is most gratifying to observe the steady progress that is being made by the Province in agriculture, stock-raising and other industrial pursuits. This advancement was well evidenced at the exhibition which took place last autumn. A wider field for competition will shortly be afforded at the Colonial Exhibition which opens in London next month, and in which I am pleased to know this Province will participate."

And here is an extract from the *Monetary Times* of February, 1886, which shows the condition of Prince Edward Island:

"The figures for Prince Edward Island are very striking. If statistics can be relied on the trade of the Island must be in an uncommonly healthy position."

Is not this a direct contradiction to what we have heard from some hon. members from Prince Edward Island, and from the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and from the members of the Opposition generally who have spoken on this. These are not my assertions, though I know them to be true, but I take them from the mouths of their own friends, from the mouths of the Grit Governments, the Grit farmers, the Grit manufacturers of Yarmouth, because that statement was accepted by the Agricultural Society of Yarmouth, and that constituency sent an hon. member here on the other side of the House with a majority of 500 or 600, and it was about the same for the hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Borden). So, out of their own mouths I have convicted them. A great deal has been said about the population of Nova Scotia and of the Maritime Provinces generally. I contend that the population of the Maritime Provinces has increased in a much larger proportion than the population of the New England States, and I have statistics here to show that that is true, and these statistics have not been controverted. From the years 1830-31 to 1881, we will see what the increase was in those fifty years in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island. In 1830-31, those States had a population of 1,953,717, and in 1881 a population of 4,010,026 or an increase in 50 years of 2,056,309. Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island had a population in 1831 of 1,065,215, and in 1881 of

4,141,424, or an increase in 50 years of 3,076,209. The New England States had doubled in that time while the population of Canada had quadrupled. Perhaps some hon. gentleman will say that is not a fair comparison. We will divide the States and compare Maine with the Maritime Provinces. In 1831 Maine had a population of 399,455, and in 1881 of 648,436, or an increase of 248,981 in 50 years. The population of the Maritime Provinces in 1830-31 amounted to 275,379, and in 1881 to 869,495, an increase of 584,116. Maine in 50 years had increased 62 per cent. while the Maritime Provinces had increased 212 per cent. in the same time. Then, if you take Maine and compare it with New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, for 20 years from 1860-61 to 1881, you will find that Maine in 1860-61 had a population of 628,279, and in 1887 a population of 648,436, an increase of 20,157 in 20 years. New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in 1860-61 had a population of 582,940, and in 1881 of 761,714, an increase of 178,774. Maine which 20 years ago had 45,000 more people than New Brunswick and Nova Scotia combined, now has 113,000 less, and in that has increased only 3 per cent. while New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have increased 30 per cent. I could make another comparison between Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont, and Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. The former increased 33 per cent. between 1860 and 1880 while the latter Provinces increased 169 per cent. in the same 20 years. Does that not show that we are increasing fairly in proportion with the rest of the countries of the world? I say that we are, and that, in view of these facts, we can only come to the conclusion that it is a bit of political pettifogging which brings forward this resolution. I say that my constituency, like the constituency indicated by the report of the Agricultural Society of King's County which I have just read, would like a reciprocity treaty with the United States, but they see that it is utterly impossible to get a reciprocity treaty. They know, and every sensible man knows, that nothing short of annexation will give us a reciprocity treaty with the United States. The United States people, and the United States papers, and the United States politicians all say the same thing, which was conveyed in the coarse language of Senator Frye, "Conquest I know, annexation I know, but what the hell is commercial union," or unrestricted reciprocity? They know very well what it would be to come over with sword and bullet and wrest our fair Canada from us, and join us to them body and soul, but they know nothing of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. Have not hon. gentlemen tried time and again to get a fair system of trade with the United States? Did not the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when leader of the Government, assert upon the floor of this House that time and again we have been knocking at the doors of the United States for fair reciprocal trade and have been refused? Have we not now, and have had ever since 1879, a standing offer upon our Statute-book for a fair reciprocal trade with our American neighbors? And did not Sir Charles Tupper, during the late fishery negotiations at Washington, offer to treat respecting our trade relations on a broad basis?—but was refused. Has not the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) often asserted that it was not the proper thing for us to go cringing to these people, asking for commercial favors? We all know that it is impossible, in any department of life, to get anything if you go humbly cringing and kissing the feet of the party of whom you want a favor. It would be a nice thing, I admit, if the amendment of the senior member for Halifax could be realised. The shipping of our Province would be benefited by it, there is not a doubt about that. But how are you going to get it? It puts me in mind of a little boy that had been trying to take charge of his mother's house. He found

that he could not take charge, and he received a spanking and was set back in the chair where the rays of the moon came in through the window. He thinks of nothing else until he sees the rays of the moon. Then he commences to blubber and says: "Mother, give me the moon to play with." The hon. gentleman's resolution, asking the United States for reciprocal coasting trade without annexation, is like the boy asking his mother for the moon to play with. Therefore, I shall not vote in favor of that amendment, neither shall I vote in favor of the resolution, but I shall record my vote in favor of the amendment of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. ELLIS. The country the hon. gentleman has described is one of the most beautiful on the face of the globe. It is fertile and productive in every way; but still the hon. gentleman says that a treaty would be desirable. He does not deny that, he cannot deny that. But, Sir, I regret to find that the fertility of the soil and the genialty of the climate do not touch the hon. gentleman himself. In the list of articles that he mentions, which the poor man need not use, he includes a number of things which I think any man might expect to use. Musical instruments, the hon. gentleman says, the poor man may do without. He would not like the poor man to have Christmas cards, and a variety of other things. I take it that anything that a rich man might use in this country a poor man might have too. I do not understand why the poor man should come between the hon. gentleman and his nobility. What is he doing but drawing a line between the rich and the poor, providing that a certain line of articles can be used by the rich from which the poor shall be excluded? I think that is the absolute re-ult of the hon. gentleman's argument. Now I wish to deal with this question without reference to personalities, as it affects the Province of New Brunswick from which I come. Most of the hon. gentlemen who have discussed this question seem to assume that the Province of Ontario was the whole of this Confederation; they seem to have lost sight entirely of the fact that nearly 900,000 people live east of the confines of Quebec. We have heard a good deal about the Ontario farmer, as if, provided that the Ontario farmer was happy, all the rest of the country must be happy too. Now, I will endeavor to show the House that that is not the case. I shall use official statistics, so far as they may be reliable. I have been consulting the statistics of Canada for 20 years. Last evening, I found out in this House that probably the American statistics were more reliable; however, I have taken Canadian statistics, and I will take my stand upon them. I do not present these figures for the purpose of showing any difference between the National Policy and the policy which preceded it. But this fact does come out, that for 11 years after New Brunswick and Nova Scotia entered the Confederation, the balance of trade, that is to say, the trade of the world in which we were concerned, was in our favor, as we were able to import more goods for consumption than we exported.

FIRST PERIOD—1868 TO 1878 INCLUSIVE.

UPPER PROVINCES.	Exports.	Entered for consumption	Imports.
	\$	\$	\$
Ontario	255,837,000	298,764,000	408,779,000
Quebec	417,975,000	435,803,000	444,221,000
	673,812,000	824,567,000	853,000,000

Surplus entered for consumption over exports. \$160,755,000
do imports over exports 180,188,000

MARITIME PROVINCES.	Exports.	Entered for Consumption.	Imports.
Nova Scotia	\$ 75,629,000	\$103,038,000	\$110,802,000
New Brunswick	64,488,000	89,082,000	90,204,000
Prince Edward Island	7,318,000	7,957,000	7,866,000
	\$147,415,000	\$200,057,000	\$208,872,000
Surplus entered for consumption over exports.....		\$52,642,000	
do imports over exports.....		61,157,000	
New Brunswick, exports	\$64,488,000		
do imports		90,204,000	
		\$25,736,000	

In other words, we are able to buy in the markets of the world \$61,000,000, representing the surplus of our imports over our exports. Take the case of New Brunswick alone. We exported \$64,000,000 worth, and we imported \$90,000,000 worth, leaving a balance in our favor of \$25,000,000. Take the second period:

SECOND PERIOD.

UPPER PROVINCES.	Exports.	Entered for Consumption.	Imports.
Ontario	\$166,815,000	\$359,871,000	\$346,964,000
Quebec	261,938,000	384,593,000	425,566,000
	\$628,753,000	\$704,264,000	\$772,530,000
Surplus entered for consumption over exports.....		\$ 76,511,000	
do imports over exports		143,777,000	

The surplus of goods entered for consumption in that period of nine years, the second period, from 1878 to the close of the last fiscal year, by the Upper Provinces, over exports was \$76,511,000 and over imports \$143,777,000. Look now at the Maritime Provinces and see how we were affected by this condition of affairs. The figures for the Maritime Provinces are as follows:

MARITIME PROVINCES.	Exports.	Entered for Consumption.	Imports.
Nova Scotia	\$ 77,323,000	\$ 69,284,000	\$ 74,391,000
New Brunswick	59,876,000	53,892,000	52,792,000
Prince Edward Island	14,195,000	7,192,000	6,926,000
	\$151,194,000	\$129,988,000	\$134,110,000
Less entered for consumption as against exports.....		\$21,205,000	
do imports as against exports		17,084,000	
New Brunswick, exports	\$59,876,000		
do imports		52,792,000	
Less imports		\$6,984,000	

Prince Edward Island, the position of which is far worse than that of any of the Provinces, exported \$14,195,000 and entered for consumption \$7,102,000, importing only \$6,926,000. The totals for the Maritime Provinces were: exports, \$151,194,000; home consumption, \$129,988,000; imports, \$134,110,000; less entered for consumption as against exports, \$21,205,000; as against imports, \$17,084,000. The effect of this is that, while during eleven years we were able to buy largely in the markets of the world to the extent of our imports, in this later period we have not been able to do so, and so far as we are concerned the trade has been entirely lost. I take now the tonnage of ships. I will not say that the extinction of our tonnage is due to the National Policy, but I am entitled to point out that the condition of affairs in the country is such that it should engage the

Mr. ELLIS.

attention of the House, and while it is very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to come here and sing songs of rejoicing, they who do so know nothing about the condition of the Maritime Provinces. They take mere off-hand statements, but if they want to know the facts they must examine matters for themselves. A great deal has been said as to what happened under the Mackenzie Government. In 1873 the tonnage of New Brunswick was 277,000 tons. This amount increased during the term of the Mackenzie Government to 335,000 tons; in 1879 it reached its highest point 340,000 and it has since fallen to 255,000 tons. We built and registered in 1874, 42,000 tons of shipping; 1875, 33,000 tons; in 1886 we built and registered only 4,931 tons. The industry of ship-building was one of the great industries of New Brunswick. Nothing has taken its place. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) the other day, referring to the maritime shipping industry, made a statement to the effect that something like 100,000 tons of shipping were built in the Maritime Provinces. In New Brunswick alone we have built in times past in one year that much shipping. In 1864 the value of the ships we built, with their first freights, was \$3,900,000, representing over 90,000 tons, and that was in New Brunswick alone. The total decrease in the shipping of the Maritime Provinces last year was 40,000 tons. That is really a complete displacement of property. The value has so much decreased that it is almost impossible to give the property away. I do not, of course, mean to convey the idea that you cannot give property away, but the property has declined in value so that the owners are glad to obtain a very small proportion of its cost. Taking the low rate of \$20 a ton for 40,000 tons there appears to be a decrease of \$800,000. I recollect that sometime ago an estate, winding up in St. John, placed in the market ship property which cost at the very least \$100,000, and they were glad to obtain about \$20,000 for it and extend the payments over a very long period. I desire to call the attention of the House to a statement made by Mr. Fairweather, with respect to losses sustained in the shipping industry. He is probably known to many members, he is a prominent Conservative, a member of the Board of Trade, and a man of undoubted character, and any certificate I could give him would be unnecessary. Mr. Fairweather, in enumerating the causes of the difficulties that have come upon the Province of New Brunswick, says:

"Unremunerative shipping property—310,000 tons is about New Brunswick's amount. This at a cost value (low enough) of \$30 per ton comes to the sum of \$9,300,000. In years past the yield from vessel property was 20 per cent. I place it at 10 per cent. annual return on the investment and find that a sum of \$930,000 per annum came to us in St. John from our ships and vessels in prosperous years. At present profits are almost nil, or say not much over a fourth or a fifth of the above sum."

He further says:

"Our ship-building—I pause before the magnitude of the loss we have sustained in the decadence of this industry. Within my recollection I believe there have been times when from 75 to 100 ships of an average of 500 tons (many 1,000 tons and larger) were in course of construction in a radius 50 miles of St. John. You can estimate what the number is to-day and the loss of employment and the non-circulation of money which is involved. What class of the people of this country was not benefited by our ship-building trade? We cannot name a class that was not advantaged directly or indirectly thereby. If I ask you to set down for yourselves what you may think is a sum correctly representing our annual loss through the decline of ship-building it is because I am unable to form an estimate that at all satisfies me of its correctness."

Mr. Fairweather estimated the loss of ship-building to St. John at not less than \$1,000,000 a year. It is impossible for an industry to decline to such an extent without having an effect upon the population. I desire to call the attention of the House to the matter of population, although I know hon. gentlemen opposite do not like it, and although I may say with respect to this matter of population in this country there has always been a kind of feeling that the country ought to have more people and would have more people than it really has had or than it will have within a

period which any man can imagine. I remember, Sir, in 1862 when the Intercolonial delegates were in England that they told the Colonial Secretary in the State paper which they laid before the Colonial Office, that in 25 years the population of the old Provinces alone would be somewhere between 12,000,000 and 15,000,000 of people. That was in 1862, and I do not think, Sir, we have more than 4,800,000 to-day. Now, take the entire population of our Province. In 1851 it was 193,800, and it had increased 25·84 per cent. from 1840. Between 1851 and 1861 it increased 30·05, in 1871 it reached 285,000, and in 1881 it was only 321,233, a gain of but 12·44 per cent. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the decline in the percentage of our population are to be dated from the time that we entered Confederation. It is impossible to say at this moment whether there is any increase in the Province of New Brunswick in the period since the last census was taken to the present time. We have no Government statistics, and the only way you can reach any idea whatever in regard to the population is from the school returns. The total number of children at school in 1880 was 69,000, and in 1887 we find from the returns just submitted to the Provincial Legislature that it was 68,583 or a decline of 1,009. These are the official figures. I do not say you can draw from this any inference either one way or the other, as there may be circumstances which would prevent in one year a larger attendance or as large an attendance of children as in another. They seem to me to show at any rate that there is no increase of population at all. Taking each period for which we have actual census returns by counties the population of the Province increased some 36,000, I think it is, and nearly one-half of the increase is in three counties alone. The county of Carleton (N.B.) represented by my friend on the left, and the county of Victoria, represented by the Minister of Inland Revenue, rich and fertile counties, have increased their population, but that increase of population and the wealth growing in that community, is due, I take it, largely to the fact that there is an excellent underground system of railways with the States. These counties lie alongside the American border, and they have opportunities there for trading with the States on the principles of unrestricted reciprocity, of which some gentlemen are so much afraid. In no other counties of the Province has there been such a large increase of population; except in Westmoreland, where it increased 8,000. This is a good agricultural county represented by a gentleman who spoke last night. But, Sir, the main reason for the increase in that county is that the Intercolonial Railway works are there. A large amount of public money has been spent there, and the spending of that money in the county has as much influence, I take it, as anything else in increasing the population. In addition to that, there is a large number of Acadians in the population, and I think they do not move as much as the people of English birth. The county of Albert, represented by an hon. gentleman who is not now in his seat, had a population of 10,000 and it increased only 1,500. In the city of St. John, which I represent here, the population has fallen off, and it was inevitable that the population of the city of St. John should decrease. It was 28,805 in 1871, and the decrease in the business of the city has reduced the population by 2,700. There is a slight increase in the county, but the whole increase in the city and county of St. John where there were 52,100 people in 1871 amounts only to such an extent as to give a population of 52,900 in the year 1881. That represents the entire increase in one of the first commercial counties on the Atlantic coast of Canada. Now, Sir, what earthly use is it for hon. gentlemen who represent the Province of Ontario, hon. gentlemen who represent the Province of Quebec to get up in this House and tell us that the condition of things is perfectly satisfactory. Have those gentlemen no interest in the Maritime Provinces?

Have they not a common feeling with us? Have they no desire to make us feel that we are part of the country? I would ask the hon. gentlemen to take the matter home to themselves and consider the condition of things as it stands with us. In the county of Sunbury, one of the finest agricultural counties in the Province, situated on the banks of a noble river, and where there is excellent land, there is no reason in the world why the community should not have increased in population if there was a fair opportunity for the people to dispose of their products. But the farmer has no opportunity. He has to leave his house and home, and I know numbers of places, Sir, in various parts of the Province of New Brunswick where people have left their houses untenanted and unoccupied. I have myself taken refuge in them when on fishing excursions, and somehow like the old stories in the fable it looked as if we might expect the master of the house to return at any moment. The county of Queen's had a population of 13,847 in 1871, and that, Sir, is a fine county, just as fine as the county of Sunbury, with a large water board, as it is situated on a great lake and on the river St. John. Its population in 1881 was 14,000, or an increase of about 100 in ten years for one of the finest counties that we can meet with anywhere in Canada. Perhaps it is not as fine as the county represented by my hon. friend who spoke last and which county possesses peculiar excellence, but I do not see where we can get a much better county.

Mr. GILLMOB. Have you got the returns for Charlotte there?

Mr. ELLIS. I think Charlotte ought to have increased, as the opportunities for smuggling are as great there as in any other county. In 1871 the population of Charlotte was 25,882, and it had increased only to 26,000 in 1887 or about 200. I do not care to particularise that county, but it, too, has opportunities of very great excellence. It seems to me that there is no reason whatever if there was any opportunity for the people to encourage trade why the population should not increase. But, Sir, the population goes away. The people are to be found in all parts of the United States. Hon. gentlemen come here and give disquisitions about people moving westward; but they are to be found in all parts of the United States. You can find many of them in the New England States. In Boston there are more of our people from New Brunswick to-day than there are in Fredericton, the capital of the Province. Now, Sir, that is not a state of things which ought to be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite. Probably some one may get up and explain it away, and may think it is all right, but I tell you it is not all right. This condition of things is producing dissatisfaction in the Province and it will have the effect either of taking the Province out of Confederation altogether or causing the Government to do something to stop the evil. There is nothing more appalling than to take up the census of Canada and see what a large number has left the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) read a paper, showing that in 1853 or some other year there was a great exodus, and argued from that fact that the same thing was going on every year; and the next moment he turned around and showed from a speech made by Mr. Howe that there was no exodus at all. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) the other evening had to admit that men who had the benefit of the highest education we could give them left us. Well, Sir, if we cannot keep the educated men in the country, what is the use of keeping the country together? What is a country for if not for its people? I do not say that there are not always people moving about over the earth, particularly with the facilities we have to-day; but when such an immense number leave the country as are going now, you are face to face with a fact that should arrest the attention of the Government at once. Taking the United States census of 1880, and looking at the selected

occupations, I find that among the Canadians in the United States there are 2,617 engaged in school teaching, 930 clergymen, 559 lawyers—I suppose they can be well spared—and 1,352 official employes of the Government of the United States—and, I presume, of the States' Governments about as many as we have in Ottawa. There are 2,219 iron—and steel workers from Canada in the United States. When is the iron policy we adopted the other day going to bring these people back? There are 5,570 Canadians engaged as official employes of the railroads in the United States. I will not pursue that branch of the subject any further; I merely call the attention of the House to the facts, and I leave hon. gentlemen to draw their own inferences. Now, I would like to ask hon. members who have discussed this question if they can suggest any idea as to how the trade we have lost is to be restored to us. Mr. Fairweather undertook to show that there was a Canadian trade—a trade with the Upper Provinces. The figures have been referred to before. I do not know under which king to serve; but the hon. Minister of Marine the other night got up and said that Mr. Longley stated in Halifax that there was a trade of \$12,000,000, that the Upper Provinces sent goods to that value to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. My hon. friend from Annapolis stated to-night that Mr. Longley said nothing of the kind, but went through his county and declared that there was no trade at all. I do not know which of these gentlemen is the more truthful; I do not know either very well.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I rise to an explanation. What I said was that Mr. Longley went through my county and stated that the Maritime Provinces had nothing to send to Quebec and Ontario, but that they were flooded with Montreal and Quebec drummers—

Mr. KIRK. That is true.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis)—and that we were purchasing \$12,000,000 of goods from those people.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman certainly did not make that explanation in that way before. However, as long as we can get two gentlemen on that side to agree, we have something accomplished. Mr. Fairweather was very anxious to show that for the loss of trade that had occurred a trade had grown up, and I believe that his statement was correct, so far as I can judge from the figures. He claimed that the Maritime Provinces sent \$4,270,000 worth of goods to the Upper Provinces, and he gives a statement of how he makes up that amount. He says, for instance, that we sent \$1,695,000 worth of sugar. Well, Sir, we do not produce sugar; we do not grow sugar. That is no export from the Maritime Provinces. It is true, the sugar may come in there and be manipulated, or it may be simply carried over the railways for the benefit of the dealer in Montreal; but the amount of profit our people can make on it is exceedingly small; in fact, I think there is no profit at all. I recollect that last year a sugar refinery in Westmoreland got into difficulty with its creditors, and they had to take payment for its debt in the stock of the company. Then, we sent to the upper provinces, \$474,000 worth of iron. I do not know whether it was Londonderry iron or not, but it did not go from the Province of New Brunswick. \$760,000 worth of coal was sent, which did not go from the Province of New Brunswick, because we do not produce any coal. \$750,000 worth of cotton was sent. None of these things are produced in the Province of New Brunswick. Mr. Fairweather goes through a number of items in the same way; but I have gone carefully over the list and I cannot find more than \$300,000 worth of goods that have gone from New Brunswick to Ontario and Quebec, and even that, I think, is a large estimate. A portion of that amount represents fish, and that trade has not been a profitable one. Then

Mr. ELLIS.

Mr. Fairweather undertook to show that there were \$12,000,000 worth of goods came from the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec to the Maritime Provinces, and he calculated that of this, \$3,150,000 was food in various forms—flour and oatmeal I presume. What effect would a reciprocity treaty with the United States have upon this? I presume it would have no effect. I presume it would make no difference to you if we bought the same amount from Ontario and Quebec, whether there was reciprocity or not. But if you argue that reciprocity would take that trade away from you, then it is clear that we are being taxed on \$3,150,000 worth of food. Now we have a great regard for you, but we do not care to pay a tax on the food you send us. Then there is \$2,000,000 worth of clothing sent from Montreal, and a considerable amount in other articles. With regard to the trade in boots and shoes, \$2,000,000 worth came to us from Ontario and Quebec. Well, before we had that trade with Ontario and Quebec we made our own boots and shoes. There were then shoe factories in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in a most flourishing condition, and whatever the reason may be, I do not pretend to say, but certainly all these factories, with one exception, are closed. That is a position of things which is neither gratifying nor satisfactory. So with regard to clothing. A few years ago, we made all our own clothing, but now the trade has passed into your hands. Is it a profitable trade to you? I think not. Any one who knows anything about the trade knows that many who have been engaged in it have been obliged to close out without meeting their liabilities. The conditions of trade have been such that the entire trade has not been profitable, and Mr. Fairweather himself does not say it is profitable; he only hopes it will become profitable. There is a long course of carriage, and the fact of it is that within the last five years the failures in the Province of Nova Scotia alone have amounted to \$8,750,000, and the assets are not the quarter that amount. That is due to the fact that we have lost a remunerative trade and are not able to keep up a trade which is unremunerative. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries called attention to the business done in the sugar trade. Now, I do not know anything of the profits made on sugar, but I know that so far as the great bulk of raw sugar for the Montreal refineries in the Upper Provinces is concerned, it does not pass over our railways, but is landed at Portland or Boston and carried thence over railways to Montreal. The hon. gentleman laid great stress on the benefit that arose from the fact that these goods came in the way they do. But I take it, the profits to our shipping on the carriage of the goods if they came from England—and I presume our ships could carry clean sugar as cheaply as raw sugar—would be greater, and, so far as the railways are concerned, it makes not the slightest difference to them whether they carry clean or unwashed sugar. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in endeavoring to make a statement with regard to the trade of the country, called attention to the registered tonnage. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Welsh) also dealt with that subject, but I would like to call your attention, Sir, for one moment to the condition of things in that regard. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries produced a statement of the registered tonnage arriving and departing from our ports, and he said it showed an increase between 1880 and 1887, on an average, of 3,000,000 tons a year. Now, when a Minister of the Crown undertakes to make a comparative statement he ought to be fair in his statement, and I regret the hon. gentleman is not here when I call the attention of the House to his unfairness. He took the short period from 1875 to 1879, in which there were two very poor years, so as to bring his average up to 3,000,000 of an increase. If, however, he had taken instead any corresponding period of years, if he had taken the years from 1870 and made a comparison he would have reduced his average by three-quarters

of a million. But, the hon. gentleman asked in a very jaunty manner: "What have these vessels been doing?" Do they come in and go out, he asked, just for the mere fun of the thing. Well, in the year 1875, when the amount of tonnage was comparatively small as contrasted with other years, there were 9,537,000 tons entered inwards and outwards, there was brought into the country \$201,000,000, worth of goods. Now, I do not say that all these goods were brought by vessels. Of course the railroad did a part of the work, but last year when the tonnage was 14,000,000 there were only \$202,000,000 worth brought in. So that the hon. gentleman's figures really prove nothing, so far as the trade is concerned, because they are made up of vessels entering into and departing from our ports. I find on examination of the figures, which the hon. gentleman gave, that the lake tonnage of 1870 was 5,510,000 tons; in 1871 it was 7,310,000; in 1872, 6,320,000; and in 1887, 5,169,000 tons, or 2,000,000 less in 1887 than in 1881, showing a constant decline since 1871 in the lake tonnage of Ontario. In the Province of Quebec the following is a statement of the vessels entered in and out:—

In 1884.....	8,207,000
1887.....	2,993,000

In British Columbia :

In 1885.....	1,187,000
Last year.....	1,185,000

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Welsh) partly suggested an explanation of this, but at the port of St. John, and others in the Maritime Provinces there are steamers engaged in carrying people away from all parts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to the United States. Undoubtedly these vessels carry freight, but their principal business is in carrying passengers. The tonnage of foreign steamers which entered the port of St. John in 1887 was 270,175. About one-third of the whole shipping that entered the port of St. John was foreign steamers. I do not know that we had any foreign steamers except American steamers, with the exception perhaps of one Spanish vessel. I find also that the totals for the last two years for Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island have increased very much, and the explanation of that is that the fishing vessels we compel to enter inwards and outwards but do not allow to trade, go to swell up these returns; so I think there is nothing whatever in the statement the hon. gentleman made in regard to the increase of trade. In addition to the decline of trade, the taxation of the country has increased. I know that hon. gentlemen do not like to hear anything about the fact of the increase of taxation, but you, Sir, can easily understand that, with a population that does not increase, with a declining trade, taxation becomes more heavy on those who remain. I remember in 1867, when the Hon. Mr. Tilley, who was afterwards Minister of Finance and is now the Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, undertook to persuade us into Confederation, he told us :

"There would be no increase of taxation; the Canadian tariff would not necessarily be introduced into New Brunswick. In a few days he would publish an estimate showing that the expense of the Confederation would not exceed \$11,000,000, which was about equal to \$2.75 per head of the whole population. He would put it forth to the world and defy successful contradiction."

And again :

"They would fully meet the entire expenses of the Federal Government by a tariff of only \$2.75 per head on the population."

Well, the interest on the debt alone now is about \$2.70 a head, so that the amount which the hon. gentleman stated would be sufficient for all the purposes of Confederation is now taken up by the payment on the public debt. In 1867, the gross debt of the Province of New Brunswick was \$5,923,000, or about \$20 a head on the people, taking the

assumed population of 1867. From the figures submitted here, the present debt is \$48 a head. Making a calculation as near as I can, I think the share of our net debt chargeable to that Province will be about \$16,000,000. In addition to that we have the provincial debt, which would bring it to about \$17,500,000, the annual charge for which would be about \$900,000, against \$330,000, when we closed our provincial accounts and entered into Confederation. There is no objection to a debt if you are able to pay, but we are not able to bear the burden the debt imposes upon us, and we are scarcely able to meet the payment to-day of even the smaller burden of the debt with which we went into Confederation. The consequence is that a chronic state of dissatisfaction has grown up in the Province of New Brunswick.

Mr. KIRK. And Nova Scotia.

Mr. ELLIS. My hon. friend says it is the same in Nova Scotia. I know every part of New Brunswick, and I am satisfied as to the feelings of the people in regard to that matter. It is true, when an election is to be run, that a gentleman may be sent to support the Government, because the people take the condition of things existing, and make the best possible bargain they can. There is a constant effort on the part of the government—of any government—I do not desire to refer so much to the form or the individuality of the present Government, as I do to refer to things generally. I remember that last year Mr. Everett, whose seat is now occupied by my hon. friend here (Mr. Skinner) addressed a meeting in Carleton, where I live myself, which forms a part of the city of St. John, in February, and said :

"The people looked forward to the time when this would be the great winter port of Canada. Carleton offered grand facilities for the handling of freight, and in that part of the city necessary grain elevators and warehouses would be erected. In a year or fifteen months elevators would be seen on our harbor front, and steamers would be here taking in cargoes of grain for the mother country."

I live on that side of the harbor, and not far from the harbor front, but there was not a sign of the construction of a grain elevator there when I left to come here. On the day before the election, the Government organ, the *Sun*, said :

"We want elevators and other terminal facilities. We have asked for an engineer and the engineer has been sent."

The hon. the Minister of Public Works will understand that.

"If the Government is strong enough in the next House to defy Mr. Blake, all may be well."

The Government was strong enough to defy Mr. Blake, but, unfortunately for us, all is not well. But, however humiliating the spectacle may be of seeing the public men of the country going through the constituencies and promising at election times that this and that work shall be undertaken, it is far more humiliating to come to this Parliament and to hear these things thrown up to the Government and to hear them reproached not only with the fact that their pledges are unfulfilled but with the fact that they were made at all. If Mr. Fairweather's statement as to what we buy from the upper Provinces is correct, we have to get money somewhere to pay what we do pay. What is the condition of our foreign trade at the present time? Our foreign trade is principally carried on with Great Britain and the United States. In 1881, we sold to all the countries with which we dealt \$6,406,000, and in 1882, \$7,474,000. But there has been a decline, and in 1887 the Province of New Brunswick only sold \$6,149,000 worth, so that there has been a decline in our foreign trade since 1882 of more than \$1,300,000 worth. That is so far as our exports are concerned. Our imports are in the same condition. We imported in 1882, \$6,778,000 worth, and from that time to 1887, with the exception of one year, there has been a decline, and in 1887 the amount was \$5,653,000. Look at the movement of that trade. In 1881 we sold more than

half our exports to England. We sold \$3,265,000 out of a total of \$6,406,000. In the same year we sold to the United States \$2,324,000. Up to 1884, we sold in England a larger proportion of our goods, but there has been a steady decline until the amount has fallen from \$3,800,000 to \$2,600,000. On the other hand, our trade with the United States has increased until it has gone up from \$2,340,000 to \$3,118,000. As we do not sell so much in England, neither do we buy so much from that country; hon. gentlemen who are so very patriotic with regard to buying from the mother country ought to take up this matter and regulate it. They are face to face with the fact that in the important Province of New Brunswick, founded, as the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) said last night, by the United Empire Loyalists, trade has declined with Great Britain and has materially increased with the United States. Now, I would like to call attention for a moment to a peculiarity of our trade. The river St. John flows through American territory as well as through British territory. The dwellers on the upper portion of the river reside in the State of Maine, and they have the right, and it is proper that they should, to navigate the river, as every man should, living upon it, who pays his lot and part towards maintaining the works on the river. The people living on the American territory cut their logs—or rather we cut them for them, and they are rolled into the St. John River and floated down stream to the booms, 80 miles from the mouth, where they are collected indiscriminately, and the logs of my hon. friend on my right, if he were a lumberman, would float alongside of the logs of a man who might be an American. The people who are engaged in cutting, and the horses that are employed, often belong to New Brunswick, and we furnish the supplies to the lumbermen, but the American customs authority, as is probably perfectly right, makes a distinction between goods that are raised in Canada and goods that are produced in the United States. When these logs reach the mouth of the river they are sawn there. Now, I want to call the attention to this matter of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Porter) who, I am sorry to see, is not in his place, because he spoke the other night in a rather contemptuous way about the people of Canada being hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Americans; and I know that it would make his patriotic soul feel sad if he were to understand the condition of things in New Brunswick to-day. The principal industry at the mouth of the St. John River now is the manufacture of the American logs into lumber. The rate of duty charged in the United States on all our lumber is \$2 a thousand, but on the American log there is no duty, and gentlemen who are wrestling with the question of who pays the duty, may take this into their calculation. These logs, cut on American soil, were actually cut by our people for the American owner, and manufactured in the mills at the mouth of the river, and they enter the United States free of duty; but the man who may be fortunate enough, or unfortunate enough, to be a British subject, who owns a British mill, when his logs go into the United States, has to pay \$2 a thousand duty. Now, there is one thing sure—the New Brunswicker who puts lumber into the American market pays the duty in the first instance; whether he ever gets it back again I cannot tell. The practical result of this state of affairs at the mouth of the St. John River is that mills that years ago were built by British capital, and were employed in manufacturing lumber for the British market, have passed into the hands of Americans to-day, and the Canadian people are hewers of wood—or sawers of wood—and drawers of water for these Americans who own mills at the mouth of the river. I desire to call attention to the export of lumber from New Brunswick to the United States. As I said before, in the year 1881, the whole quantity of our exports to the United States, most of it lumber, amounted to \$2,334,000, and in the

Mr. ELLIS.

customs returns \$1,583,000 is put down as the product of New Brunswick, and \$750,000 as the product of the United States. We are compelled now to depend upon this trade largely, and the goods not the produce of New Brunswick have grown from \$750,000 to \$1,334,000 in the period between 1881 and 1887. What would be the effect under reciprocity? The discrimination between these goods would be swept away, and the Canadian lumber on the River St. John, no matter where the lumber was cut, would have the benefit of the market; the Canadian would be put on equal ground with the American. Now, the duty levied upon manufactured lumber amounts to about 35 per cent.; I think our lumbermen speak of it as about \$4 a thousand. We are compelled by the conditions of trade simply to cut the lumber up in the rough and sell it that way. What we want, and what we must have, by some means or other, is the lumber trade of the United States, that is, we will have to get the right in some way to get our lumber to the United States market after we manufacture it at home, not simply to take it away in the rough, and carry it, as you do sugar, with all its dirt and impurity. We want to profit from the product of our own labor upon this lumber before we carry it to the markets of the United States. Moreover, the trade which we do with other countries is declining, for a variety of reasons. At one time we carried on quite a trade in lumber along the Mediterranean and southern Atlantic ports, but the conditions have changed entirely, and we sell far less lumber in these ports. The lumber now required is served to the smaller ports of Italy, Spain and France, and is carried there in small steamers from the various forests of Europe, and that lumber is gradually driving our lumber entirely out of those markets. The trade we once did, to a considerable extent, with France, has gradually declined. In 1882 our exports to France were of the value of \$494,000—more being sent from New Brunswick than from any other Province; they have fallen to \$160,000. Our exports to Spain were of the value of \$98,000 in 1882, they have fallen to \$50,000; to Portugal, from \$38,600 to \$11,000. It is the same with different countries with which we do business. We have lost the trade, and we do not therefore obtain the profits. I desire to call attention to the changes that have taken place in our transatlantic shipments to Great Britain. I have a statement of the lumber trade of New Brunswick, and I may explain that part of this lumber may come from Nova Scotia, but that has been the case year after year and does not make a difference in the proportion. The lumber is brought in small vessels to St. John. In 1883, the shipments were 404,000,000 feet; in 1887, they had fallen to 257,000,000 feet; they have, in fact, fallen steadily; in 1883 there were 404,000,000 feet; 1884, 331,000,000; 1885, 289,000,000; 1886, 272,000,000; 1887, 252,000,000 feet. Thus it is apparent that the trade has decreased one-third, and it will steadily decrease, as we are not able to place the goods on the English market on as advantageous terms as our rivals, because the competition year by year from the ports in the Baltic, the wood of which is cheaper and more suitable and more rapidly transported. The statement was made by the American consul in St. John that we sent to the United States last year about fifty millions of lumber in the form of boards, laths, shooks, and short lumber, on which there was a duty paid of \$100,000. I do not know whether the consumer ever got it back or not, but I state the fact that it was paid; and as the Americans at the mouth of the river did not pay any duty, there is that much duty as against Canadians. Now, with regard to the condition of our export trade. The exports of the country are grouped together under the heads of mining, fishing, agricultural products, and so forth. I have prepared a statement showing each class, and I will summarise it. The total exports of New Brunswick, of

the mine, in 1887, amounted to \$132,016, of which we sent \$118,354 to the United States. Our total fish exports amounted to \$729,060, of which \$554,538 went to the United States. The products of the forest, \$4,498,572, of which \$1,812,529 went to the United States, and this item is growing constantly. The next item is products of the farm. Whatever may be said in regard to the question as to who pays the duty, we find this in New Brunswick, that we can do better by sending our farm products, and perhaps our fish as well, to places of exchange rather than to the places of consumption, because the goods we buy in exchange suit us better than if we were obliged to send our products to distant markets. The products of the farm amounted to \$101,164, of which \$96,115 went to the United States. Of animals and their products to the value of \$339,374, the United States took the value of \$336,566. Of our manufactures \$301,059, the United States took \$151,463. Under the head of miscellaneous, \$48,644, all practically was sent to the United States. What we, in St. John and New Brunswick maintain, is that if our markets were enlarged, if we got a better opportunity to extend our trade, this trade would increase. It is the only profitable trade we have. I desire to call the attention of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to a remark he made the other day with respect to protection afforded to exports of manufactures. If the hon. gentleman will look over the table of exports he will find that the manufactures that are exported are scarcely protected at all, in fact, that it is not our protective manufactures which are exported. The great bulk of our exports are exports manufactured from the raw materials of the country. In New Brunswick, for example, we export manufactures under the heading of hemlock bark, which is used in tanning. The lime and gypsum which we manufacture, the grindstones we make, the granite, we polish, all these are natural products of the country in a state of manufacture, and these are the goods we can sell. At the present time we dispose of them in the markets of the United States under very great disadvantage. If those markets were open to us there is practically no limit to the quantity we could send in there. Take the article of red granite, which is found extensively in a natural state in the Province, and particularly in the county of Charlotte. There is a heavy duty on the manufactured article entering the United States; the granite is of very little value in its raw state, it is the labor that gives it value. Our merchants are continually told that if there was some arrangement made by which they could get their goods into the American market on satisfactory terms they would be able to do practically an unlimited trade. As regards the trade of St. John, I have here a statement, which the American consul was so kind as to prepare, of the shipment to the United States from that port for the five years ending December, 1887:

1883—Produce not American	\$ 415,812 26
American lumber	816,870 48
Total	\$1,232,482 74
1884—Produce not American	\$ 411,318 19
American lumber	775,294 27
Total	\$1,186,612 46
1885—Produce not American	\$ 372,675 24
American lumber	1,062,490 27
Total	\$1,435,165 51
1886—Produce not American	\$ 461,728 79
American lumber	1,434,286 23
Total	\$1,896,015 02

1887—Produce not American	\$ 705,976 00
American lumber	1,263,714 23
Total	\$1,969,685 23
Gain	\$737,203 00

The trade, so far as regards the American lumber, is not one that we can control, as the land is probably cut over year by year and the limit of production will probably soon be reached; but there is no limit whatever, I repeat, to the increased products of New Brunswick if opportunity is given. Reference has been made to the old treaty. I desire to call attention to the fact that during the eleven years preceding reciprocity the value of exports from New Brunswick to the United States was \$2,300,000. During the eleven years of the operation of reciprocity the value was \$11,500,000. In 1854, the year before the treaty, it was \$480,000; in 1865, the last year of the treaty, the value was \$1,700,000. The fact is quite plain that the people of New Brunswick, remembering the advantages accruing from reciprocity, desire to again obtain a reciprocity treaty. But there was one peculiarity with regard to the treaty which has been referred to in our debate here. Our exports from the Province of New Brunswick increased to a large extent. In 1854 we sent out \$485,000 worth; in 1866, \$880,000 worth; in 1859 \$1,115,000; and in 1865, the last year of the treaty, \$1,800,000. But, Sir, the imports from the United States did not increase at all. In 1854 we brought in \$3,500,000 worth; next year the same; next year \$3,300,000 worth, and in 1865, the last year of the treaty, \$3,100,000, showing that there is ground and good ground for the complaint made by the American people that while the treaty opened to us the markets of the United States it did not give them a corresponding advantage in our market. I can expect, Sir, that some gentleman replying to me will confront me with the savings bank returns, as a proof of prosperity. The savings bank returns always do a great service to the Government. I would like somebody who understands this question better perhaps than I do, to look into those returns and see what they mean. One gentleman spoke about this money being laid up by the people and put in the banks. It is not in the banks. The people in their individual capacity have saved the money, and the people in their collective capacity use the money and have spent it. If the Government want to pay that money to the depositor they have to borrow it at its own expense. I took the trouble to look over the returns for last year, and I find that the money in the banks has as little existence as the gold in King Solomon's Mines of which that imaginative writer Rider Haggard tells us. The account last year was increased by \$1,322,000 of added interest. But do we earn that interest? Is it like money invested in any savings bank or institution where there is a direct return? We are simply increasing this by writing it on paper, and the moment we add to the principal we commence to add to the interest again, and so it goes on increasing. Fully one-third of the total interest is an amount which has no existence whatever, but is added by a stroke of the pen of a clerk in the Finance Department. Sir, the hon. gentleman who spoke last referred to the State of Maine, and it is quite a common thing to compare New Brunswick with the State of Maine. What are the facts in regard to that State. In the first place a man who leaves the State of Maine goes to another part of the United States and he is still bearing his share of the national burden, and does not escape. With regard to the movement of population from that State, any person who looks at history will remember that, during the war of the rebellion, the population of that country was disturbed and a large number of men went out from some States and have not come back again. Some left their bones on the field of battle, some

took situations in various other places, and such was the disturbance among the male population of the country that it has scarcely yet recovered. But the State of Maine notwithstanding the fact that it has only about double the population of New Brunswick has \$35,100,000 in its saving bank while Canada has only \$40,000,000. The State of Massachusetts which has not as large a population as Ontario, has could pay off the whole debt of Canada and have thirty or forty millions dollars left. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the savings banks and they seem to think it a great thing that the Government has left a small amount of money which they have not taken from the people by taxation. The sooner that saving bank business is looked fully in the face and the sooner the Government ceases to brag about it the better for the country. The State of Vermont in 1870 had \$2,300,000 in the savings bank; in 1886 it had \$11,700,000. You must understand that this money is invested in productive investments and it earns its own interest. It may not be as safe as in the hands of the Government of Canada, but I will not pronounce an opinion upon that. The State of New Hampshire, not a very remarkable State, had \$21,500,000 in the saving bank in 1870, and in 1886 in had \$47,000,000, or had more than doubled itself in that period. Now, as to the State of Rhode Island. I do not wish to refer particularly to this State because it is one of the richest States of the Union, and I can recollect the time when there was more gold and silver in Providence than there was in any other place of its size. Rhode Island, in 1870, had \$30,700,000 in the saving bank, and in 1886 \$51,800,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And what is the population?

Mr ELLIS. The population is 276,000, not as many as the population of New Brunswick, but it has more money in the banks than all the people of the Dominion of Canada put together have. I presume it is sufficient to call attention to those facts to show that all this talk about the greatness of the saving bank deposits in Canada is just sheer nonsense, when we compare the results with the industrial and prosperous condition of the country alongside of us. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries the other night referred to our great trade, and when that gentleman undertakes to launch forth into a current of words nobody in this House can equal him. He made a long speech; perhaps I am making a long speech too, but I am endeavoring to discharge the duty I have before me as best I can. In the long current of words delivered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the hon. gentleman undertook to controvert the statement made by the hon. the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who introduced this resolution into the House when he spoke about the geographical difficulties in the way of trade. The hon. gentleman built up quite a pyramid of words, and when I came to examine his speech I found that he had reached about the same conclusion as the hon. gentleman for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He says that somebody has tunnelled the Alps. That is quite true. The engineers made a straight line through the Alps, but I cannot myself see much sense in making an enormous hole in the Alps to facilitate trade, if you put up a paper wall which is more effective against trade than when the mountain stood there in its natural state. We boast in this country that we have made the shortest and quickest route for the carriage of trade from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and if there is anything in that argument how can you hold to the principle that it is best to carry trade over a long distance to the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman referred to the trade of the east. Why, Sir, what greater achievement was ever undertaken by a single man than that of the man who carried the first overland mail so that there might be quickness of carriage, the man who devoted his life to that object of

Mr. Ellis.

carrying the overland mail from India to England. And, Sir, England and Europe have followed his example and they have cut canals to speedily bring them the trade of the east. You do not go against nature, but you use nature entirely for your own purposes. The best you can do is occasionally to wrest from her by patient and diligent work, or by some accident, some of her secrets which you can turn to your own account. All those things have been done to facilitate trade and they have been done not by going against nature, but by utilising nature as far as possible. Now, Sir, you have built a railway in this country over the longest possible route you could build it. Is that common sense? I think you will say no, because if it were you have certainly shown you did not believe in your own action, because you have put up a large amount of the public money of Canada to carry the trade across the United States in order to take it to the ports of St. John. You have corrected the mistake you made. The hon. gentleman was perfectly right in his statement, notwithstanding the apparent objections the hon. Minister of Marine raised. You are doing for New Brunswick what you refused to do for Manitoba, but what I presume you will have eventually to do. The hon. Minister of Marine referred to the trade with the West Indies. He said that Halifax was the proper place from where to carry on that trade, and I have no doubt it is. But let us see the condition of that trade. In 1873 the total exports from Canada to the West Indies were \$3,984,000; in 1880 they had fallen to \$3,583,000; and in 1887 they had fallen to \$2,075,000 or nearly one-half. Well, Sir, not selling to that country, we cannot buy so easily from it. In 1882 there was entered for consumption in Canada from the West Indies \$4,000,000 worth; in 1883 \$4,369,000 worth; and in 1887 \$1,942,000 worth, showing a falling off of one-half. The total imports from the West Indies, including British Guiana, were, in 1831 \$4,000,000, in 1882, \$4,400,000 and in 1887, \$2,421,000. That trade is completely gone, and I think there are perhaps several reasons for it. I think the real reason is that there is no trade in the West Indies. Any one who takes up the work of a great Conservative historian on the West Indies will see that the country is almost in a state of chaos. I turn to New Brunswick and I find that in 1881 we sent from that Province to the West Indies \$141,385 worth of goods. There was a time when we used to bring 100 pounds of sugar to every puncheon of rum from the West Indies, but with the spread of temperance we do not import this article to the same extent. The trade has fallen from \$141,000 in 1881 to \$46,000 in 1887. There is practically no trade that we in New Brunswick can carry on with that country. The Province of Nova Scotia can, I presume, send some fish there, but even in fish the trade is not so good as it was. Now, the facts which I have presented have not been set down in malice; they have not been exaggerated; they are statements found in the blue-books of the country, and they stare us in the face day after day. I live in a community where I have lived thirty years—a community in which the people are not to be excelled in enterprise, energy and spirit, and we are face to face with this question. I will not say that the farms of New Brunswick do not produce as well as they ever did. I presume that those that are cultivated do. But the great trade we had we are losing, and we want the trade of the United States; we want to pass into that country with our trade as freely as we can pass from one part of Canada to the other. How that is to be done I leave to the sense of the House; but, speaking with the responsibility I hold, I say it will have to be done or you will not retain New Brunswick in the Confederation. An hon. gentleman laughs. He has no responsibility to that Province; he does not live in it; and the fact that he laughs shows how little he cares about it. I will not conceal the fact that we have started some manufactories in that Province. I am,

myself, in a small way a shareholder in a cotton factory, having become possessed of a share because the company could not pay me a debt it owed to me, and gave me its stock. Mr. Gibson, a man of great enterprise and ability, has started a cotton factory, and the result is that he finds himself confronted by the fact that he has no market, except such as he can get by the most energetic pushing and driving in a market already too well filled. The hon. Minister of Marine, the other night, asked what is going to become of the coal miner of New Brunswick if you allow American coal in. Well, Sir, we do admit American coal of a particular kind, because we want it, and Nova Scotia produces coal that the Americans want, and if that market were opened there would be tens and hundreds of thousands of tons additional produced, and if you would displace a small quantity in one direction you would make it up in another. So with regard to cotton. Mr. Gibson believes that he can go in the American market and hold his own there, and I am told that the proprietors of a cotton mill on the St. Croix River, which is on the border, are quite anxious to get the American market opened to them; and why should they not? A man in the State of Maine may put up a cotton factory, and he trusts to his energy and enterprise to make his way. In that country one factory is nothing here or there, and if the manufacturer on the St. Croix river cannot make his way with the United States markets opened to him better than he can now in the overcrowded market of Canada, he had better take his mill down. The employment of the people of the Maritime Provinces in paying industries would have the effect of increasing the population, and we should have people working on the soil, not only farmers, but miners and persons engaged in various industrial occupations which first spring from the soil; and those people being there, manufactures would soon grow up around them. In the city of St. John to-day there is quite a number of various kinds of small manufactories, there were quite a number of manufacturers in various lines, who, beginning with very little, have grown by degrees, and some of them were started 30 or 40 years ago. But the great difficulty now is that the present system compels the erection of immense factories for which there is not sufficient market. I notice with some interest that the Labor Commission are just now visiting the city of St. John, I notice that Mr. Alexander Christie, who has his whole life been Conservative and an energetic Conservative, told the Commissioners that he had been in the business of wood turning for 20 years, and he had not increased it a great deal. It was as small now as it had ever been, and a few years ago there was better employment for the workmen than there is now. He says he knows now of no mechanics who build houses for themselves, and he holds that is due to the lack of profitable employment. That is the testimony of a prominent Conservative, well known among the clubs in St. John. Another hon. gentleman said he could employ more hands if the Upper Province competition was put at an end to. I notice that another gentleman, Mr. Pender, who is a man of whom any country ought to be proud—a man who, beginning in a small way, makes an article of horse-shoe nails, which, for excellence of workmanship, surpasses all other articles in the same line, and if he had access to the markets of the United States, I have no doubt that the excellence of his work would command these markets—complained that the difficulty in his work was the duty on nail rods. This he said should come in free, as no iron suitable for his purpose could be found in Canada. It appears he is allowed a certain drawback on the iron he uses, but it is not sufficient. He practically has not the raw material free, because he only gets back two-thirds of the duty he paid on it. I will deal with one point more with reference to the question whether it is possible, assuming that this treaty is made, to carry on the Government of the country,

because, of course, this is a matter of considerable importance. Well, I think that in the first place the effect of opening up a large number of native manufactories in the country would be to increase our population. We have tried to do so under existing circumstances, and have failed. You cannot retain your population, and a great and growing factor in the political and social history of Canada to-day is that the people are leaving it. Can you do anything to retain them? I believe that by the creation of industries based upon the natural wants of the country you could. Other manufactories to suit our needs would follow, and thus by degrees would grow up requirements which demand almost every kind of undertaking. No doubt the country is expensively governed. I take it that we could do with seven members of the Cabinet. France has only seven or eight, and if a country like France can do with so small a number, I think Canada ought to follow her example. The establishment of reciprocity in fish with the United States would enable us to sweep away at once \$150,000 expended in the fishery protection service. You could go through the civil service, and with a firm hand make such a number of reductions as to bring down the expenditure of the country to a fair basis compared with its revenue. That might be hard work, because the country, under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite has suffered so much from depression, that you cannot get a railroad started in any locality except by means of Government aid. There is a particular insect tribe in which the mother generates the young in her body, and they feed upon her until they reach maturity and she dies, and that is the way the Provinces to-day are feeding on the Dominion. One by one they are feeding upon it, and how it is possible for the country to carry the burdens which bear upon it, it is impossible for any man who takes a reasonable view of the case to say. What is the position of our coasting trade? We have in the city of St. John 600 schooners of various sizes and classes. Our seamen thoroughly knew the coast with all the indentations and sinuosities from the harbor of Quebec to the capes of Florida. But the people of St. John, at any rate, are compelled to-day to put their money in American vessels, as it does not pay to put it in Canadian vessels, and the hardy mariners of our coast are passing under the American flag. That may make no difference to hon. gentlemen opposite, but these are facts of great importance to us, and there was a time when they were infinitely important; there was a time the mother country would spend thousands of dollars in promoting the growth of a good class of seamen here, with the idea that this would benefit the national navy. Having pointed out these things, I do not know that I have much more to say, but I would like to refer to just one matter, and that is the political aspect of the question as regards the mother country. I see the hon. member for Montreal in his seat, and I may say, with reference to his remarks, that the articles he read to-night, referring to the Union between England and Ireland, against the proposition before the House, seemed to me to suit admirably the case of the Maritime Provinces. Had he made the application of his remarks to these Provinces they would have been far more pertinent than they were in the way he did apply them. There is one fact in the history of the mother country which is plain as any fact can be. The hon. member for South Oxford referred to it in his speech. He did not, perhaps, cover the whole ground, but it is an absolute fact that England is putting forth every possible effort to cement friendship with the people of the United States. That is one fact that stands out above all others in the literature of the times, so far as the current of English literature is concerned. I do not think that any small pecuniary disadvantage which might happen to England from the loss of a small trade, could be at all put in comparison with the advantage which would come to England

by any arrangement that would have for its object the promotion of peace and prosperity between the two people. I read the other day in an English magazine a paper written by an English Liberal, once an English politician, Lord Coleridge, to the memory of the exemplary English Conservative, Sir Stafford Northcote—an article that is replete with as much tender sentiment, perhaps, as Englishmen like to express, an article that, in some respects, rises to the finish of Wordsworth's poetry, as the perfection of art so carried out that it seems like nature. What was the one fact which he put forward above all others why the people of England should keep enshrined in their memory a recollection of this amiable and able Conservative? It was that during the war of the rebellion, during the differences which arose out of the *Alabama* question, this man stood by the side of the North, and he emphasised that fact above all others in order to impress upon the American people, as well as upon his own people, the duty of a relationship which should exist between the two. Taking up the other day a book written by a historian who probably stands as high in English literature as anyone we have, I refer to Mr. Freeman, the historian of the Norman Conquest, I came across an extract which I think suits the position better than anything I could say myself, and I will read it to the House. I have nearly finished.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. ELLIS. An hon. member says "hear, hear." I am very much obliged to the House for the patient hearing they have given me. Mr. Freeman says, speaking in the United States:

"If we do not belong to the same nation, I do hold that we belong to the same people, or rather, to use a word of our own tongue, to the same *folk*. By that, I mean that we come of the same stock, that we speak the same tongue, that we have a long common history and a crowd of common memories. I mean, in short, that we are one folk in all things except that local and political separation which the hand of nature and the facts of nature have wrought. And these ties of blood and speech and memory surely rise above the lesser facts of local and political separation to make us feel ourselves in the highest sense one people. We dwell in different quarters of the globe, but we are surely more to one another than dwellers in the same quarter of the globe who do not come of the common stock, who do not speak the common tongue. Let me say that the words 'foreign' and 'foreigner' are words which should never be spoken between men of the English folk in Britain and men of the English folk in America. It grated more on my ears when I heard myself, in a speech otherwise highly honorable to me, spoken of as one of a 'foreign nationality.' But I was relieved and comforted by the hearty zeal with which the rest of the company accepted my strong disclaimers of anything foreign about me, and welcomed me as one of their own kin. 'Foreign,' 'foreigner,' and 'foreign nationality,' away with such forms of words! You are not foreigners; we do not look on you as foreigners, when you come to visit the older England in Britain. And I am not a foreigner, I will not deem myself a foreigner, I will not bear that you should look on me as a foreigner, when I come to visit this newer England in America. Here on your soil I am not indeed in mine own home, but I am none the less among mine own folk. I am among men of mine own blood and mine own tongue, sharers in all that a man of either England deems it his pride and happiness to share in. How can we be strangers and foreigners to one another, how can we be other than kinsfolk and brethren in the same hearth, when we think that your forefathers and mine may have sailed together from the oldest England of all in the keels of Hengest or of Cerdic—that they may have lurked together with Ælfred in the marshes of Athelney—that they may have stood side by side in the thick shield-wall on the hill of Seniac—that they may have marched together as brethren to live and die for English freedom alike on the field of overthrow at Rvesham, and on the field of victory at Naseby. I surely need not remind you that the whole heritage of the past, the history, the memories, the illustrious names, which belong to the earlier days of the English folk in Britain, are yours as well as ours. They are in the stricter sense your own. The men who piled up the mighty fabric of English law and English freedom, were your fathers, your brethren, no less than ours. In the long line of hero-Kings who built up the Kingdom of England you have as full a share as we have. In building up the Kingdom of England they were building up the commonwealth of America. If yours is the King who lurked in Athelney, yours too is the King who won the fight at Brunanbush. Yours are the Kings who waged the year of battle with the Dane and the King who waged the day of battle with the Norman. And if the Kings are yours as well as ours, so are the men who curbed the power of Kings. Yours are the men who wrung the great charter from the kingly rebel; yours are the men who dictated the provisions of Oxford and the men who gathered round the victor of Poitiers on the nobler field of

Mr. ELLIS.

the Good Parliament. Your share is alike with ours in every blow struck on behalf of freedom from the day of Lewes to the day of Marston. And if we boast that we won to ourselves the men of other lands, if we changed the Dane and the Norman into Englishmen as true as if their forefathers had first seen the shores of Britain from the keels of Hengest, the work was yours as well as ours. The strangers whom we made specially our own, they whose names we rank alongside of the noblest of our native worthies, the men who came from the beech-clad fells of Denmark, from the deep Alpine valley of Aosta, from the strong mount that guarded the land of France against the Norman, to become Englishmen on English soil—Canute the King, Anselm the bishop, Simon the earl—they are yours by the same law of adoption that makes them ours. And when the course of our history parts asunder, when the English people become two nations instead of one, if the history which you have wrought in America is no longer ours, if the history which we have wrought in Britain is no longer yours, in the same sense as in the common history which we wrought together in earlier times, still, we have a common interest, a common fellow-feeling, the feeling which follows the deeds of friends and kinsfolk with a different eye from that with which it follows the deeds of strangers, in all that men of English blood have done on American soil since the older and newer England parted asunder. And you too, I trust, have not ceased to look with the like feeling on all that men of English blood have done on British soil since the day when the newer England bade farewell to its political connection with the elder, but did not, I trust, bid farewell to the far higher tie of a common blood, a common speech, the long glories of a common history.

And so I agree with the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that whatever we can do to strengthen the ties between England and the people of the United States in the way of trade relations it is our duty to do, it is in the interests of England as well as in the interests of Canada, it is not against the interests of England, and it is not worth while to raise that question here to-day because the interests of Canada, as they stand to-day, are certainly the interests of England.

Mr. BAIRD moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:45 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 22nd March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 59) to confer certain powers on the Nova Scotia Telephone Company (Limited).—(Mr. Tupper, Picton.)

Bill (No. 60) to amend Chapter 27 of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

EASTER HOLIDAYS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I asked the Minister of Public Works yesterday if he could give the House any information as to the intention of the Government with respect to the Easter holidays. The hon. gentleman was to have mentioned the matter, I think, to the Prime Minister, and, as I see that the right hon. gentleman is now in his place, I ask him if he can give us the information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are very anxious, if it is possible, to finish this important debate before the adjournment, but that is for the House to say, not for us. We propose, if it be the will of the House, that when we adjourn on Wednesday night, we shall stand adjourned until the following Tuesday, at eight o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—RECIPROCITY DEBATE.

Mr. McMILLAN (South Huron). I rise to make an explanation. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Porter), in his speech the other night, denied the accuracy of my statement previously made that the value of farm land in the County of Huron was not increasing, and he said that between 1880 and 1886 it had increased in value 15 per cent. I sent and got the minutes of the County Council of Huron for this year, to prove the statement I had made, that land was not rising in value, and, Sir, I am borne out by those minutes. I find that in 1880—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend is quite in order. The statement made by him was contradicted on the floor of this House, and he is now simply proving that he made an accurate statement. I have never known an hon. gentleman refused permission, when contradicted, to prove that he was right. I do not suppose the First Minister wishes to do it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he confines himself to that point.

Mr. McMILLAN. As I understand the Rules of the House, I have a right to speak to the amendment after I have spoken on the main motion, and, therefore, I take the opportunity of making an explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has not the floor. If the hon. gentleman wishes to speak on the amendment he cannot do so now, because the hon. gentleman who has moved the adjournment of the debate, has precedence.

Mr. MITCHELL. If I understand the position, the hon. gentleman rises to a question of privilege for the purpose of explaining a statement in which he was contradicted, and in that case he has a right to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER. But he claims to speak to the amendment.

Mr. McMILLAN. I wish to correct the statement made by the hon. member for West Huron contradicting my statement. In the first place I stated—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot make a speech now.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am not going to make a speech.

Mr. MITCHELL. Let him make an explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman made his explanation and is now proceeding to give his proofs. If that is not making a speech, I do not know what is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will have every opportunity. My hon. friend who moved the adjournment of the debate has the floor. When he sits down, the hon. gentleman can get up and make his speech, and make his explanation at the same time.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Are we to understand it is ruled that an explanation cannot be had, although the Order has not yet been called? My hon. friend has a right, before the Orders of the Day are called, to make his correction.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have already ruled that when the statements of an hon. member have been misrepresented, he is always allowed to say that what had been attributed to him was not what he said, or was not what he intended to say, and nothing more.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, do I understand that you rule that an hon. gentleman who has been flatly contradicted on a point of fact, is not allowed to produce the evidence which he wishes, that he was right?—because that has hardly been our practice, I think.

Mr. SPEAKER. The whole of this debate is a contradiction of statements made on either side, and if I allow every hon. gentleman to get up a second time and prove that his statements were correct, and to make a new speech to show that what he said ought not to be contradicted, I should have to allow every hon. member to speak, perhaps, a dozen times.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted).

That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I promise not to detain the House long with the remarks that I have to make. The subject has been well and ably discussed on both sides, and I must admit that there is no great necessity for any speech at all from me. But coming as I do from the chief commercial city of the Province of New Brunswick, representing a constituency near that city where the people are, I may say, intensely interested in the subject of this debate, I feel it a duty and a privilege to lay before you the reasons for the vote that I intend to record; and I trust that you will excuse me if my remarks are somewhat broken and fragmentary. I do not come here armed with an array of figures. Statistics have been so ably filled in here that I think it unnecessary for me to produce any more, and I shall rely on a few general statements in placing my views before you. I want to be very careful in what I say. Since Monday night I have conceived a great horror of scrap-books. I would rather meet almost anything else in the world than to have one of these hon. gentlemen after me with a scrap-book. Up to that time I had gained the impression that hon. gentlemen opposite had always entertained only one view of this question, but I have learned that very many of the leading lights on the other side of the House, at some stage or another in their political career, have been coquetting with protection, and many of these sage and profound statesmen have been thinking and believing both sides of the question. It was a revelation to me, because I knew nothing or recollected nothing of it in the past. Now, Sir, it appears that both sides claim to be actuated by motives of patriotism, and I hope and trust they are. But I think everyone must admit there are two kinds of patriotism in this House. There is the despondent patriot and the hopeful patriot; there appears to be the patriot who sees nothing before us but political and financial ruin, who thinks only of neglected farms and deserted homes, the result of

emigration, who speaks of deserted villages and ruined cities, and an impoverished people, the result of corruption and misrule. Then, on the other hand, we have the hopeful patriot, who likes to look at Canada as she is, who likes to look at her as she appears on the map of the world, greater in extent than the whole continent of Europe, greater than the great United States of America, stretching away from ocean to ocean, nearly 4,000 miles, with the Atlantic bathing her eastern and the Pacific bathing her western shores, with an area of fertile land greater, I may say, than any other country under the sun, with broad plains, and magnificent forests, and an intelligent and industrious people able to subdue these forests and to convert our vast prairies into fields of waving corn. He likes also to speak of many other of her great qualities, of the surroundings of the ocean, of her bays and her harbors and her rivers filled with the tribes of the sea, making up one of the most magnificent fisheries in the world. Then he speaks of her great highway being finished from ocean to ocean, and with pride he speaks of the fact that the banner of the Canadian Pacific now floats from the top of the Rockies, and draws your attention to one of the greatest monuments of engineering skill ever known to the world. Well, Sir, the hopeful patriot does not stop there. He looks beyond. Away to the westward he sees the broad Pacific capable of bearing commerce ten-fold greater than has ever yet furrowed the waves of the Atlantic. He looks across that ocean, and sees that we are trading neighbors to seven hundred millions or eight hundred millions of people, and with hope he believes that we have an interest in the trade of the Orient, and he looks to that as one of the future prizes to the Dominion of Canada. Then he looks to the eastward and he sees we are trading neighbors to two hundred and fifty millions of the busy populations of Europe, and each year our large trade is growing and will continue to grow with those busy nations. Then, again, he looks to the southward, and finds the great United States, a people whom we are proud and anxious to call our American brothers, and we can boast of a great trade with that people, a trade on which our friends opposite enlarge. We think as much of the American people, I trust, as do hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches, and we know them to be a shrewd and clever people, a people who have in the past shown their ability to enforce the law of political science, and we have to look to our dealings with them with a careful and jealous eye. He does not stop there. He looks further to the south, even crossing the equator, and beholds the countries of South America. Many of them have grown with a rapidity that even outrivals the United States, cities growing up in the Argentine republic and in the Brazils outrivalling the growth even of Chicago. And I say in looking at the south we have a warm interest in her trade, which may be called a foreign trade, to be built up with that continent. I hear hon. gentlemen opposite speak with great emphasis in regard to an exchange of natural products or a natural market. If the word "natural market" has any meaning as between Canada and the United States, that meaning is ten-fold increased and ten fold intensified when used as between Canada and South America. In Canada we grow all that will grow in the northern temperate climate, in South America they grow all that will grow in a tropical climate, all that will grow under the blaze of the meridian sun. We are the two extremes. They are known to be a people of great wealth, a people who are surprising all beholders at the prodigious strides they are making. The great thing to be considered is this, that in South America they have little or no manufactures. That country is low and level chiefly, and affords no water power. Then, again, coal is one of the motive powers of the day, and that they are absolutely without. Their supply of coal at present comes from Great Britain, chiefly from Cardiff in Wales. That coal when it leaves Cardiff costs 11s.

Mr. BAIRD.

sterling a ton, and is carried at freight rates varying from 20s to 27s. 6d. per ton, and that coal when delivered realises too high a price to be used in arts and manufactures. Canada has a right to look in that direction for a trade with that people. Again, they have none of the products grown in Canadian forests. They have neither pine nor spruce, and, if I am correctly informed, those cities, even the cities of the Argentine republic, consume perhaps one hundred millions of lumber of the northern temperate climate, and, strange to say, those one hundred millions of lumber are supplied from our two neighboring States, Maine and Massachusetts, and when their supply is short they come into Canada and obtain here what they require to carry on that trade. It is strange that we must sit idly by while this trade goes into the hands, and is kept under the control, of our American neighbors. I say there is a real meaning when you speak of exchanging natural products, or obtaining a national market in regard to South America. Here are the two extremes. There is a land of perpetual summer, where the tall palmetto waves; here we are the land of the pine and the maple; and, if there is any meaning to be given to the words, "exchange of natural products," I think hon. gentlemen opposite will see that the meaning has great force as regards trade between these two countries. While I am dwelling on this matter I will speak of a movement on foot in the city of St. John with a view to secure and encourage trade as between Canada and the countries of South America; I should not say St. John alone, because I find the other Provinces of the Dominion are identified with it, and with commendable zeal they have undertaken to drive the enquiry to the very bottom. The Government have been approached on this matter, and I am gratified to say that they too have taken the matter under consideration, and have appointed a commissioner to visit those countries and make a report. I trust that report will be a favorable one. I trust that, on a future day, we shall see the products of Canadian forests being carried to the countries of South America. I trust we shall see the products of the mines of Nova Scotia taking the place of the products of the mines of Great Britain, and it will be a gratifying thing to see trade, which is untold in its volume, carried on in this way. When we take a further view of it we find that hon. gentlemen opposite in dealing with this matter appear to take great satisfaction in speaking in a doubtful way respecting Canada generally. The subject is one that enables them to reach the highest altitude of liberal statesmanship in running down and belittling Canada. They appear to reach their greatest height in dealing with this subject, and they appear to enjoy the privilege of making unfair comparisons between Canada and the great United States of America. They are not content to compare Canada with Australia, New Zealand, or New South Wales, or some other colony that is doing just what Canada is doing, that is, trying to open up and develop its resources, making great expenditures in view of the large territory it has to deal with in order to develop the country and make it attractive, and drawing the population of Europe by immigration here to fill up the country. This is what we have been doing, this is what the colonies have been doing; and if you make a comparison with those colonies you will find that Canada outrivals them all, that Canada to-day is the most favored of all British colonial possessions. But they are not satisfied with that—United States alone is the subject of comparison. It is unfair, it is unjust and ungenerous that you should compare Canada with the great United States. They have had privileges that no other country under the sun ever enjoyed. They have had the wealth of forest and field in an abundance that is most marvellous. They have had in addition to this a wealth of mine and mineral that surpasses all records

of the world. They have had the wealth of hills and mountains that were fairly blasted with silver and gold, and they have had the wealth of river and stream whose yellow sands when sifted enabled them to build up cities by magic, and furnish them with all the grand embellishments of art and science. In addition to that, they have been drawing from their western prairies the strength of the virgin soil and transporting it as rapidly as possible in order to convert it into cash. Some time, if reports be true, they might as well have taken the acres and shipped them away, as they were drawing the very strength from them by tilling large areas with all modern means and appliances, and gathering great crops of grain year after year, until the land is no longer productive, and if reports be true, the very best areas of the United States have been turned into ready cash; and in this way the country is rolling full of money, which fact no one denies, but all readily admit. It is unfair to compare the savings banks and monetary institutions of the United States with similar institutions in Canada. We have had none of those advantages of which I have spoken. We have our fertile soil and good climate, we have an industrious people who are willing and are determined to make of Canada all that can be expected or can be asked for. I say that a person coming with such an argument, in that way acts unfairly against Canada. I consider it a damaging statement to go abroad to the people, who hear and must every day read the remarks that are being made. Take the effect of this when it is placed before the uninitiated mind. Take it and place it before the farmer's son. He may be content with his surroundings, he may be content with the farm and the homestead life, but you preach to him and tell him that the land is fit to starve him to death; tell him that it is in fact no life for him to lead, give him to understand that there are more prospects to the westward, tell him that there are colossal fortunes to be made there and do not tell him the real truth, do not tell him that the laborer in the United States is not better off than he is in Canada, but paint such a picture, and he becomes discouraged under those strange arguments. It is a disposition in all the human family to be somewhat dissatisfied with their lots, and most minds are susceptible to it. You can even convince a man that he is sick, for if a number of persons tell him he is sick he may yield to their persuasion. So the human family is constituted. So they receive the damaging propositions, and so the mind becomes imbued with a false idea. Those damaging assertions are made against Canada only for the purpose of bringing certain people prominently to the front, and of creating discontent in the minds of the Canadian people. In order that they may gain something, those damaging assertions are made by certain gentlemen, to get the public mind interested in the matter. They think they may gain something if they can make a disturbance in the minds of the people of Canada. Now, Sir, to come right down to the matter before us and to deal with the question that is now before the House in its closer sense, I would like to take hold of the remarks which I first heard made by the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies). That hon. gentleman made the charge against the present Administration, that when protection was first introduced, or, as he said, when it was "first preached" to the people of the Maritime Provinces, it was not introduced or it was not preached to them as a remedy for their troubles, for it was introduced to them as a remedy which would bring about a return of the old Reciprocity Treaty or some treaty of commerce between ourselves and the people of the United States. The hon. member for Queen's P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) dwelt most heavily upon this point, and his worthy colleague there appeared to endorse very strongly what he said. The substance of what he said was that the people

of the Maritime Provinces were cheated by this delusion, and carried away by the hope that it was going to bring back to them reciprocity with the United States. Now, Sir, the hon. member spoke for Prince Edward Island, and I will undertake to speak on behalf of New Brunswick. When the policy of protection was first introduced in the Maritime Provinces, Sir Leonard Tilley, a statesman who occupies the highest respect from friend and foe alike, was about the first I heard speak on the subject. He and several worthy members of our party opened the subject in the city of St. John, and what I understood from them was, substantially, that they laid before the people the fact that, located as we were alongside the people of the great United States of America, who, in consequence of some ill-feeling towards Great Britain arising out of the late rebellion, had abrogated the Treaty of Commerce, and had put up a wall against us and our trade relations, by which they should take charge of us and our markets, and by which they were taking away our raw material and sending back manufactured goods. Those gentlemen pointed out that it was absolutely necessary that something should be done to turn the tide of affairs, and I am pleased to say, Sir, that the people of St. John and the people of New Brunswick readily understood their meaning at the time and became deeply interested in the question. They knew that something was wrong and they could see that the country was being wasted in its youth, and that the people were being impoverished in the midst of great natural abundance which only awaited development. The policy was laid before us in that way. Shortly after that I recollect that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) visited the city of St. John, and I looked very anxiously for his coming. I was deeply interested and anxious to see and hear him, for up to that time I had never seen a live English knight. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman spoke to us in the St. John's skating rink, I think, and he dwelt the greater part of his time on the Pacific Scandal, and then for an hour or two he told us what he had done for the country—and what he would do for the country. The people gave him a patient hearing and I think they made up their minds that he had done enough for his country and they ought to give him a rest. At all events, they acted upon that principle. Among other things Sir Leonard Tilley taught us to believe was that by the adoption of this policy of commercial independence, or even of retaliation if you like to call it so, that we would be able to show our American neighbors that we could take care of ourselves, that we could live in defiance of the wall which they put up against us, that Canada had rights which she knew and was ready to protect, that the effect of the National Policy would be to bring the American people to a clear understanding of what our rights were, and that if they would no longer deal with us in that way, we could live independent of them. I am proud to say, Sir, and to see that the prophecies and promises made respecting that policy were truly made, and that they never had the appearance of being more literally verified than they are to-day. Surely the signs of the present times show it. Why are the American people interested in us to-day more than they were at that date? If you recollect aright, at that time they laughed at our inability. They laughed at the idea of our independence, and they prophesied that they would drive us into annexation. That was the kind of talk which prevailed at that time. Why is it now that the Butterworths, the Morrises, the Hits, the Wimans and other political economists are trying to draw us from our attitude to-day? Why is the attitude of the United States Congress liberal towards us? Do you think it is because they wish to help us or benefit Canada? No, Sir, they see we are able to maintain the attitude that we have taken, that we are able to take care of ourselves under the protective system, and that we could really live independent of them.

Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that the American people are now ready to make overtures to us. There must be some reason for that; and I say that we are driven to the conclusion that it is in consequence of the adoption of the National Policy, which had far more efficacy in bringing that state of things about than any servile prayer for admission to their trade would have had. When you look at the matter fairly, I think you will agree with me that no set of men could have had deeper forethought or greater wisdom in handling the affairs of a nation than the hon. leader of this House and his worthy colleagues, when they prepared that policy of commercial independence for the Dominion of Canada, and applied it to the country in the firm manner they did. Hon. gentlemen may assert that they acted from a different motive than the welfare of the country, and I have heard it asserted, on the platform, that they did it in order to draw from the people a large revenue which they might squander in all sorts of spendthrift profusion and extravagance. But I have confidence that they had higher aims and nobler ambitions than that—that they were working for the true interests of their country; and I think the results to-day prove it. If, to-day, there is an approach by the people of the United States, it is in consequence of the firm attitude that has been taken and maintained down to the present day. The people of the Dominion of Canada may well congratulate themselves on having sustained the National Policy three times, and they may well be proud of the statesmen who inaugurated that policy and showed to the world that they were able to take care of Canada in every exigency. Now, I wish to reply for a few moments to the hon. member for the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis) who made the last address on this subject. That hon. gentleman undertook to set forth the deplorable state of affairs in the Province of New Brunswick, and with an array of figures that lasted nearly two hours he applied himself to the task of showing that there had been a decline in our trade and prosperity. I do not intend to occupy your time with a like array of figures; time is too short for that kind of business. I think we are here to deal simply with the causes of the decline, and to supply a remedy if we can, and having done that, we shall have done our duty. Now, my business career is short, but by experience and observation I claim to have acquired some knowledge of the causes of the decline, and I shall show you that the National Policy is not to blame for a single dollar of the loss which he has shown to have occurred in the Province of New Brunswick. He has stated that lumber and shipping are our chief industries, and I agree with him. The manufacture and export of spruce deals to the English market and to the Mediterranean ports in the early days yielded great profits. My recollection runs back ten or twelve years, during which time I have been about the city of St. John. When I first went there, I saw and handled deals for which \$11 per 1,000 superficial feet was paid. Time went on, and prices began to decline; the English market failed; the Baltic trade sprang up, and from that the English were able to obtain deals at a lower price than they were paying us. Therefore prices gradually declined to \$9, \$8, and I believe as low as \$7 and \$7.50. Since the National Policy came into effect it is very rarely that we have seen spruce deals sold above \$8 or \$9 per 1,000—the average, I think, would be \$8. Before the National Policy was introduced, our forests were largely depleted, and the lumberman to-day has not only a reduced price to contend with, but he cannot get his lumber with the same facilities as he could when the primeval forests were there in their original grandeur. The forests have been cut away, and he has to go farther and get inferior lumber to what he did ten or twelve years ago; he has to contend with a reduction of 25 per cent. in the price, he has to pay increased stumpage; and all these things

Mr. BAIRD.

have had a tendency to dry up the lumber trade, and hence the volume of the trade of the Province, and to dry up the statistics my hon. friend handled. Is the National Policy to blame for that? Were you told that the National Policy was intended to keep up the English market? Could the National Policy affect a market in the ports of the Mediterranean? It is with regret that we have seen the lumber industry become a waning industry; we had some years ago a large trade in pine and birch timber, which brought remunerative prices on the other side of the Atlantic. This timber was required to be cut square, and to be sound and good timber. But the forests have been cut away, and there has been a large decline in the supply, and along with that the prices have declined. Then, again, up to the time of the National Policy, we did a considerable trade in box pine for the West India Islands, to be used for boxes required in the sugar trade. That trade lasted up to, perhaps, nine or ten years ago and then it suddenly dropped. The means of transportation were entirely changed, the timber was gone, and there was no demand. Ten or twelve years ago, all the mills surrounding the harbor of St. John, as soon as they shut down on the production of spruce lumber, would begin to be occupied in sawing lumber for sugar boxes. A fleet of vessels carried the boxes to the West India Islands, where they would load with sugar and carry it in other directions. Had the National Policy anything to do with the loss of that trade? If you had had unrestricted reciprocity, could it have prolonged that trade any longer? He states that the shipping industry is an industry of the past, but no blame can be attached to the National Policy for the decline in that respect. When I first went to the city of St. John, every place where a ship-yard could be established was a hive of industry. A large number of wooden ships were being built, and an immense number of men employed every day in the year; but since then the iron vessels have ousted the wooden ones from the trade, and the shipbuilding industry has received a blow from which it will probably never recover. I remember when, at times, two ships would be on the stocks at once, and when in one year, as in 1873, from 120,000 to 150,000 tons of shipping would be added to the shipping list of Canada. Again, the ships were largely owned at the port of St. John, which was, at that time, ranked as the fourth port in the Empire for the ownership of ships; and go where you would throughout the world, you would see "St. John, N.B.," written on the bows of numerous ships. It was almost impossible to visit any shipping ports in the world without seeing in its waters a number of St. John vessels, but that trade has been destroyed almost entirely by the increase in the number of iron ships, which, having taken the place of the wooden vessels, have dealt the finishing blow to the shipbuilding industry. But surely it will not be contended that the National Policy can be blamed for this state of affairs. The hon. gentleman takes great delight in dwelling on the reduced condition of the city of St. John. Instead of sympathising with her in her misfortunes, he seems to gloat over them. But when we consider the great losses that St. John has sustained, when we consider the great industry that has been swept away from her, when we consider the immense revenues which flowed from the large fleet of ships that formerly frequented her harbor into the hands of her ship owners, but which now have become a thing of the past; when we consider the destruction that took place on June 20, 1877, when the entire city was swept away by a terrible conflagration which left hardly anything standing but a few desolate walls to mark the resting-place of that once fine city, it should be, not a matter for condolence, but rather a matter for congratulation that she should have sprung up as she has, like the phoenix from its ashes, and should occupy the position she does

to-day despite all her reverses. Instead of showing that, despite her great losses, St. John is able to hold her own to-day, the hon. gentleman endeavors to depict her condition to make out the worst he can out of her condition. He is obliged to confess, however, that despite all his wailings, St. John is still able to hold her own, and in admitting that, he admits a great deal. Again, the city of St. John, I may say, had another stroke of disaster on the 22nd February, 1887, a political stroke as blighting almost as the flames of the great conflagration. Will the hon. gentleman undertake to tell me that St. John would have recovered, as she has to-day, in a great degree from her reverses, had it not been for the National Policy? Can he in any way point out a single fault that can be found with the National Policy? Could the shipping trade have been in any way affected by the abolition of the National Policy? If it could, the hon. gentleman would not have failed to tell us how and in what manner the National Policy has worked to our detriment, but he confined himself to pointing out that St. John is in a deplorable condition; he contented himself with merely pointing out her difficulties and misfortunes. He took delight in taunting her people with their poverty, and was careful not to furnish a single shadow of an excuse for that state of affairs, a state of affairs which, instead of discussing fairly, he largely exaggerated. The hon. gentleman ought not to complain, for he has been well provided for in that city. He has been sent here as its representative, and I think he has dealt unjustly towards the city of his birth, or adoption—I do not know which—and that it deserved better treatment at his hands. Did the hon. gentleman assign any cause for the state of affairs he depicted? No, he was entirely silent on that point. He merely recited all these calamities, and did not even go so far as to say they were the result of the National Policy. He did not say that if the National Policy had never been adopted there would have been a different state of things. He did not say that the National Policy is responsible for the people of the United States abrogating the Reciprocity Treaty. He would not go to that extent. Now, what remedy does he propose? Or does he propose any? I find him silent on that point, too. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Foster), and, I think, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), congratulated the hon. gentleman upon his boldness and courage; they congratulated him on showing that he had the courage of his convictions, and was prepared to give his remedy boldly and openly in preference to the hon. gentleman who, they said, really contemplated annexation in disguise. I thought, when I heard those hon. gentlemen speaking, that they really did not know their man, and that they would find they were mistaken in him. I was confident we would not have from that hon. gentleman a bold and outspoken statement of what he considered the true remedy. Nor have we had such a statement. The hon. gentleman does not like honorable warfare; he likes warfare of a more quiet and concealed nature, and he would not put himself on record by going the full length of his views, as the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the hon. member for Westmoreland supposed he would. It may be, however, that the hon. gentleman has relented, and is not prepared to go so far as he led us to believe he would. I hope he has relented; I hope he has receded from the position he once took; I hope he is not now disguising his real sentiments under a species of mock loyalty; I hope and trust the hon. gentleman has changed his tactics. Surely the hon. gentleman would not like to see all that is Canadian handed over to foreign hands; surely his mind has undergone a change; surely patriotism and love of home and country are not still to him words without meaning; surely the memory of England's care and England's love

for her patriot sons in all parts of the world has awakened in his mind the slumbering recollections of his earlier manhood, and brought him to a nearer and clearer sense of duty; surely the thought of an alien flag floating over loyalists' graves has formed a barrier between him and the darling scheme he held a few months ago. I hope and trust that a change has come over the spirit of his dreams; I hope and trust the hon. gentleman is in a position to say that he has relented and cast his annexationist ideas to the wind; I hope and trust that the hon. member is hand to hand in sentiment with true patriots. The hon. gentleman, through the medium of his press, has always taught us to look to this part of Canada as our natural enemy; he has taught us to look upon inter-provincial trade as a humbug, and to cast our eyes towards the United States as our great and only friend, as our only real friend, as the only source from which we have anything to hope. The hon. gentleman might have explained, for he is up here among Ontario gentlemen who are on the same side of politics with him, and no doubt hold high hopes, and high anticipations, and high aspirations as to Ontario. But the hon. member has always told us something different through the medium of a mischievous press. He has given us to understand, you are a weight and a burden, and you are dragging us down to ruin. He might have explained this, but he did not see fit to do so. The hon. gentleman and several others on that side of the House, I have heard make mention of the industries that were in existence. But they do not take the trouble to mention such as were to be found in the city of St. John, such as were sustained by the protecting care of the National Policy; they do not mention that the population of St. John, large as it is now, is maintained and sustained by manufactures which have taken the place of shipbuilding. This was not very suddenly the result, but it was of slow growth. Many other parts of the Dominion have grown up more rapidly, but we have not stood still. While I was on my way up here, I asked a gentleman to give me some statistics of the industries which were going on in St. John, and he did so, but, unfortunately, I have dropped the statement. At all events, he showed, I think, that there were nearly or quite 2,000 men employed in factories there, in the cotton factories and the iron works, and the car establishments, in all those industries which are well known to men who come from St. John. Those industries have grown up, and are maintained under the fostering care of the National Policy. Still hon. gentlemen did not speak of them, but they all did speak of the factory of Mr. Alexander Gibson, and many of them quoted the remarks made by Mr. Gibson. I am not aware, and I scarcely believe, that Mr. Gibson ever made the remarks attributed to him. However, I would not be afraid to deal with the question, or to hear Mr. Gibson express himself. Those hon. gentlemen speak as if he wanted an extended market. I only visited his factory once in my life, and then it appeared to me to be the pride of Mr. Gibson to point out a lot of orders and to say, I cannot begin to fill the orders, that is my trouble; I do not have to send out a runner, because I cannot fill the orders I have, and I believe, if I had another factory like this, I could run it. To take the reverse view of it and say that he wanted the market of the United States, appears extraordinary to me. What reason or what argument is there why Mr. Gibson, or any other man, should contend against the great establishments of the United States? We know that cotton is a little lower in the United States than in Canada; we know that they have an over-supply of factories, that they have an over-supply of cotton which they could throw on to this market, and make a profit. The hon. gentleman knows very well that the 60,000,000 of people he spoke of as his market are well supplied, and there is a surplus in the United States which would come

into Canada if the customs line were taken away. He knows that he would not point with pride to unfilled orders hanging upon the wall if they had full swing in our market. I have understood that Mr. Gibson has repudiated the statement and declared that he never made it, but, if he did make it, it has been the subject of his reconsideration. Now, we do not stand alone in this matter. When these gentlemen introduced and inaugurated this policy of protection for the industries of Canada, they could not have been working on their imagination alone. They had the experience and they had the precedents of other nations. In fact, all the powerful and sagacious nations of the earth, at some time in their political history, have been forced to do in self-defence just what Canada did when she adopted the National Policy. This is no assertion of mine, it is a matter of history. Each of the powerful nations of the earth at some time have tried this policy. We know that France, Germany, Austria, Prussia, Belgium, all these great countries have seen fit to adopt a protective system. For instance, we may take Germany. At the time she commenced with her protective system, if statistics are to be believed, she imported \$240,000,000 of manufactured goods from Great Britain more than she sent back. Ten years afterwards she had entirely turned the tables, and was sending to England upwards of \$240,000,000 more than she brought back. That was the effect of the adoption of that policy. In all these other countries, there has been unparalleled prosperity from the time they adopted their protective policy. They had wise and sagacious men at the head of affairs, each considering what would be best for his country, each taking up this system in turn, and each going in that direction as far as the system could be enforced. England alone, at the present time, of all these great nations stands out as a free-trade people; but at the time she commenced her system of free trade, at the time she admitted grain into her ports free, although all the world hailed it with delight as a step in the direction of free trade, it was in reality a master-stroke in the direction of protection. At that time England was the manufacturing centre of the world, it was the workshop of the world. Sir Robert Peel saw that, by encouraging her industries, he could, as he desired, really make her manufacturing supremacy complete. All he had to do was to give cheap breadstuffs to her people, and, while he was willing to sacrifice her farmers, he knew he could draw a generous supply of breadstuffs from the different parts of the world, from the prairies of the United States, from the banks of the Nile, from the shores of the Baltic, from the fields of Russia and of India; that he could obtain a more generous supply from those regions than he could by trying to protect the farmers of Great Britain, and he saw that it was really a master-stroke in the way of maintaining the manufacturing supremacy of Great Britain at that time to adopt the policy he did. That state of things continued for a time. England really was the workshop of the world, and to a great extent she has preserved that position, but at the same time she had a full and complete supply of coal in unlimited quantity and iron to an unlimited quantity, and she had workmen and she had everything but cheap bread, and it was Sir Robert Peel's design to give her cheap bread and thus maintain her manufacturing supremacy. Now, in dealing with the subject of iron, I have heard one of the gentlemen opposite, from East Huron, I think, deal with the question of iron, and I have heard many members on the Opposition side find fault with the price of iron, and the additional duties which have been placed on iron, and they always point to the great United States, and to the flourishing condition of the iron industry in the United States; but they do not take the record of the iron industry in the United States in the past, but speak of it as it is to-day, just as it suits their argument. Why do

Mr. BAIRD.

they do not go back a little over twenty years? If they do, they will find that that industry in the United States was then in a flatter condition than it is now in this country. At that time steel rails were held at \$150 a ton in Great Britain. The Bessemer Steel Works had full control of that market. Then protection comes in in the United States, and, after that, the iron industries are started there. The English manufacturer sees that it is to be an encroachment on his work, and he visits the American market, and then down goes the price of steel rails from \$150 to \$30 a ton. But they had taken the grip of this matter in the United States. They saw that to be compelled to pay from \$350 to \$400 a ton for the rails when landed in New York was going too far. They found, as the hon. gentleman explained it, that they had an abundance of coal, they had an abundance of iron, almost an unlimited quantity, and there was no reason why it could not be manufactured if their industries were fostered and encouraged, no reason why they could not manufacture as cheaply as Great Britain. Well, the prices came tumbling down until they reached the historical figures of \$54. Perhaps the hon. gentlemen remember when steel rails got down to \$54, then there was a great purchase made for Canada. Hon. gentlemen did not believe in protection at that time, they did not consider that protection was at work upon the industries of the United States, and that the price of steel rails would come tumbling down through the range of prices, leaving them dangling in the air at 54. They ought to recollect those figures. When hon. gentlemen opposite deal with the iron industry, they ought to deal with its history for a few years back, and not deal with it as it is to-day. It seems to me that they must know that iron is the very sinew of our modern civilisation, that no country which cannot supply its own iron can be independent. It is needed in commerce, it is needed in war, it is needed everywhere. If I recollect aright, we import \$11,000,000 worth every year to carry on the great public works of Canada. In face of this fact, the hon. member for Huron told us that we had unlimited coal fields in Canada, that we had boundless fields of iron ore, and all the materials in the earth, only waiting the magic touch of capital and enterprise to drag them forth for the benefit of the people. Still, they are unwilling that the industry should be encouraged; they would rather see this country purchase from a foreign country, and from this standpoint they argue. I look at it from an entirely different standpoint. If you are going to adopt a protective system, you must adopt it in its entirety, and you must apply it to all the industries that need encouragement and protection. The true principle of protection is to encourage every industry that needs protection, until it can stand alone and can compete with like industries in other countries, or, in other words, until it is able to take care of itself. It appears to me to be right and consistent that the iron industry of Canada should be protected and fostered, and that it will have the effect of forcing into action the very powers that are capable of making Canada an iron manufacturing country. Now, Sir, the question is also one that appeals to our patriotism, somewhat, as well as to our material interests. We have a pride in talking of our British connection, notwithstanding that the hon. member for South Oxford tells that it is a flimsy hope. He gives us to understand that the day is rapidly approaching when some power more potent than the arm of Britain will be needed to protect us from invading foes, and indeed, he warns us in a quiet way that we had better seek shelter under the wing of the great American Eagle. Well, Sir, that has not much effect upon our minds in the Province of New Brunswick. I do not think it has much effect upon the minds up here in this part of the Dominion. We have long had implicit faith and confidence in the power of Great Britain, and

we are proud to say that she has always protected her dominions, and always protected her subjects. We do not expect to live to see the day when we shall have to learn the bitter lesson that Britannia no longer rules the wave. I can tell the hon. member for South Oxford that his prediction does not affect our minds in the least. He tells us that all the great powers of Europe—France, Germany and Austria—are in league against Great Britain; still we are willing to take our lot and share with her, and if she is not able to protect her broad domains, then, Sir, we are willing to go down with her expiring glories. This is our view of it down in the Provinces of New Brunswick, and I think it is really the view of the hon. member himself, only he wants to make an argument to suit his own purpose. Now, I want to deal with another industry, one which is somewhat difficult for me to speak about, an industry referred to in the amendment of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones)—I refer to the shipping industries of Canada. That amendment is somewhat artful, somewhat ingenious, and it would be folly for an individual like me who claims to be acquainted with the marine interests of the country, to contend for one moment that the privileges mentioned in that amendment would not be a great boon to the Maritime Provinces. I admit that they would be a great boon; I must also admit that, comparatively speaking, perhaps no member in this House would be more benefited by such a privilege than myself; no one would hail with greater delight such a privilege if it could be obtained upon fair and equitable terms to the Dominion. The reasons are obvious to any man who is acquainted with the shipping industry. We know that to give Canadian coasters the privilege of coasting along the American seaboard, from Maine to Mexico, would be to enhance the value of Canadian coasters 50 per cent., yes, perhaps 100 per cent., at a single stroke. It would open a field to Canadian mariners where they could outdo our American neighbors. Let it be remembered that the carrying of the ocean trade of the world is now a subject of keen competition. It is a matter where combines and monopolies do not reach, it is really a survival of the fittest and it is only by energy, industry and a close application of the rules of economy, that we can obtain success in prosecuting the marine industry. Now, Sir, Canadian ships can under-work and outdo the American ships—lower cost of construction, lower wages, more economy exercised, and the sterling qualities of courage, energy and hardihood so prominent in the English sailor, and which have enabled England to become the mistress of the sea, are still to be found in her Canadian sons, which would win in any race upon the ocean. But, Sir, we have got to look at this matter in the face. Can this privilege be obtained? I am of opinion that it cannot be obtained, but even if it could be obtained upon the terms the hon. gentlemen propose, I would say: No, the price is too high. The matter comes home very close to me in that respect. Many of you are aware that every dollar I possess in the world is the result of following that industry, and every dollar I possess is involved in that business. But, Sir, if I must declare between my country and my property, I shall let the property go. I say it would be better that our coasting interests should perish, it would be better that our commerce in that direction should be driven from the seas, it would be better that our ships should rot, than we should engage in an increased trade in that direction at the fearful price to Canada that hon. gentlemen opposite propose to pay. It is coming right down to that with us. I expect to meet these statements. I expect to again face my constituents, and to hear it heralded on every platform that I stood in their light and in the way of obtaining a reciprocity treaty or unrestricted reciprocity. It will, no doubt, be heralded just as though hon. gentlemen opposite held reciprocity in their hands, and that voting for them and sustaining them would give

us reciprocity. Such is not the fact at all; that is the way they desire it should go to the country, and, no doubt, they will avail themselves of it; but I will give them credit if they are able to persuade the people of my county that such is the case. I think I can show fairly and honestly what is the true state of affairs. I can show them that the proposition of hon. gentlemen opposite would mean the destruction of Canada. Experience has proved beyond a doubt that new industries can not combat with establishments that are cemented by time and raised by generous capital, backed by credit, the result of long and continued success, and operated by a large number of skilled and experienced workmen. It is impossible to expect it. They ask us at a single stroke to do away with protection, they ask us at a single stroke to open our markets to all foreign fabrics, to all the merchandise of the world, the result of which would be that our stores and warehouses would be filled with foreign fabrics at the price extinguishing our own manufactures. This is the extent and true state of affairs, and the carrying out of such a proposition would shake to its very foundation every industry and every establishment now in operation in this Dominion, and we would soon have a repetition of the scenes enacted in 1878 when the flies were on the wheel. It would not be long before we would get back to that position. It is unnecessary for me to follow that line of argument further. I think hon. gentlemen understand my views. I believe, I firmly believe, that the time is coming when we shall have freer trade relations with the people of the United States; but I take to ourselves the credit of bringing about that reciprocity of trade through the operation of the National Policy. That alone can bring it. I can fully understand and appreciate any remarks made by hon. gentlemen from different localities, particularly from Prince Edward Island, whose constituents suffer great loss on many products that go to the United States by the high duty and tariff against them. One of the hon. members for Prince Edward Island spoke more particularly of potatoes. That is a low-priced article, and when a duty is placed on it, I sympathise with the farmers who have to meet it; but I say there is no advantage in the course the hon. gentlemen opposite are taking with regard to our natural products. I say it is only by holding firmly, by adhering strictly to the principles of our present policy, that we shall get reciprocity on fair and equitable terms to Canada; then I would claim it should be had, and I would fail to support any Administration that would not give us any reciprocity on those equitable terms. Hon. gentlemen opposite perhaps take that view to a certain extent, perhaps they do not. Perhaps they are of the opinion that all that is necessary for us to do is to say to the people of the United States that we are ready for unrestricted reciprocity or for any other kind of reciprocity, and they would accept our offer. But there is nothing to lead us to suppose that or to hope for that, and going to them in that way, as has been done repeatedly, will not bring about the desired result. Then I would ask each hon. member who can deal with the question from this standpoint to remember with me that the best interests of our country demands that we should maintain ourselves in our present condition until we know we can get fair and reasonable terms from the people of the United States. Remember that the best interests of our country, the power and glory of our country, depend entirely upon the prosperity, the intelligence and the inspiring hopes of the people we are here to represent and to govern. Then, so far as we can see, our duty lies in the direction of taking care of our different industries, and if we love our country we will stand by her industries and by the statesmen who have made them great.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. The question now before the House is perhaps one of the greatest interest that has been discussed

since 1878. It would appear as if as many members would discuss this question on the floor of Parliament as have discussed any other question since the date I have mentioned. I have the honor of representing a constituency which forms a portion of the county of Lambton. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) and myself represent, I think I may say without being egotistical, one of the finest counties in Canada, an opinion which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) I feel satisfied will endorse, as he will anything I may say in regard to the prosperity and industry of the people of that county. In addition to the farming community and its farming interests, in addition to its fertile land, in addition to the intelligence of the people and the growing prosperity of its farmers, it has in its centre one of the largest industrial interests in this Dominion. That industry, the oil industry, came into existence a little over twenty years ago. Petrolia, was, at that time I may say almost a solid bush. Now, so rapidly has that place advanced, that to-day it has a population of about 5,000 people. To-day, Sir, let us look at the prosperity which is taking place in that town, and we will see that instead of the frame houses built temporarily some 20 years ago we have now some of the finest buildings and residences in that place that you will find in any other prosperous town in the Dominion. We have now before the House a choice of two resolutions. The one is unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, irrespective of the injury or the damage it may do to any of our prosperous manufactories or other prosperous industries in our country. The other one in amendment to that motion expresses our desire to have reciprocity with the United States, clothed with a protective clause which I think will meet with the approval of this House by, perhaps, the largest majority vote that this Government will obtain during this Session. It will not only receive the very large support of the respective members of the House, but I think that if the question was to be referred to the people of Canada, a still greater proportion would endorse the principles enunciated in the amendment of the hon. the Minister of Marine. While, Sir, adopting and approving of reciprocal trade with the United States to a large extent this motion protects our position in this country. Allow me to read it:

"That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various industries and interests of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and which has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of the people."

These, Mr. Speaker, would appear to be the questions before the House. The arguments adduced in favor of the original motion, if I mistake not, are these: First, that the deplorable condition of this country requires this radical change; and that, Sir, is perhaps the strongest ground that gentlemen on the other side submit to this House as an argument that we should have unrestricted reciprocal trade with the United States. It is also contended, as a second argument, that free trade with the American market would add to our wealth, would increase the industries that we have in the country, and would increase the manufacturing and mining interests of this country, and would more rapidly increase the population. It is stated further, that it would also bring back to this country thousands of Canadians who are to be found in the United States, and who have left our Dominion; and it is also contended by those gentlemen opposite that all this could be obtained without any increased expense to us, without even resorting to direct taxation, and without tending to annexation. I wish to take issue flatly with those gentlemen on the other side on the arguments they have brought before the House, and on which, so far, they have rested their position. I wish, Sir, and I hope to be able to prove to this House in my humble way before I sit down, that every

MR. MONCREIFF.

argument they have used is untenable. I hope to be able to prove to this House that the position taken by the Conservatives of this country is the true position, and the only one that can be supported by facts. Now, Sir, as to the argument that this country is in a deplorable condition, that it requires this radical change. I shall say a few words. It might be almost like cracking chestnuts if I attempted to repeat the testimony given by members on this side of the House, and which testimony points clearly to the improvement and steady progress of this country. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in the early part of his remarks to this House, defended the main motion on the ground that it would remove the agricultural depression which exists. This was the position that he took. In addition to this the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in referring to the same matter says "that it was a cruel insult to the farmers of Ontario to say that they were in a prosperous and contented condition." Now, Sir, you have had the views of hon. members and the testimony of the highest authorities in the Province of Ontario on this question. You have had quoted to you by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) the remarks made by the hon. Mr. Mowat, and also the remarks made by the hon. the Minister of Education for this Province. It may be that the experience of those gentlemen who administer public affairs in the Province of Ontario, has shown them the position of that Province better than it has to the gentlemen who are opposed to us in this House. In addition, Sir, to the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Education, and which this House surely is bound to accept, in addition to the remarks he made that this country had advantages and was surrounded by influences tending to make us a peaceful and contented people—using the very language in the positive that the hon. leader of the Opposition used in the negative, and using the very language in the positive that the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) used in the negative—I will quote, Sir, another expression of this gentleman (the Hon. Mr. Ross) which I do not think was quoted on a previous occasion. He says, Sir:

"Our prosperity must have impressed him—"

This was addressed to the Hon. Mr. Chamberlain—

"and I hope he will speak of it when he returns to our friends in the mother country."

Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House will have to accept one of two positions. They must either apologise to the hon. the Minister of Education for the Province of Ontario for their ignorance in speaking of the farmers of Ontario, or else they will have to put up their hands to him and say: "Never mind, we were only talking 'buncombe' in the House of Parliament." I think, Sir, that I shall leave the hon. gentlemen on the other side to fight out this matter with the Hon. Mr. Mowat and the Hon. the Minister of Education, and not take up time any further on this point. Now, Sir, I shall refer to the position often referred to before in this debate which Canada occupies at the present time. Her progress to-day and the growth of her industries, as hon. gentlemen in this House know, whether they are willing to acknowledge it or not, are dependent on the resolutions of 1878. These resolutions having been carried into effect, have had the results of what protection in any young country will do, of fostering the industries of the country, of increasing its manufactures and furnishing a home market for the farmers of the country and thus improve their condition. I regret to say that the hon. the late leader of the Opposition is absent from the House, but I will quote to you what the hon. gentleman said previous to the last election:

"I freely acknowledge that the situation had been changed even by 1882, and I have as freely acknowledged that it has been changed more since 1882, and that many things then possible are now absolutely impossible."

Now, Sir, he was then speaking against any interference with the tariff or in any way returning to the position that the country had been in prior to 1873.

"And that a more permanent structure has been raised, some may think it for good, some may think it evil, but so it is. What an absurdity it would be not to recognise existing facts, not to avail ourselves fully and freely with frank and unprejudiced minds of all the knowledge and all the experience which has been accumulated, not to direct our course by the light so to be gained."

There, Sir, was the acknowledgment of that gentleman that having had the experience of this country since 1878, he said, as his own language tells us, that it would be wrong now not to direct our course by the light that we had gained. What was the result of that? The result of the adoption by him of the policy set forth in that speech is that many a Reformer to-day sits in this House who would otherwise never have been here. The hon. gentleman said:

"I have always recognised the great importance of stability in tariffs. It is one of the most material things."

It is only a few months since that language was used by that hon. gentleman, and it is only a few months since the Reformers who now occupy seats on the other side of the House were elected on the strength of the hon. gentleman's words. But to-day we find them, in the absence of the hon. gentleman, who I believe is in Italy, springing upon this House a motion for unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union with the United States, or whatever you like to call it. Surely that cannot be done with the sanction of that hon. gentleman. I hope, Sir, his absence is not dependent on this resolution being passed or refused by this House. I hope his absence will not be delayed a moment on account of this discussion. To me, a very young politician indeed, it seems that when a radical change of this kind is proposed, this House should remember that the principle of protection which was submitted fairly and honestly to the people of Canada, in three elections, was last approved by the people only some thirteen months ago; and on that principle the majority of the members of this House now hold their seats. Therefore it appears to me that it would be monstrous for any member of this House to vote for this resolution of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States without at least having had the sanction of his constituents. Before any gentleman votes for it, I think his duty would first be to resign his seat, go to his constituents and tell them: There is the issue, I want you to send me to Parliament upon it. If hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to take that course, I shall regret, after the election, the absence of a number of familiar faces that I see opposite me now. Sir, on account of the very large vote of the farming population of this country, hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to awaken the prejudices of the farmers as much as possible. Now, Sir, what is the best policy for the farmers? Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that I do not know anything about them; but I think I have had as much communication with farmers as many hon. gentlemen opposite. I say that any policy having the effect of increasing the demand for farm products must be of benefit to the farmers; and, not to waste more time on that subject, because it has already been fully discussed, I would just like to read three lines written by Robert Ellis Thompson, the great political economist of the United States, a gentleman who stands so high that he has been invited to lecture on political economy in the Harvard University. Upon that question he says:

"The policy which increases the number of those who are not engaged in farming, but must live on its products and pay for them, is that which secures for the farmer the best and steadiest remuneration."

Now, Sir, that policy was adopted by the hon. leader of this House, and has it resulted in benefit to the farmer? Let me refer to a few statistics showing the quantities of breadstuffs imported into this country under the policy which existed from 1874 to 1878, and under the National

Policy from 1882 to 1886, and we shall see at a glance whether that policy has been of benefit to the farmers of this country or not. From 1874 to 1878 we imported breadstuffs to the enormous value of \$67,692,000; from 1882 to 1886, with the protective tariff stemming back the flood of produce from the American market, the whole amount that has been permitted to come to this country to compete with the produce of the Canadian farmer, has been only \$18,536,000 worth. \$50,000,000 worth of breadstuffs have been excluded under the National Policy during those last five years, which would otherwise have come in to displace the produce of the Canadian farmer. Sir, that is surely not an evidence of ruin or desolation in Canada, but the very reverse. But while hon. gentlemen are wailing over the discontent of the farmers have they any idea of the condition of the farmers in other countries? Have they any idea that while we in Canada are enjoying prosperity, other countries are in the condition which they have improperly attributed to Canada. I find a report in a Scotch newspaper, of the Teviotdale Farmers' Club, stating that agriculture in Scotland is in a deplorable condition, that they have looked from year to year for an improvement in that interest, but without avail, and that now there appears to be no brighter prospect for the future, and there was no word of encouragement that could be offered to the farmers of Scotland at the present time. So that you find that your language is more applicable to other countries than to our own. Now, the result of our protection, as I have said, and I believe the statement cannot be contradicted, is, that it fosters the industries of the country, by increasing the demand for labor and creating among ourselves a variety of industrial functions. This same writer, to whom I have referred, Mr. Thomson, on page 362, says in reference to protection:

"It creates a variety of industrial functions within the nation, and fosters the most rapid and continual interchange of services between persons thus differentiated. It promotes associations between members of a same nation by producing variety in their employments; while free trade between more or less advanced nations always has resulted in the destruction of association among the people of the less advanced, and in a reduction to a monotony of occupation."

The United States have seen the folly of free trade, and Mr. Thomson, at page 358, refers to the development of the industries of the States, under its protective tariff, in these words:

"It is admitted on all hands that the effect of our present protective tariff has been an extraordinary development of our manufacturing industries, and a rapid advance towards a period when we shall be altogether independent of the rest of the world, as regards all the great staples which are capable of economical production on American soil."

Now, that is just the goal towards which we are steering in Canada to-day. And in time, economic writers will be able to use, with regard to Canada, the same language as Mr. Thomson has used in reference to the States. Now, it is stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that all they propose to do by their policy may be done without having to resort to direct taxation, and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), speaking of the amount of money we would require to economise, said that we would not be in a worse position than that in which we are to-day. He said:

"It is possible to reduce our expenses by the entire loss that we would sustain from the American duties. We could reduce our expenses \$7,000,000 with advantage."

Now, I understand, it is conceded in this House that the loss to the revenue of this country would be about \$7,000,000 upon American imports, based upon the returns of last year. I maintain, however, that if we had free trade or reciprocity with the United States, the amount that would be cut off from our revenue would far exceed \$7,000,000. I do not think I would be far astray in saying that it would be nearer \$17,000,000 than \$7,000,000, and my reasons are these: Hon. gentlemen opposite say that our

loss would be \$7,000,000, because that is the amount of duties we collected on imports from the United States last year; but the gentlemen who have been arguing in favor of unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union on the other side, have told the Americans there—and I believe their argument was a good one—as an inducement to carry out this policy, that it would double, if not quadruple, the trade between the United States and Canada. They contend that the Americans would furnish the Canadians with more cotton and machinery and with an additional quantity of every item upon which our tariff to-day imposes a tax of \$7,000,000. What would the result be, we cannot use any more goods in the country; we have quite enough for our wants. It is therefore undeniable that, with a tariff ruling against all other countries but the United States, the result must be that American goods will crowd out goods from Great Britain and Germany and other countries in the world, and thus deprive us of one-half, if not three-quarters, of the revenue at present obtained from our Customs tariff on imports from those countries. Let me tell you, Sir, what is the amount of dutiable goods received by us: the total imports of dutiable goods into this country last year were \$105,639,000, of which we got from the United States, \$45,107,000; from Great Britain, \$44,962,000, and from other places the balance, about \$15,500,000. From the United States, as I have said, we imported of dutiable goods \$45,107,000 worth, and from other places, including Great Britain, \$60,535,000 worth. Well, if the Americans were to bring into this country double what they bring now, we would only have about \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 worth of goods coming into this country from all the rest of the world, upon which the Minister of Customs could lay his tax. What would the result of that be? The result would be inevitably just what those hon. gentlemen say will not take place: we would be compelled to raise our revenue by direct taxation. Are the people prepared to have direct taxation? I am sure this House will show by an overwhelming majority that we are not, and I am sure, if the hon. gentlemen opposite would go to the country on a policy of direct taxation, they would be met with the most ignominious defeat that they have yet received. I have here language in reference to direct taxation, which the hon. gentleman who formerly led the Opposition and who is now in Italy, used in January last. He said: "The great bulk of our taxes come, and must come, from taxation. What are our sources of taxation? Direct taxation is at this time out of the question." That hon. gentleman was, therefore, as fully impressed as we are to-day with the conviction that direct taxation is entirely out of the question. "The reasons," he said, "I need not discuss; the advantages and disadvantages I need not review. We are dealing with practical conditions, and no one suggests direct taxation as practicable." I think I have established that under the most economical system that could be devised, under a system that I would almost be willing the leader of the Opposition should suggest to this side of the House, it would be impossible to so control the finances of the country that we would not fall short \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000, which would have to be raised by direct taxation. So much for direct taxation. A number of hon. gentlemen have talked about the sentimental view. So far, I have only dealt with the question in a business light; but I have sentiments just as other gentlemen in this House, and I should not like to enter into any trade arrangements that would have the effect of tending to sever, at any time, our connection with the mother country, and I think that statement meets the hearty approval of every member of this House. If there is any hon. gentleman who does not approve of it, he had better retire and ask his constituents whether his views and theirs are in harmony. Now, dealing with this question of annexation to the United States. Would unre-

Mr. MONCRIEFF.

restricted reciprocity tend towards annexation with the United States? I feel I am correct in stating that it would. My naked statement certainly will not convince hon. gentlemen on the other side, but I think I shall prove to them, out of their own mouth, out of the columns of their own newspapers, and out of the mouths of their own supporters, that the result of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union will unquestionably tend, sooner or later, towards a political union of the two countries. I now read from the *Globe* of August 1st, 1887, the organ, I suppose, of hon. gentlemen opposite—at least, I do not think they will repudiate it as being their organ. The *Globe* says:

"Unrestricted reciprocity without a customs union is the unattainable best."

That is, that they consider that unrestricted reciprocity without a customs union is the best for this country.

"With a customs union, it would be very good, and that we can probably obtain. To refuse unrestricted reciprocity because it happens to involve commercial union would be like refusing a business worth a million a year because to take it would necessitate the abandonment of a trade worth ten thousand."

Now, what does this mean? It simply means that unrestricted reciprocity means commercial union, and, having defined that so far, I think I shall be able to prove to you more clearly that commercial union means annexation. Now, gentlemen on the other side, though they do not have their friend Professor Goldwin Smith on the floor of the House to advocate their views, still advocate views very much like his, and they seem to be taking their cue from him and the Wiman combination. On the 27th August last, speaking in Detroit, Mr. Goldwin Smith said:

"I believe that annexation would be best for both countries. I believe it is bound to come. It was not possible in this era of civilisation to keep apart two peoples so much alike as these. Their manifest destiny was to come together, and commercial union was but a step, though a large step to that end."

Do I prove it out of his mouth? Let me also refer to some gentlemen who are members of this House, and see whether their views are the same as those of this gentleman. Professor Smith expresses almost a desire for annexation, but I believe the member in this House to whom I refer will not for a moment endorse the sentiments of Professor Goldwin Smith in this regard. I believe he is too loyal to do that, and I feel sure that there is not a taint of annexation about him. I refer to the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister). Still, I want to quote his words in reply to an interviewer who had an interview with him in the town of Sarnia, last summer. The interviewer says:

"Will not union develop the annexation sentiment?"

What is his answer, as far as the newspaper gives it? I was not there, but I have never heard it contradicted, and it is published in his own newspaper, the *Sarnia Observer*. He says:

"Annexation is the natural outgrowth of union, and, if we had that, annexation would probably follow ultimately."

I think I have convinced you of two things, that unrestricted reciprocity is only an underhand name for commercial union, and that commercial union in this country means annexation ultimately, as the hon. member for West Lambton and Professor Smith say. Having answered, I think, perhaps not to the satisfaction of all hon. gentlemen in this House, but according to my own opinions, these questions, I think we may fairly sum up by considering what would be the result of this union if it were to be brought about. What would be the result to this country if we had this unrestricted reciprocity, by any name you choose to give it? I listened with great pleasure indeed to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran). He seemed to grasp the key of the situation. He dealt with

in a masterly manner, showing the effect that commercial union or unrestricted free trade had had in foreign countries where it had been adopted, the effect it has had upon nations in the past, and that is one way in which we would be able to judge as to the result of this proposed commercial union upon our own country. My own impression is that the United States would be constantly underselling us Canadians, that manufacturers in this country would suffer from day to day, that the large surplus manufactured on the other side, which used to be brought in here as a slaughter market under the 17½ per cent. tariff, would continue to be brought into this country but in larger quantities than ever, that it would oust our manufacturers from the trade they have already made for themselves. Such would have the inevitable result of destroying the growth of capital in the country. The one certainly follows the other. If you destroy the manufacturing interest in this country, you destroy one of the great means of increasing capital and making wealth. If you adopt the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), you will destroy many an industry in this country, and the variety of industries in Canada will be lessened. That will be the inevitable result. Some industries of a weaker class than others which have grown to be strong under this policy, would be wiped out, and in a short time the remaining industries of this country would be probably counted on your fingers. I think also that the result of this resolution would be to cause the productive powers of Canada to steadily decline, capital having been drawn out and the means of accumulating wealth having been taken away, before very long we would find this country in the condition in which the hon. gentleman from Centre Montreal (Mr. Curran) described the industrial manufactures of Ireland to be in. Now, Sir, this political economist, Mr. Thomson, has also very decided views upon this question. The House will pardon me if I read what he says upon the effect of free trade union between two nations, not between two nations of equal weight, of equal capital, of equal resources, but a free trade union between a wealthy nation and a nation that is not in as good circumstances. Here is what he says:

"But this is by no means the actual state, even of the nations called civilised."

That is, they are not on an equal footing.

"No two nations have reached the same point in industrial development, some are far ahead, because of an earlier use of natural advantages, others lag far behind, though they are striving with all energy to come up. Suppose now, that two nations that differ thus should establish full and free commercial intercourse between each other, what will be the necessary effect? At first sight it might seem that the rich nation would be conferring benefits upon the poorer one, which the other could but feebly return; that the difference between them would gradually and steadily diminish through the poorer nation coming forward in industrial development, and taking an even higher place and that more rapidly than before."

Now, Sir, this author says that at first sight all that might be the result—at first sight only. He says that the picture drawn by the hon. gentlemen opposite at first sight might be thought to be the correct picture; but hon. gentlemen opposite, perhaps, had better study political economy a little more carefully and see if what I have stated is not the inevitable result. Mr. Thomson goes on to say:

"But experience shows that just the reverse of this is the case. The rich nation becomes, for a time, at least, richer by the exchange, the poor nation permanently poorer. The former, through its command of cheap capital, and, by consequence, its greater division and deficiency of labor, can continually undersell the latter in whatever it chooses to export to it, for it can send its manufactured goods at prices with which the manufacturers of the other cannot compete. The process of accumulating capital in the poorer country is decidedly checked; its people are reduced from what variety of industry and the mutual exchange of services they had possessed, to a uniformity of employment in which no man needs or helps his neighbor. Their power of association is destroyed, money, the instrument of association, is drained out of the country. Nothing is left them but the production of such raw materials as the richer nation chooses to buy, and how unprofitable a commerce of that

sort is, we have already seen. The country steadily declines in all the elements of productive power, even in the character of the single home industry that is left it. 'From him that hath not, is taken away that which he seemeth to have.'"

Now, Sir, that is the true doctrine, and I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite, before they cast their votes, will consider well the doctrine that is laid down by this political economist. Let me ask those hon. gentlemen now, if they were upon this side of the House, and charged with the administration of the country, is there a single man of them who would dare to pronounce in favor of unrestricted reciprocity? I will guarantee that it never would be mentioned by any one of those hon. gentlemen, if they were conducting the finance and the fiscal policy of this country. In conclusion let me say that the vast majority of the Canadian people are in favor of cultivating trade with the United States, but, in the language of the amendment, only in so far as it does not conflict with the policy of fostering the various industries of this country; nor will the Conservative party support any policy that will tend to disturb trade and industry which have been established here. I can honestly say that I wish hon. gentlemen opposite would not take such a gloomy view of this country and of its future. I believe if they could rid themselves of that tendency they would be much better able to discuss this question. I wish they would lay aside their partisan views in discussing a national question like this. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I ask them whether they would take the same view of this question if they were entrusted with the administration of the government of this country? We ought to approach the consideration of this question as true and loyal Canadians and British subjects. But hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have no faith in the future of this country. It may be well said of them, "O, ye of little faith." In closing, Mr. Speaker, permit me to quote just four lines from an American poet, which I venture to believe, echo the feelings and the hopes of all true Canadians about this country:

"Our hearts, our hopes are all with thee;
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our fears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee, are all with thee."

Mr. SKINNER. In rising to address the House upon this important question I feel some embarrassment, because I doubt if the opinions I hold are entirely in accordance with those held on either side of the House. Still, whatever opinions I have I feel it my duty to express them under the circumstances, because, from the liberty of debate that is granted here, it seems to be generally conceded that every gentleman shall have the privilege of saying pretty nearly what he likes upon this question. The reason that I feel a degree of embarrassment in addressing the House on this question is that I ran my election under a pledge to my constituents that I would make no war upon the National Policy. I do not know but that, to a certain extent, at least in my own mind, I thought that was a wiser way in which to run the election, because I believed that, outside of the merits or demerits of the National Policy, inasmuch as the country had approved of it in subsequent elections, it was better, in the interest of the whole country, that it should be maintained, for a time, at least, in order that the manufacturers and capitalists of the country should know what to depend upon, and that the business of the country should be, as far as possible, upon a stable foundation. But holding that opinion and making these statements, representing as I do and running as I did in connection with a maritime constituency, I always understood that those who framed the National Policy framed it in this way: that as soon as the United States were willing to relax their tariff we would be willing to meet them and relax ours. And therefore I stand upon that foundation in this House to-day, and while I have been a supporter in my own constituency of the National Policy, and while I am to a cer-

tain extent at least a supporter of it here, I say that I support it upon the understanding that it is not to be forever, so to speak, established among us, that it is not to be considered as one of the permanent institutions of the country, but as the strong hand of the people for the time to guard the manufacturers of the country until they shall by the strength of the tariff have sufficient power of themselves to compete with other nations. If they are not then willing to accept the National Policy, then my opinion would be that it would be better that we had never had it. Passing from that branch of the subject as to permanency of the tariff I say this, that if we can get free trade with the United States I am in favor of having it. If we are to have free trade with the United States I want us to acquire it in such a way that we can conduct the institutions of the country and preserve our national existence all the way through. It has been said here that if the tariff between us and the United States was going to be disagreeable to England, then so much the worse for England. I do not accede to that proposition at all.

An hon. MEMBER. A Tory.

Mr. SKINNER. Never mind what I am, Tory or anything else. We could not get free trade with the United States as a matter of legislation; that is to say, that if the United States would give us free trade now, within five or ten years they might change that legislation and so upset the whole trade relations of the two countries; that would not do. If we are to have free trade with them it must be a matter of treaty, and if so, the treaty must be made as matters now stand through the British Government, we speaking through and with them, as was the case in regard to the Fisheries Treaty. That being the way these matters would have to be proceeded with we should move hand in hand with the mother country, or I would rather say shoulder to shoulder with the mother country. I do not, therefore, like either here or at the hustings or in the country or anywhere these sentiments thrown out—that if the mother country did not like it we would do so and so. Let us as loyal men and as the representatives of loyal people first ascertain what the mother country is willing to do, and if after that had been done it was not satisfactory, it would then be time enough for us to express sentiments of that character. There are two points to be kept in view with respect to the National Policy; the first is the building up of our domestic trade, and the second is the creation and building up of a foreign trade as well. We all know that the National Policy or protection is practically directed towards the building up of internal trade, and in proportion very largely as it builds up internal trade it does so at the expense of the foreign trade, and that country cannot be called to any very great extent a successful country which, while it may strengthen its right hand, so to speak, its domestic trade, paralyses its left hand, its foreign trade. The real truth of this matter is, therefore, not on either side of the House, or at all events is not as much on either side as hon. gentlemen on both sides seem to think. Now, with respect to our foreign trade. I do not agree exactly with what my co-representative (Mr. Ellis) said last night in regard to the West India trade. He seemed to think we would reach the very sum of happiness, so far as trade was concerned, if we obtained free trade with the United States. I do not think so. I think free trade with the United States would be very desirable, I do not think it would be everything. I hold that growing as young Canada is we are capable, even if the United States would never give us free trade, of building up a foreign as well as a domestic trade. My hon. friend said that it was not worth while troubling about the West India trade for it would not amount to much. I looked into the statistics with respect to the West India trade the other day and I differ from him, and

Mr. SKINNER.

with the very best of feeling I put this difference before the House. Since last Session of Parliament I have done what I could in my own constituency with a view to turning the attention of the merchants and traders of the Province to the development of a foreign trade—not exactly a foreign trade, but a trade with South America and the West Indies. What is the West India trade, that is trade with the British West Indies in particular? Last year the United States exported of their products to the West Indies an amount to the value of \$6,462,030; Canada sent products to the value of \$1,166,268. When you remember that the West Indies are a part of our country and that if we had facilities for trading with them and if our people directed their attention to the same extent in that direction as they have done in other directions the United States would not so far outstrip us in that trade. If hon. members would turn their attention, moreover, to the details of the articles that make up the merchandise sent by the United States to the British West Indies last year, they will see that Canada could have supplied every article the United States sent there. I think, therefore, it is worth our while to turn our attention to this trade and to control it if we can, and the merchants and manufacturers of Canada in view of the perseverance and capacity they have shown in regard to the internal trade, could no doubt substantially control that foreign business if they make up their minds to do it. Take now the great country of Brazil, a country as large as the United States, and one possessing vast resources. The United States sent there last year goods to the value of \$7,071,753, Canada sent goods to the value of \$439,382. Is there not a fine field there for the cultivation of Canadian trade? How was it with respect to the Argentine republic? The United States sent that republic last year \$5,671,729 worth of merchandise. How much did Canada send them? Only \$385,984 worth. See what a field there is there. That country is rising into mercantile greatness, not into manufacturing greatness, and it is rising with astonishingly rapid strides, and, so to speak, inviting the merchants and manufacturing world to bid for its trade. Let us in Canada not turn so much to internal business, but direct our attention also to the foreign trade, and when we want some field of operation let us not altogether turn our attention to the United States but let us take other countries as well. Then there is the French West Indies. The United States last year sent them \$1,334,344 worth, and Canada sent them next to nothing, if not almost nothing. I put those statistics before the House because I recognise that all peoples as well as all individuals are inclined to run too much into grooves. We are running one time into the groove of the National Policy and we get it, so to speak, on the brain. We relieve our minds from that, and then we turn our attention to the United States as the great panacea for what are called the evils of this country. I think this question is larger than that, and I ask that the attention of the country shall be turned towards South America, in order that a trade may be built up in that direction. I wish also to say, when I am upon this subject, that, as a Canadian and as a British subject, I hope to see the day when every foot of British soil in America shall be under the confederation with which we have the honor to be associated. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen, I make this expression of my opinion, and I do not wish to be misunderstood in the slightest. I am not seeking to go between parties, or anything of that kind. I have just as much interest as the rest of you in falling right into line, and I merely wish to express what my own honest conviction is. I do not wish to be considered as attacking party lines. The expression is purely of my own opinions, whether they be worth anything or not. I am in favor of reciprocal trade with the United States. I am in favor of meeting the United States, as it were step by step, as they

may hold out their hands towards us, but I am not in favor of cringing to them; I am not in favor of decrying my own country, and asking them to give us free trade because we are poor. Gentlemen, poverty is no more honorable in a nation than it is in an individual. The individual who is poor is powerless as spilt water. So it is with a nation and so it would be with a Dominion like this. In my opinion, if we want the respect of the United States, and if we want the respect of the world, it is our duty to stand upon the greatness of our country, and whilst we say to the United States: "We want to trade with you," we should also say: "We do not want to trade with you because we are poor, but we want to trade with you because we are rich, because we are able to give you as much proportionally as you can give us, and we can make our relations reciprocal and to the interest of both of us." Now, gentlemen, as to the coasting trade in the Maritime Provinces. Some hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces scarcely grasp—at least, I think they scarcely grasp—the importance of the coasting trade and of all that it implies. I would have you remember that in the Maritime Provinces we have something over 800,000 of a population, and taking them man for man they are as prosperous as any people in the Dominion. They may not be as wealthy, because we have not had the opportunity of heaping up wealth in individuals as you have had in the western country, but yet, take our population man for man they are on the average as independent, as contented and as prosperous a people as in any other part of the Dominion. If we could share in the coasting trade of the United States, it would be of great value to us. We have heard a good deal of the greatness of the wheat products of Ontario. Why, gentlemen, the fishing privileges and properties of the Maritime Provinces are equal in value to the wheat crop of Ontario. Therefore it is that with those maritime interests on our hands we are not as deeply interested in the National Policy as you are in the other Provinces. Protection of course is a sort of congestion, protection benefits the centres more than it does the extremes of a country. In those ports and places situated upon the coast of the country, merchants stretch their eyes as it were out over the seas, and their business grows up upon the water; whilst merchants and manufacturers in the centres are more deeply interested in protection than others. In my opinion, therefore, the policy of Canada should be so moderated or modulated that it should not be all for Ontario, if you like that, but it should prosper the Maritime Provinces as well, and the Government of the country casting their eyes over the whole country should see what the whole demands and make an average policy for the benefit of the entire Dominion. That being the case you will see that our policy could be modified in a great many things, so that it will give to the merchants of the sea an opportunity to build up a foreign commerce, as well as to give the manufacturers of Hamilton, Montreal and Toronto an opportunity to have protection against "slaughter markets" and against all foreign trade unfairly carried on against them. I wish to say a word with reference to the Intercolonial Railway. Everything seems to have been drawn into this debate and I have heard it charged here against the Government of Canada that the Intercolonial Railway does not pay. Gentlemen, the River St. Lawrence does not pay, but if you would close it up it would paralyse the free flow of trade and commerce of this great Dominion to such an extent that you could not get any person to vote in favor of closing it up. The Intercolonial Railway is as I understand it in the same position with reference to Canada as the Canadian Pacific Railway is, that is to say, the two together make up the great artery of trade through this Dominion. In this connection, I am sorry to see that one of my maritime friends should have reflected upon the Government because they gave money enough to build the Short Line

Railway. A remark of this kind, of course, does not please a gentleman who comes from my part of the country. As you know, in the city of which I am one of the representatives in this House, this project has been looked forward to since Confederation. They have looked forward to having the shortest line to Montreal and the west for the purpose, of our trade. We say that this work is in the spirit of Confederation, we also say that it tends to develop the commerce of the whole country, and the city of St. John is, therefore, heartily in favor of the Short Line Railway. We hope, when it shall be built and when we have facilities to carry on business with western Canada, we shall be in a position then to extend our trade with Montreal and Toronto under greatly more advantageous circumstances than we have had before. Gentlemen, we, in the Maritime Provinces, have made sacrifices in connection with the Union, and as my hon. friend said last night, our foreign trade has been depressed. It has decreased to some extent but the decrease of our foreign trade has been made up by the development of a certain amount of internal trade, otherwise we would have been in a very bad position in St. John and New Brunswick. Mr. Speaker, in reference to this question of how New Brunswick has suffered from the trade relations of this country let me say this, that when we entered into the Union our Province, according to its population, was one of the largest ship-owning countries in the world. The money of our merchants was invested in wooden ships, and that business has been entirely wiped out—when I say entirely, I mean substantially; and after that business was wiped out by the iron ships, one would think we would fall beneath the loss. But we did not; and more than that, we stood up under the great calamity of the fire of ten years ago, which was as great a loss to us as would be the loss to the people of Montreal if a fire should occur there to-morrow and sweep away \$75,000,000 worth of property. We could not have done that unless our business houses were on good foundations, and unless manufacturing, to some extent, had been developed. We are holding our own to-day, and I do not believe that in the Maritime Provinces anything like a substantial vote would be cast in favor of taking New Brunswick out of this Union. I come here representing the sentiments of a class of people who believe they should have some remedies given them, and who believe they can get those remedies by loyalty to the Union, by joining hands with those with whom they are associated, and persevering in the course we have undertaken to follow.

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

After Recess.

Mr. SKINNER. I do not intend to continue my remarks at any great length. I have expressed the views I hold on this question and in doing so have attempted to condense rather than expand. If I had my own way in the matter, I should propose a resolution different from any of those now before the House; but before saying what that resolution would be, I wish to call the attention of the House to a fact in illustration of the object at which I think we should aim, namely, to reduce our tariff whenever the business of the country will allow of it, and whenever the course taken by the United States would be in the same direction. For example, the members for the city and county of St. John have recently heard from their constituents, and we have seen it is stated in the public press, that a petition has been sent to the United States Congress by persons interested in the lime business in the United States paying for an increase in the duty on lime. We have near the city of St. John one of the finest lime deposits in America, and recently there has been an extensive development of that business, and the lime has been exported in large quantities to the United States, thus, of

course, coming into direct competition with the lime produced in that country. Our tariff on lime is 20 per cent. whereas the tariff of the United States is 10 per cent. and the petition presented to Congress asks that the duty on lime coming from Canada should be made equal to the Canadian duty. Now, that strikes me to be a case to which the attention of the Government should be drawn, and if our tariff is higher than that of the United States, let it be reduced. Therefore, I would have no cast-iron rule regulating this matter; but I would say, let us modify our tariff as the interests of the country should require. The resolution I would like to move would be something like this: Resolved, that the Government of Canada be requested to communicate with the Government of the United States, and ascertain whether they are willing to enter into an arrangement of reciprocity in all articles the produce of the two countries, and if they are, on what terms it can be had, and that the result of the enquiry be laid before the House. Then we could ascertain whether we could get such an arrangement and on what terms, and the House and the country would be able to come to a conclusion as to whether they could get it or not. But, as I say, situated as I am, it is not for me to say what resolution should be submitted to the House, because it would be useless for me to move a resolution unless I were certain of getting some considerable support for it. Therefore my views of the question just bring me to this conclusion, that I am in favor of reciprocity when it can be had, even if it impinges to a certain extent on the National Policy. The amendment moved to the resolution by the hon. Minister of Marine is to the effect that we can never have reciprocity if it is going to impinge on the National Policy. That far I cannot go, and, therefore, I shall not be able to support that amendment. I would rather something such as I suggest should be offered, so that enquiry could be made, because I wish it distinctly understood that I am in favor of reciprocity between the two countries when we can get it in harmony with the interest of the country, and in accordance with the dignity of Canada.

Mr. BORDEN. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) in his speech last night, based a large part of his argument, to justify him in voting against the proposition for unrestricted reciprocity, upon certain reports of agricultural societies from which he read very extensive extracts to this House, the principal one being that of an agricultural society in my county. It is possible that I should not have troubled the House with any remarks on this subject at this stage had not the hon. gentleman paid so much attention to the county which I have the honor to represent. Now, I will say at once that I have no objection to that report. That report in the main, so far as it referred to the subject to which it had a right to refer, as the report of an agricultural society, was true. It is a report written by a clever man, but not by an agriculturist. It will be clear to any one who reads it, that the report was a very peculiar one to emanate from an agricultural society. The fact is it was the work of a doctor of medicine. Like many other doctors, whom we know in this House, this doctor had a mind above and beyond the ordinary practice of his profession, and if this report be fully read, it will be found that he is inclined to cut a very wide swathe, because, in the course of the report, he treats of the physical position of the country, its political position, its trade and commerce, and winds up with a short dissertation on morals. He concludes his report in this way:

"The only ruin threatening is rum ruin. Let us see to it that our Council makes every provision in its power for the enforcement of the Scott Act."

So you will observe the author of this report is a cosmopolitan gentleman, who does not confine himself to matters of agriculture. It is only fair for me to explain in this

Mr. SKINNER.

connection that the gentleman who wrote it took a very active part in politics in the county of King's, and took the stump throughout the elections just preceding the issuing of this report, the local elections of 1886. Having taken a very prominent part in these elections, and having got the worst of it, he took advantage of his opportunity to abuse his position by interjecting political matters into a report which should have been entirely free from anything of the kind. But, as I have said, so far as the report treats of matters which legitimately belong to it, I endorse it entirely. When he says that the valley of Cornwallis and Annapolis, the country represented by the hon. member for Annapolis and myself, has superior advantages for the growing of fruit and apples, I agree with him. When he says it is one of the finest spots on the face of the earth for that industry, I approve of what he says. His statement cannot be gainsaid. But the hon. member for Annapolis has no right to make use of statements improperly put in his report, as for instance, the following with regard to potatoes:

"For years the crop which overshadowed all others in this valley, since the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, and the imposition of a duty, in 1886, have gradually taken the second place, apples now leading. In the political agitation which recently visited us, there is no doubt that potatoes and reciprocity were greatly mixed up in the minds of our farmers. The old days of a dollar a bushel held a fond place in their memories. Reciprocity for King's means simply a free market in the United States for potatoes. This, it is believed, would be a panacea for all our ills."

Now, by that very statement, he admits that the question of reciprocity is an important one in the county of King's. That very statement shows that the people think reciprocity would be the panacea for all their ills, yet the hon. member for Annapolis argues from this report that the people of that county are entirely satisfied with their present condition, and do not desire reciprocity at all. Now, with regard to the growth of fruit, and with regard to the apple crop, we have, as I said before, superior advantages. We have, it may be said, a monopoly, which is a natural monopoly, a monopoly which the Great Giver of all good has bestowed upon us, and which hurts nobody but does good to everybody. It is not a monopoly which we have had to seek at the hands of Parliament; it is not a monopoly which taxes the rest of the country to support us. Quite the contrary, it is a monopoly which does everybody good, both those to whom we sell and those who have the fruit to sell. The hon. member for Annapolis has told us that we go abroad into the world to sell our products. So we do, we go into the English market. A year ago, we sold in that market 100 barrels of apples, for which we obtained good prices; but we have not to thank the National Policy for that. We have not to thank any particular legislation for that. On the contrary we were interfered with. Our enjoyment of the very benefits which Providence has conferred on us is interfered with by the fact that we are not allowed to buy where we sell; and when we go across the Atlantic with our fruit, we cannot bring back English goods, but have to bring back the money and spend it somewhere in the Dominion, in purchasing, at enhanced prices, the articles we consume. To judge by the tone of the remarks of the hon. member for Annapolis, the people of King's and Annapolis live exclusively upon apples. They clothe themselves with apples or apple leaves, possibly, as in the old story with regard to the Garden of Eden. Why, the people of those counties are large consumers. They want something to eat; they want clothing; they want agricultural implements and the tariff we have in this country interferes with their buying in the markets where they want to buy, and obliges them to come back with their money and buy it home at enhanced prices. However, I do not intend to enlarge on that subject. I wish to show further that the hon. member for Annapolis is not correct in endeavoring to convey to the House the impression, although he was correct in what he said with

regard to the fruit industry, that we do nothing in those countries but grow fruit. One of the most important features of that magnificent valley is the diversity of the crops we are able to grow. We not only grow apples but we produce an enormous quantity of potatoes, and there is no crop from which our farmers are as sure of getting a return as from the potato crop. The hon. member for Annapolis did not see fit to read extracts from some of the reports of the agricultural societies, which would have thrown light upon this industry, and have shown that we are dependent upon other markets besides the English market for a return for our crops. In Kings county, the Central Agricultural Society has this report:

"A new market has been opened to us through the Hathaway Line of steamers which ply between Annapolis and Boston."

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). That is defunct years ago.

Mr. BORDEN. Well, there is a line in its place. Is there not regular steam communication between Annapolis and Boston every week or twice a week.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). Yes.

Mr. BORDEN. Then it does not matter whether it is a Hathaway Line or another line. But the report goes on to say:

"A new market has been opened to us through the Hathaway Line of steamers with Boston, which has already been of great importance to this section of the Province. A large amount of mutton, fruit, vegetables, poultry and dairy produce have been shipped, and favorable returns realised."

The King's County Agricultural Society in its report says:

"A new departure was made in this county by the shipment to New York of several cargoes of turnips at 35 and 40 cents per bushel. Should a market for turnips continue, even at 30 cents, this will make a profitable crop, as they can be made to yield 1,000 bushels to the acre—900 having been grown on one acre in Cornwallis last season."

That report was written by the very gentleman whose other report was so largely quoted by the hon. member for Annapolis. Then the Central Agricultural Society of King's County, says:

"Potatoes, our staple crop, have given a very abundant yield . . . Lamb, poultry, eggs and dairy produce (owing mainly to the Boston market via the Hathaway line from Annapolis) have been in good demand and bring good returns. A large amount of potatoes are also sent by this line, which is a great accommodation to many farmers along the line of railway."

The Union Agricultural Society reports:

"With an average crop of fruit they (the farmers) are obtaining very large prices, and in the sale of an extraordinary large yield of potatoes and hay of superior quality, the returns have seldom been equalled and never exceeded. In viewing the prospects of the industrious agriculturists, we are more and more convinced that, with free and favorable markets for the sale of our products, our lines have fallen in pleasant places and that we have a goodly heritage."

The Farmers Agricultural Society Directors' report of 1884 says:

"In reference to the crops we beg to report that as a whole we have been blessed with a liberal harvest, for which we feel grateful to the Giver of all good. Potatoes, our staple crop, were about an average; prices however, ruled low, and owing to the exorbitant duty, but few will be likely to find their way to the United States; probably a large portion of them will be driven to market. . . . Apples probably not more than half an average crop, but quality good; a large quantity have already found their way to the United States markets."

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). What year is that?

Mr. BORDEN. 1884.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). That is four years ago.

Mr. BORDEN. Three years ago. It is not very long ago. The West Cornwallis Agricultural Society Officers report says:

"Potatoes an abundant crop, especially in moist land, but as yet prices ranging very low."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will quote to the hon. gentleman some of the reports from the Annapolis Society which he seems

to have overlooked, and first the Nictaux Agricultural Society Directors' report, says:

"Potatoes a large crop, and turnips about an average, but owing to the low price and small demand they will mostly be fed to stock"

Bridgetown Agricultural Society Directors' report:

"Potatoes a fair yield, but the market value both 'home and abroad' is very discouraging for paying prices."

Paradise Agricultural Society Directors' report:

"In presenting their annual report the directors of this society would note that while our farmers are not untouched by the 'hard times,' which more or less affect all branches of trade, their condition will yet, we believe, compare favorably with that of their fellows enjoyed in other industries."

"2. Crop Report.—Hay far below the average, but well made. Potatoes above average and of fine quality. Grain, average yield; turnips and other roots, owing to want of timely rain, small. Fruit far below average, but prices for hand picked, rule high; from \$1 to \$4 at the orchard."

The Eastern Annapolis Agricultural Society Director's report states:

"The past year has been in many respects disadvantageous to the farmers in this place in common with other localities, as regards general cultivated crops. Hay very short and gathered in bad condition; wheat small quantities sown with fair yield; corn below average; peas and beans medium; potatoes, small crop and rather inferior in quality, selling value nothing; apples, abundant crop, of average quality, but the selling prices are low, so in the end our net cash receipts on our year's operations in crops will be much less than was wished for and expected in the early season."

Now, I think that those extracts which I have read show very fairly that the impression which the hon. gentleman attempted to convey to this House last night was not exactly in accordance with the facts, first as to our dependence entirely upon the fruit crop, and secondly, as to the people of that locality not wishing or caring for a reciprocity treaty. The potato crop, as I have shown, is one of our most important crops, and, as pointed out in one of the reports I have read, we know that our farmers are met with a duty of 15 cents a bushel on these potatoes when they send them to the United States. Last year the farmers of my county exported more than 200,000 bushels of potatoes, which at 15 cents a bushel, means \$30,000 which the farmers of the county would have received but for the duty. I do not know the extent of the exportation from Annapolis county, but I have no doubt, judging from the reports which are here, that it was very large. Then there is the article of hay, and I am sure the hon. gentleman is deeply interested in that. I believe that Annapolis county exports a very large quantity of hay to the United States market, where it meets a duty of \$2 a ton. The hon. gentleman told us that the values of real estate had greatly increased in that valley. He said that the statements made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that the assessed value of property in this country had not materially increased in the last twenty years, were entirely a mistake so far as our section of the country was concerned. I agree with him so far as the orchard lands of that valley are concerned. There is no question that there has been in the last five years a great increase in the value of those lands, but, I am sorry to say, they are all not orchard lands; orchard lands bear a very small proportion to the total number of acres in that valley. We have large farms which are not growing fruit at all, but are depending entirely on the growth of potatoes and other vegetables, and I say, and I challenge contradiction, that any farm which has not an orchard on it is not worth half what it was in 1866, the last year of the Reciprocity Treaty. I think the hon. gentleman will find that, in the county of Annapolis, as well as in the county of King's, along the area of the mountain range along the southern side of the Bay of Fundy, there are thousands of acres of land which are now not occupied at all and which twenty years ago were supporting hundreds of thrifty and industrious people. I challenge contradiction on that point. Three years ago, the total

assessment of the county of King's did not exceed by many thousand dollars the total assessment twenty years previous to that date.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The same may be said of Annapolis as regards the assessment.

Mr. BORDEN. The assessment is conducted on the same principle now as it was then.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). The assessment is no criterion whatever.

Mr. BORDEN. It may not be a criterion, but I say that the assessment is made on precisely the same principle as it was twenty years ago.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). I would like to make an explanation, if the hon. gentlemen will allow me. The assessment is no criterion. In the county of Annapolis—and I know what I am talking about, for I have had some experience in regard to it—they assess the wards, each ward has an assessor, and the county is rated according to that assessment. In some wards, they think the ward nearest to them is assessed too low, and, notwithstanding their oath, they will assess the property in their ward lower still, and so on until they get the whole thing down to a very low rate of assessment. That is the way in Annapolis, and I think it is in King's also.

Mr. BORDEN. I do not see that that is very much of an explanation. The principle upon which the assessment is made is precisely the same now as it was twenty years ago, and I say that the assessment has not increased *pro rata* with the population in the last twenty years, and the reason is that, although there has been an enormous increase in the value of orchard lands, there has been a corresponding decrease in the value of those lands which are used for ordinary farming purposes only, and I say further that, if we had the old Reciprocity Treaty—and I appeal to the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) to contradict me if he can—if we had a restoration of the old Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, the property in the county of Annapolis and in the county of King's, the moment it was known, would be worth 25 per cent. more than it is to-day. The hon. gentleman cannot contradict that statement. Now, I will call attention still further concerning the value of property. There is another kind of property, the property in the villages and towns along the coasts of our western shores. During the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty we had a continuous progress, towns and villages grew up and became thrifty, and did a profitable trade with our neighbors in the United States. Those towns have become almost depopulated. Along the whole coast of King's county and the Bay of Fundy, and, I will venture to say, the county of Annapolis, you will find scores of houses untenanted, shops unused, and wharves unused. If the resolution of the hon. gentleman for Halifax could become law, if that arrangement for coasting trade between the two countries could be made, I venture to say that in only three years these towns and villages would be restored to the old prosperity which they enjoyed during the period between 1854 and 1866. Now, since the report of the gentleman to whom I referred in opening my speech, has been read so extensively, and commented upon so extensively, by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), I may be pardoned for illustrating this part of my subject by referring to an incident of the campaign during the elections of 1866. The gentleman who made this report was on the stump, supporting the candidate who was opposed to me. I happened to meet him in a public meeting. He pointed to me and said: "Dr. Borden is the last man to complain of our not being entirely prosperous." "Why," he said, "he is prosperous, look at the fine place he lives in, the nice grounds and beautiful buildings that he

Mr. BORDEN.

has around him. I am glad of it, but he is the last man to complain of hard times." I said in reply that I did not care to have my private affairs dragged into a public meeting, but as he had seen fit to take me as an example I explained to this meeting how I happened to become possessed of that property. That property was purchased in 1866 by the man who sold it to me the last year of the Reciprocity Treaty, and one year before Confederation, for the sum of \$4,000. That man spent \$1,000 in adding lands and buildings to that property, making it cost him \$5,000, 15 years after that date, that man was glad to sell it to me for \$2,100, and that is the way I became possessor of that valuable property. That argument seemed to satisfy even the gentleman himself, and I may state further that if any person would come to me to-day and give me \$2,100 and the additional money which I have spent in building since, I will gladly sell him that property. I think that is a fair illustration of how property has diminished in value in towns. I do not speak of farming and orchard lands, they are exceptions, but of the towns in the western part of Nova Scotia. So much, then, for the assessed value of property. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been a somewhat attentive student of public questions in this country since I had the honor of a seat in this House. Since 1874, I have usually been in my place, and I have had the pleasure of listening to most of the discussions that have taken place in this House during the time I have been a member of it, and I have always understood, up to this time, that reciprocity was a part of the political faith of both parties in this country. I think I can show the House the very best reasons for believing that. Take the history of the different treaties. Both parties assisted in the negotiations of the treaty of 1854; both parties agreed that it was a good thing. In 1866 both parties agreed that that treaty should be renewed if possible. The liberal party sent an agent to Washington, in 1874, to attempt to negotiate a treaty; unfortunately he failed. The next utterance we have upon the subject of reciprocity was made in 1876, in this House, and I had the pleasure of listening to it. I hold in my hand the speech of the present Finance Minister, which he made in this House on the 5th March, 1876, and here is what he said:

"Individual members might be opposed to reciprocity, but both political parties were favorable to such a treaty, which meant free trade to a certain extent with the United States; and it could only be attained by one means—a defensive policy. Why did we get it 20 years ago? Simply in order to remove the customs duties, which restricted the free interchange of certain products between the two countries. Why did they adopt that treaty? It was because there was a hostile tariff on both sides of the line, and the time has come when, if we would secure a renewal of reciprocal relations, we must have something to offer. Therefore every one who believed in reciprocal free trade with the United States was bound to support the resolution before the House."

The resolution mentioned was moved by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the House, in amendment, I think, to going into Committee of Supply. Then what do we find next? In 1878 on the eve of the general election, the right hon. gentleman moved the following resolution:

"This House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a national policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow country-men now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade."

And what did the right hon. gentleman say in supporting his resolution? Speaking of the Americans he said:

"They will not have anything like reciprocity of trade with us unless we show them that it will be to their advantage. Why should they give

us reciprocity when they have our markets open to them now? It is only by closing our doors and by cutting them out of our markets, that they will open theirs to us. If they would take the same steps as England had done with France, and say: We will lower the duties on your wines, if you will lower the duties on our cotton goods, for instance, something might be done. All the Browns in Canada sent to Washington will be of no avail unless we have something to give in return. . . . If you say 'we will cripple your trade and shut you out, but at the same time we will give you every opportunity of fairly entering into a reciprocity of trade with us; if not we will keep our markets to ourselves,' it would have a great effect."

What was the object, then, in imposing this high taxation? It was in order to keep the Americans out and to force them to make reciprocal trade relations with us. We objected to the admission of their manufactured goods into Canada. We said: We will put up a high tariff and keep their manufactured goods out, and when the proper time came, according to the hon. gentleman's own reasoning, that we had something to give them, what was that something? It either meant that or nothing. As late as 28th March, 1854, during a discussion of a resolution in favor of reciprocity offered by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), the hon. gentleman who now leads the Government said:

"Unless the United States will come at some time or other to a conclusion that they would be willing to enter upon a reciprocity treaty, not only for our natural productions but for our manufactures as well as our natural products, we will never have a treaty."

Thus, I think, I have shown clearly that the *raison d'être* of establishing the policy of protection which was established in this country was, that we would be in a better position to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States. That kind of language was used not only in this House but also in the country. We are all aware that the Finance Minister stated once and I think twice in public in Prince Edward Island, on the eve of elections, that we would have reciprocity within two years. I venture to say that the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), notwithstanding his statement last night, declared during his campaign at the recent election, for he dare not do otherwise, that he was favorable to reciprocity if reciprocity could be got. I venture to say he did so. This policy of protection has been put forward as an alternative, as something not desirable but something that we could not help adopting, and something that we were to use as a means to an end. Now the policy seems to be the reverse, and this protective policy is to be the means of preventing the attainment of the desired end, because the resolution of the Minister of Marine, plainly tells us that if reciprocity is to interfere in the slightest degree with any industry fostered in this country then he will not have it, thus virtually substituting a policy of protection for a policy of reciprocity. Why, Mr. Speaker, coming down to a later date, almost up to this very day, we find that it was the policy of this Government, and the policy therefore of this country, to endeavor to obtain a reciprocity treaty. Let hon. members look at the correspondence between Mr. Bayard and the Finance Minister; let them look at the protocols and at the offers made. Are we to suppose that that offer to negotiate on the basis of freer trade relations was not made sincerely? I should be very sorry to suppose anything of the kind, I do not believe anything of the kind. I believe it was the policy until a very late date, until almost within an hour of the time this resolution was put before the House by the Minister of Marine. I cannot say why this change of base has been made; but certainly after the statements I have made and the proofs I have given, it is not fitting that hon. gentlemen opposite should charge members on this side of the House with inconsistency. We have been consistent advocates of reciprocity from first to last; hon. gentlemen opposite have been advocates of reciprocity up to the time when, I venture to think, there is more chance of obtaining it than there has been at any time during the last twenty years. Are they abandoning it because there is a pros-

pect of our getting it? Is that the reason? I do not know what the reason is. This extraordinary change of base requires explanation. I cannot understand it. Does it mean that the manufacturers are getting too much power? Certainly there must be some explanation to afford. I await with interest their explanation. It is scarcely necessary to ask, after I have shown that both sides have agreed as to the advisability of reciprocity, and it has been an axiom in the political faith of both parties, to show whether it is a desirable thing or not. I might ask the question: Is commerce desirable at all, is it advantageous? Surely if commerce is desirable, if foreign trade is desirable, it is certainly desirable that we should have the freest possible trade with our neighbors to the south. They are our nearest neighbors. They want what we have to sell, and we want what they have to sell. Our geographical position is such that it is convenient for us to trade with them; and as to the advantage there cannot be any question, we have had experience of it. What did the experience of 1854 to 1866 show? Why, trade went up by leaps and bounds during those twenty years, advancing from six million dollars to ten times that amount. We have heard a good deal during this debate of the loyalty cry. I have here an extract from a report of the Committee of the Executive Council approved by the Governor General of Canada, 19th February, 1865, upon the subject of the old Reciprocity Treaty. I believe the right hon. gentleman who now leads the House was a member of the Government at that time; I do not know whether he was leader but he was a member of it. After a reference to loyalty to their sovereign the committee concluded with these words:

"They cannot err in directing the attention of the enlightened statesmen of the Great Empire, of which it is the proudest boast of Canadians to form a part, to the connection between material prosperity and political contentment, feeling that they appealed to the highest motives of patriotic statesmen, the desire to perpetuate a Dominion founded on the affectionate allegiance of a prosperous and contented people."

My hon. friend from Queen's, N.B. (Mr. Baird) has spoken of this aspect of the question. It was quite pathetic to hear him. He said that there was no doubt at all that the adoption of the policy shadowed in the resolution of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) to give us free coasting trade along the whole coast of North America would be a wonderful advantage to his constituency and to himself. He spoke as if he had a personal interest in the matter, but he would rather sacrifice his property, he said, his own personal interests, than do anything at all that might savor of disloyalty. It was truly pathetic. It reminded one of what another distinguished patriot, Artemus Ward, said during the southern rebellion. He said rather than the secession of the southern States of the Union should have taken place he would have sacrificed his wife's relations. The hon. member for Queen's, N.B., would sacrifice his property rather than be suspected of disloyalty. I tell that hon. gentleman that there are some things in the world quite as important as loyalty. And if he would turn his attention as carefully to all the other virtues as he does to this, possibly it would not do him any harm. I will not remind him, possibly it would not be parliamentary to do so, of what the celebrated Dr. Johnson said of people who were inclined to talk so much about their own loyalty. But, Sir, we are told that we are disloyal because we are in favor of freer trade relations with the United States. I hold in my hand, Sir, an article in the *Westminster Review* on the subject of Imperial Federation, and I think it will be generally conceded that this review—a British review—might be supposed to be quite as loyal in its utterances, particularly when it is advocating a cause such as that of Imperial Federation, as the hon. gentleman who takes an opposite view to myself on this question.

"We are long past the day when the interests of classes can long prevail over those of nations, or diplomatic artifices or expedients over facts; and it is only when those who are in the right descend to artifices and expedients that the opponents of truth and nature have a chance. The Canadian people know what they are about and what they want, and will vote as benefits their own commercial interests and national and imperial instincts. Those who think otherwise should consider how and why the Reciprocity Treaty fell through, the vast and almost magical changes already resulting from the development of the Great North-West, how the transcontinental and inter-oceanic railway at once empowers, embodies, and stimulates the spirit of patriotism and empire, as well as the energies of commerce, and whether it is likely that citizens of the freest country in the world will much longer continue to raise a superabundant income by taxing themselves for the benefit of a few manufacturers?"

And again:

"Every passing year now strengthens the Canadian nationality beyond all ordinary computation of the effect of time, but if commercial union with the States should come and prosper, popular content with things as they are would strengthen with it."

And again:

"We hear a good deal now of Canadian railways which are political and ought to be commercial, and of the Canadian farmer, with profits mulcted by excessive freight on the one hand and a protective tariff on the other, who is kept out of the States' markets close by, whilst beckoned on through vast spaces to Dominion markets that hardly yet exist. We rely, however on general causes operating naturally, and we think irresistibly in a given uniform direction; and we say that Canadian nationality has grown with everything that has favored it, and in spite of everything that seemed to hinder it; that it has increased and not decreased with the feeling of loyalty to England, and of pride in belonging to a great Empire, and that facts now favor an immense development of that feeling. Canada has nationality and wants Empire. She can have a freer hand as a member of the British Empire than as one of the United States. Railways beget railways and traffic traffic. Unity consolidates nationality, and nationality leads to empire. Dominion markets must constantly extend and increase. Railways will create along their route and especially at either end, vast emporia of commerce. Esquimalt Harbor, land-docked easily protected, of sufficient depth, of four or five hundred acres area, and covered by Vancouver Island, the only coal-producing spot in that region, will be a place of concourse for the fleets of that hemisphere, and eyrie of imperial outlook and a stronghold for defence and communication."

How does he conclude the article?

"All tends to show that Canadian nationality and loyalty bid fair to be intensified and extended, and that if Canadian and States commercial unity comes, it will not mean severance from England."

That is the opinion of the reviewer in the *Westminster Review*. Now, Sir, what is the truest kind of loyalty? It is loyalty to the best interests of the country. The time has come in our system of government, when the best understood wishes of the people are the wishes of the Sovereign, and when there is no difference between the feelings and desires and wishes of the majority and the wishes of the Sovereign under whose beneficent sway we are proud to live. That is the fact, and if we, by a large majority in this country, show to Her Majesty the Queen that we are in favor of freer trade relations with the United States she will not only consider it not disloyal, but she will be proud to assist us in carrying out that which is going to be for our own material advantage. Now, we are told that the adoption of this resolution and this policy will injure the manufacturers. I dissent entirely from that view. I do believe that, so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, the manufacturers of Toronto, Hamilton, London, and perhaps of Montreal, will not have the markets in the Maritime Provinces. I quite admit that the Maritime Provinces would have the right to trade where they want to trade, where they have a right to trade, and where they would trade, were it not for the very high tariff, with the United States their nearest neighbor. Those centres to which I have referred would become centres of a larger area of country. They would have their share of the trade with the 60,000,000 people to the south of us, and they could send their goods down in competition with the manufacturers of the United States. Is it possible that, after a lengthened period of protection to our manufacturers in this country, we are not able to compete with the manufacturers of the United States? I would be ashamed to acknowledge anything of that kind. I do not believe it. I believe that

Mr. BARRON,

the adoption of the policy would be as advantageous to the manufacturers of this country as to any other of the people of the country. If not, then what does it mean? Is it not a contention that the people of this country are being taxed heavily in order to support those manufacturers and that we are annually paying heavy taxes into the revenue and putting the taxes into the pockets of the manufacturers? This is what it means. What do we find in the United States? We find that twenty-five years, aye, fifteen years ago, manufacturers were unknown in the southern States of the Union; we find to-day that manufacturers are going ahead rapidly and that the southern States of the Union are doing their own manufacturing, notwithstanding that their neighbors in the New England States had from fifty to one hundred years the start of them. Are we, who are manufacturing almost as long as the manufacturers of the New England States, to fall behind in the race, when the southern States have within a few years developed their large manufactures? I think not. I am entirely of a different view from that. I have in my own county a few manufacturers and I have talked with them on the subject. We have manufacturers of axes, and I am assured by those men that they do not fear reciprocity and free trade with the United States. They say give us the raw materials free and we will compete with anybody. We are not afraid of competition. So it is with all the manufacturers. They say: "Give us a chance to send our manufactures into the State of Maine, and we are not afraid of competition. We are more afraid of Canadian competition under a high tariff than we would be of competition under free trade with the United States." We are further told that this is not a practical question, and that it does not come within the range of practical politics. I think, Sir, that this article which I have read on the subject of Imperial Federation, and in which incidentally this question of commercial free trade with the United States is considered, shows that it is within the range of practical politics, shows that it is being considered upon the other side of the water, and I think it is only necessary to read a letter of Mr. Bayard to Sir Charles Tupper in order to see that the question is within the range of practical politics. We find now that there are two propositions on this subject in the United States, one before Congress and one before the Senate, directly pointing to the carrying out of something similar to that which is proposed in the resolution before the House. I refer to Congressman Hitt's resolution for commercial union, and I refer also to the resolution of Senator Frye for reciprocal commercial relations between the United States, Mexico, South America and Brazil. Why were we not included? Simply because we have not at present the power of negotiating our own treaties. It is clear from these propositions, which are now before both branches of the United States Legislature, that the Americans are turning their attention to greater freedom of trade; and in view of that disposition on the part of the United States to extend their trade relations with the whole of North America, I think it is not correct to say that this subject is not within the range of practical politics.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, in occupying the time of the House at this late stage of the debate, the only excuse that I offer is the importance of the subject under consideration. The hon. member who introduced the resolution told this House, and through this House the country, that this was one of the most important subjects that ever engaged the attention of the Canadian Parliament since Confederation. I think hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House will agree with him in that statement, for from whatever standpoint we consider the issue involved, we must acknowledge that it is a most important question. If we look at it from a commercial standpoint, it means a complete revolution in the trade of over 4,000,000 people.

If we examine it from a social standpoint, remembering that in social life as in everything else the greater invariably controls the less, it means a change in our social status. It means a change in every part of our country, so that we must ultimately grow more and more like the nation with whom we associate. If we examine it from the manufacturers' standpoint, I think there are few but would admit that it means virtually the extinction of the manufacturing industries of our country. If we examine it from a political standpoint, it means the annihilation of our system which we believe to be modelled on the best system in the world, or the grafting upon it whatever is new and peculiar in the political system of the great country lying to the south of us. If we examine it from a national standpoint, whether as an integral part of the British Empire, or as an important nation growing up on the North American continent, it is equally important, because I believe it means our national extinction. If we examine it from the standpoint of the mother country, that power which has been our protection and shield from our embryonic life to the present, whose flag has shielded us through the helpless years of infancy and has continued to wave over us in our growth to maturity, whose influence and power have secured for us the rights of the high seas, and whose overshadowing influence has always afforded us protection in every part of the world, it means the detraction of this important and integral part of the British Empire from the mother country. We must admit that it is a great issue. The hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution told us that it was only owing to the condition of the country at the present time that he ventured to spring upon the Canadian Parliament such an important issue, and he went on to give us that doleful and lamentable picture which we have had presented to us year after year since 1878, when hon. gentlemen opposite were so signally defeated at the polls. He painted that picture in all its horrors and melancholy. One might almost suppose, if the picture was sketched by an artist, that after he had given it the last touch of the brush, he would sit down in solitude and melancholy and feel unhappy for the rest of his life. He gave us a picture of the condition of our country from many standpoints. It was a ruined and impoverished country. He told us our railways had cost millions of dollars, and had never paid for the money invested in them. He forgot to tell us of our highways, our concessions, our streets, for which we have paid large sums of money, but which do not pay any interest on the investment; but they are there to enable us to carry on our trade and intercourse with each other. He forgot to tell us of the great highways of nature, such as the St. Lawrence, which have been deepened in their channels, or the canals which have been dug in the earth, and which are paying no interest on the money expended. But will he tell us that any civilised country in the world could do without these conveniences of life? They do not give us any returns in dividends, but they enable us conveniently to carry on all the operations of trade and commerce like other civilised countries. He told you that the farmers, a great and important industrial class of the country, were growing poorer and poorer every year, that they are unable by their labors to supply themselves and their families with the necessities and comforts of life. He represented their farms as shrinking in value year after year, and debts growing up on their farms in the shape of mortgages which represented a large percentage of their actual value, and their wealth as decreasing owing to a reduction in their profits from the products of their farms. He declared that we were rapidly rolling up a national debt so burdensome to the people of Canada that they were unable to bear it. With regard to that, I have a return from which I find that the burden imposed upon the people in consequence of that national debt is comparatively very

light. The only burden they can feel is the interest they pay on it; and how much a head does it amount to to-day? When Mr. Mackenzie left power it amounted to \$1.58 a head, and if there was any truth in the assertion that the extravagance of this Government had run up the debt so rapidly that the people could not endure it, you would naturally expect the interest to be much greater, but it is only \$1.59 per head to-day. Did he tell the people that the magnificent railway system we possess, nearly 3,000 miles in length, in addition to the other railway lines subsidised all over the country, is no compensation for this one cent per head? Did he tell them that the development which has gone on in this country from 1878 to the present time is of no importance, and that they are paying too dearly for it at the rate of one cent a head more than they had in 1878? If the hon. gentleman is honest, he would give credit to the party which has successfully navigated the ship of State since 1878, for the greatest progress which any country has accomplished in the same time, and this, with the very least burden imposed on the people. But instead of this, the hon. gentleman asserts that everything in Canada has been falling into decay, that there has been a shrinkage in values in every line, that poverty is depicted on every countenance, and concluded by saying that there is no country in the world to-day in which the producing people receive less for what they sell and pay more for what they have to buy. He made this sweeping statement, and when we consider his position as a public man, we might be disposed to attribute to it some force, but what can be thought of that hon. gentleman's standing, what can be thought of his intelligence and of his integrity, when, on looking at the different markets of the world, we find that we are receiving for what we produce as high prices as the great people to the south of us receive for similar productions, and that we pay as little for what we buy as almost any people in the world. When we look over this country and find, in spite of the hon. gentleman's doleful picture, that the sun shines as brightly here as ever, that the day is as long, that the people have their three meals a day, that they are well clothed, healthy, happy and prosperous, when we look at them in their homes and at their gatherings and see them well dressed and buoyant in spirits, what opinion must we form of the patriotism or the intelligence of the hon. gentleman who draws these dismal pictures? We have heard from time to time, during the last ten years, the same oft-repeated story which has become stale and unpalatable, but which has been dished up to us this last few weeks in an entirely new form and dress; we have seen the picture drawn so often that we can almost imagine the people of the country addressing the hon. gentlemen opposite in the celebrated language which the poet Edgar Allan Poe addressed to his raven. These hon. gentlemen have often, on previous occasions, challenged us to appeal to the country. Speaking the other night, an hon. gentleman said: I challenge the Government to appeal to this country on this issue, and I can assure them that if they should accept the challenge they would not come back with a corporal's guard. This is not the first time we have heard of this corporal's guard. We heard of it in 1879, when the National Policy was adopted, and we heard of it again when the contract was given to the Canadian Pacific Railway; yet on every occasion that we have appealed to the people we have come back with a good many corporal's guards. We may well imagine the people addressing the hon. gentlemen opposite, as I have said, in the celebrated lines:

"Prophet! said I, thing of evil. Prophet still, though bird or devil,
Whether tempter sent, or whether tempest-tossed thee here ashore—
De-olate yet all undaunted, on this desert land enchanted,
On this home by horror haunted, tell me truly I implore,
Is there—is there balm in Gilead, tell me—tell me, I implore.
Said the Raven: never more."

Hon. gentlemen opposite said to the people of the country for ten years, "never more," but they have now come back with a remedy, and they say there is balm in Gilead. There is a remedy, and that remedy is unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. Let us see what that will lead to. We have these doleful pictures given to us by hon. gentlemen opposite, notwithstanding the fact that when we entered Confederation we had only 2,000 miles of railway, while to-day we have 10,700 miles. Our canals have been extended, widened and deepened in every part of the country. The position of our people is a prosperous one, looked at from every standpoint. Whether looked at from the standpoint of the savings banks deposits, the deposits in the banks, the operation of loan companies, the number of farm mortgages, the comfort of the people in their homes—from whatever standpoint we look at it, you must conclude unmistakably that the condition of our people is prosperous. An hon. gentleman opposite said that the number of mortgages held by loan societies was no criterion, because a number of people in private life are taking mortgages on farms. I would ask, where do the people get the money to lend, if not from the operations they have carried on during the time when the Opposition said the country was going down and men were receiving no return for their labor? We find farmers to-day lending money to their brother farmers on mortgages; and we must conclude that if their agricultural operations had not been successful, they would not have been in a position to lend money. Take the deposits in the post office savings banks, which I consider is one of the most correct barometers for ascertaining the condition of the working people. There is no reasonable man who will not come to the conclusion that the people are not in a very bad condition to-day. I have a return before me, by which I find that, in 1873, when Mr. Mackenzie came in power, the deposits in the post office savings banks amounted to \$3,000,000; in 1875, the amount was \$3,000,000; in 1876, \$2,000,000; in 1877, \$2,000,000; in 1878, \$2,000,000; but, in 1879, the first year under the present Administration, the deposits reached \$3,105,000; in 1880, the amount deposited was \$3,945,000; in 1881, \$6,000,000; in 1882, \$9,000,000; in 1883, \$11,000,000; in 1884, \$13,000,000 and last year no less a sum than \$19,880,000. Now this represents the deposits from 109,383 people, showing that they covered a large class, and according to the post office regulations, the deposits must have come from the poorer classes, because you can only deposit a small sum at a time. To-night we have a remedy proposed for this condition of the country as pictured by hon. gentlemen opposite. We have a remedy proposed for the condition of this down-trodden people. The hon. the leader of the Opposition gave us several remedies; but, to finish up, he was pleased to propose what he called the climax, "unrestricted reciprocity." He said we want a distribution of the taxes equitably; we want to curtail expenditure on public works, we want a reduction on expenditure in building railways, we want a reconstruction of the civil service, and we want a revision of the constitution. I may say of the hon. gentleman that if the constitution needs revision, and if his motion should pass, the unfortunate revision would not be in the direction mapped out by the provincial delegates last year, or in the direction mapped out by the Hon. Mr. Mowat in Ontario, but it would be a reconstruction of the state so as to make it suit an alliance or connection with the United States, so as to cause the annexation of our country, so as to sink our national individuality, and to make us part and parcel of the United States, with such provisions as to make us work in harmony with their system of political government. He said, we are going to do away with railway monopoly, and we are going to do that by asking another country to open her arms to us and receive us—a country which has the Vanderbilt railway monopoly, and the Jay Gould railway monopoly, of which we have all

Mr. SPROULE.

heard so much, and the celebrated Mr. Wiman, himself, the apostle of free trade and unrestricted reciprocity, is one of the greatest monopolists of telegraph lines on this continent to-day. This is the direction in which this resolution leads. He says it is to do away with the gigantic railway monopolies, and for that he says the true remedy is to have free trade with the United States, and that in that way the sting would be taken away from these tariff combines. It is for us to consider to-night how far that would be a panacea for our ills. I purpose to examine this question for a short time, because I think that hon. gentlemen are very unfair in their presentation of it. These hon. gentlemen have placed their policy before the country and the House. They have submitted that panacea, and they are to-day in the judgment of this House, and will be in the future in the judgment of the people of this country, because we are told that this is only a commencement, that they will fight it out at the polls, and will continue the agitation, and I tell them that, when an appeal is made to the country, they will come back with some experience, and with some such consolation and comfort as the old lady obtained from the parrot for which she paid a high price. There is a story of an old lady who lived alone and had no children, and had very few comforts as far as society was concerned. She induced a little girl to come to her from the orphan's home to live with her, and she promised her a great deal, but the discrepancy between age and youth was so great that the child did not find much comfort there, and, as an inducement, the old lady used to tell her: "Stay until I die, and I will give you all my money, and then you can buy what you want, you can be rich and pay for everything you desire, and be a great woman." She did not comfort her much in this way, and a gentleman came round selling parrots that he said were great talkers, and, though they were held at a high price, the old lady bought one of these parrots, thinking it would be a great comfort to her, and would be some company for the child. After she had bought it, she found that, like a good many parrots for which high prices had been paid, it did not talk at all; but the little girl was so lonesome when the old lady would go away that she used to say to herself: "I wish the old lady would die, it would be a good thing, and then I would get the money." She repeated this so often that the parrot got hold of it, and he would say: "I wish the old lady would die." So the old lady had not much comfort from the parrot. She was lonesome, and she appealed to her spiritual adviser, and told him: "The parrot that I have is the curse of my life; it only says two or three words, but it never says anything but bad words, and there is no comfort in that." He suggested a remedy. He said: "I have a parrot which has been with me for a long time; it does not talk very much, but, as I am a preacher, what it says are good words, and not bad words. You take this parrot and put it with your parrot, and it will teach it to talk in such a way that it will say nothing but good words." So she got the preacher's parrot. In due time the preacher came to visit her, and he said: "Well, sister, how is the parrot getting along?" "Oh," said she, "it is worse and worse. These parrots are the curse of my life. I do not know what to do with those parrots. When I come in, feeling so lonesome that I could sink into the ground, the first thing I hear is, 'I wish the old lady would die!' and then your parrot will draw a long face and say, 'Lord, answer prayer!'" I think hon. gentlemen will have about as much comfort out of the situation when they come back from the country as the old lady had from her parrot. But we may be asked, what does this unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union mean? We have had the versions of several hon. gentlemen. They have not been very definite. They have not given a very clear definition of what it is, but, if we can glean from those hon. gentlemen who have been advocating the subject so strongly what they mean by it, we will be able to find out

what is meant by unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. You will understand that I hold these to be synonymous terms, that they are convertible the one into the other, because in reality they mean the same thing. But it happens that these hon. gentlemen, finding of late that the words "commercial union" turned out to be not very palatable, have dressed them up and adopted a new name and presented the same idea in a different shape. If we ask what does it mean and take the gentlemen who have been discussing the question, not only in Canada but in the United States, we may fairly be entitled to accept their views as to what it means. The Hon. Robert Hitt, who has introduced a Bill in the United States Congress, pointing in the direction at which these hon. gentlemen aim, says, speaking of the people of Canada:

"They would probably accept commercial union, with unrestricted trade, common fishing rights, coasting trade privileges, and an equalised tariff would abolish all these custom houses."

What does this include? Exactly what is included in the first motion made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the addition tacked on to it by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). What does Mr. Goldwin Smith say about this? He is another gentleman who has been enlightening the country on this subject, and he says:

"Commercial union would, of course, involve assimilation of tariffs, which, however, since the raising of Canadian import duties, has brought the tariff more nearly to a level, would present no insurmountable difficulty."

The Hon. Mr. Longley, Attorney General of Nova Scotia, writes as follows:

"I have just had time to express a strong sense of the value and importance of a commercial union and to hint at the spirit in which the United States—from whom such a proposition must emanate—should approach it. The passing of Mr. Butterworth's proposed measure by the American Congress, will, in my judgment, be an enormous step in the accomplishment of this great object."

"Commercial union"—that is what one of our Canadian statesmen calls it, and that is what he understands by this motion before the House. Then take Mr. Wharton-Barker, and he speaks of it as commercial union with Canada. He says:

"A commercial union with Canada, such as is here proposed as preferable to reciprocity, would be established on the footing of a common tariff for both countries, and the distribution of the receipts from customs on the basis of population, or on some other basis that might be thought more equitable. As the present Canadian tariff contains many duties 'for revenue only,' its assimilation to our own would be attended by some loss of revenue to Canada; and it would not be unfair to guarantee her a sum equal to her present receipts for a number of years."

Now, he speaks of it and he makes no difference between unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union. He is an American. We go further, and we take Vallancy E. Fuller, one of our own Canadians, who has been over Ontario in advocacy of this question. We find him addressing a circular to the Farmers' Institutes of Ontario, asking them to take up this question and pass resolutions in favor of it. The following is the heading of his circular:—

THE CANADIAN FARMERS' DUTY,

BY VALLANCY E. FULLER,

President Central Farmers' Institute of Ontario.

Now, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said the other night that 48 Farmers' Institutes had passed resolutions on the lines of the resolution that was introduced here. Then, if that be so, who will say that it does not mean commercial union? Why, the Farmers' Institutes recognise it, Mr. Fuller looked upon it, Goldwin Smith, and Mr. Shaw, of Hamilton, who is conducting a campaign in the west—all these look upon it as practically commercial union. Then, are we not entitled to consider it in the same light? I think we are. But Mr. Wiman himself speaks of it in the same light, and he called it com-

mercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. So we have it from different public men who have given utterance to sentiments on this question, that they mean the same thing, and the agitation has been kept up since in our country on these lines. Take the utterances of every public man on this question, and you can come to no other conclusion than that they understand commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity to mean the same thing, and it is the same thing. Then I would like to ask one question here. The hon. member for North Norfolk said that 48 Farmers' Institutes decided in favor of this scheme. Why did they decide in favor of it? Because we had Mr. Shaw, of Hamilton, we had Vallancy E. Fuller, from Hamilton, we had the agents of these men going through the country calling the Farmers' Institutes together, and addressing them upon the subject, almost entirely on the one side, there was no discussion on the other side, comparatively, and it was an easy matter, when these men were brought together for that sole purpose, to get an opinion from these institutes on the one side, when there was no discussion on the other side. It was an easy matter to get resolutions pointing in the direction which the hon. member for North Norfolk has spoken of. Now, let me ask what is unrestricted reciprocity, provided we get it? I hold that from our position as Canadians it is unreasonable to expect that we could get a fair commercial treaty with the United States to-day. Commercial union I believe the people of Canada do not want, but a fair commercial treaty I believe they will be willing to make, and are prepared to accept freer trade relations with the United States any time that they can get them. But can we get them? We find that during the last 22 years every effort that has been made by Canada to extend these trade relations with the United States, has been rejected almost contemptuously. In 1869 it was rejected, and in 1874, when the Hon. George Brown went to Washington to negotiate one, it was rejected. Our standing offer which has been on the Statute-book since 1879, has been disregarded and ignored, and every offer that has been made to induce the United States to grant an extension of these trade relations on lines which we believe would be in the interest of the people of Canada, has been systematically ignored. Now, would we be more likely to obtain it to-day? Let us see the answer which was made to the British plenipotentiaries by the representatives of the United States, and I think that is the very best argument we can produce to show that we are unlikely to get it at the present time. Here is what the United States commissioners say:

"While continuing their proposal heretofore submitted—on the 30th ultimo—and fully sharing the desire of Her Britannic Majesty's plenipotentiaries to remove all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries; the American plenipotentiaries are constrained, after careful consideration, to decline to ask from the President authority requisite to consider the proposal conveyed to them on the 3d inst. as a means to the desired end, because the greater freedom of commercial intercourse so proposed would necessitate an adjustment of the present tariff of the United States by Congressional action; which adjustment the American plenipotentiaries consider to be manifestly impracticable of accomplishment, through the medium of a treaty under the circumstances now existing."

Now, then, it appears that this matter is to them one of perfect indifference. This is the conclusion that we must come to from reading their answer to Sir Charles Tupper's letter, and this is the conclusion they come to after careful consideration of the question, that if they proposed such a thing from their standpoint, it would be impracticable for the simple reason that it would require Congressional action, which they are inclined to think they could not get. Now, how far would England be likely to tolerate this, provided we got it? I understand there is a provision made between England and other countries, that when commercial relations with other countries are entered into she promises to give them the same advantages, the freest trade relations that they concede to the British Empire or her colonies. Now, if this is the case, and I be-

lieve it is, how far would England tolerate a discrimination in tariff in favor of the United States, and against her, and against all other countries with which she was on amicable relations, and with which she had trade relations. Would it not be a distinct violation of her commercial treaties with other countries? Because if we do not let these countries trade with us upon the same terms that we let the United States trade with us, we do not give them the advantages of the most favored trade relations. Therefore, I say it would be a violation of her treaties, and if there were no other reasons, that alone would prevent her from entertaining the subject for a single moment. But what objections are there to the commercial relations provided we had them? Well, in the first place, it would destroy the revenue of our country. Now, I think that both parties are agreed that if we abolished the duty now paid by goods that we receive from the United States, the change would at one slap take away from us \$7,300,000, and if we can believe the calculations made by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, when they tell us that if we had unrestricted reciprocity, our trade with the United States would increase nearly one hundred fold, I say it means nearly twice the amount. I believe that it means, at least, a falling off in our revenue of over \$15,000,000. Now, when you reduce the revenue of a country by \$15,000,000, you bring about a very serious condition of things in that country. We are yet a new country, and we must spend increasing amounts of money almost every year, because our country being new, it needs to be developed. We want railways, we want canals, we want harbors, we want public buildings, we want various things to enable our people to carry on their operations as successfully as other countries which are in the enjoyment of advanced civilised life, therefore we need an increasing amount of expenditure each year. But the United States are an old country, and their great difficulty is to know how to decrease the revenue at the present time. Then I say that if we were to rest the tariff on the principle suggested by the hon. gentleman, to say that we could throw our customs revenue into one pool, whereas we are 5,000,000 of people and the United States are 60,000,000, we could draw out only one dollar for every twelve they drew out. They want to reduce their revenue, but we want to increase ours. Now, in order to reduce their revenue they must reduce their tariff, and we do not believe that it is the interests of the people of our country to reduce our tariff now. Therefore, provided we had this, what would be the result? We would be face to face with the very condition of things said to exist in some of the Provinces to-day. We would be almost in a state of insolvency. We would be unable to raise enough money to carry on the operations in our extensive country. The Provinces are spending money as part of the Dominion of Canada to-day, and when they run short of money they can come back and say: We want an additional subsidy, and the Dominion must give it. We are obliged to do it because they are a part and parcel of our country. But could we go to the United States after we had entered into an arrangement for a certain time, but found in a few years that we were short of revenue, and ask them to readjust this arrangement? They would tell us, no, that it was entered into for a definite length of time, that they could not adjust it to suit our purposes, that we must take the consequence, that it suited our public men at the time, and that we must accept the result. What would be our condition then? Either we would have to get rid of the compact or would have to devise some other means of relief in the direction of raising money, and in that event it must be direct taxation. Suppose we went out of the compact. Suppose we stepped out again and assumed our national independence as it exists to-day, it would bring about a financial crisis in our country that would shake it from the centre to the circumference, that would be felt in

Mr. SPROULE,

every line of trade for ten years to come, and it would leave us in the condition we occupied in 1866, after the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, and we would have to build up our country again. Suppose we accepted the other alternative, and imposed direct taxation. We have heard a great deal from hon. gentlemen opposite about the burdens imposed upon the country and who pays the taxes—the poor men or rich men. They would require very little argument, provided that state of things was brought about that I have indicated, to satisfy poor people as to who paid the taxes. If we levied direct taxation, instead of the taxes being paid by the wealthy, in part by foreigners and only in a fractional degree by poor people, the poor people would have to bear the burdens of the country as they would find to their cost, and they would be called upon to pay the bulk of the taxation required to carry on the affairs of this great country. I say it would be most impracticable, most unreasonable to ask the people to enter into such a contract and into such relations, because we would be unable at any time to carry out the arrangement. We say further that you would have no chance to protect the interests of our people. Why? Because the tariff of the United States represents the interests of 60,000,000 of people, and they would necessarily make it suit their wants, even though it might crush our industries. Then it is suggested we might change our tariff. What right would we have to do so? It is proposed that those tariffs would be framed and agreed upon by some kind of a committee which would be composed of twelve representatives of the United States to everyone from Canada. What influence would one representative have among twelve? What chance would he have to protect the interests of this country? What could he do in regard to altering the tariff for our protection and to suit our requirements and wants, and to aid in the development of this country that is only partially developed, especially when as regards the United States that country does not need development, for it is developed to-day, but it needs reduced taxation so that less money need be raised. We would have little or no share of the work. There is another feature which must not be lost sight of. Canadian history from the earliest time to the present shows that the Reform party has sought to get Canada from under the control of the mother country. It has always been said that Downing-street has too much part in controlling this country, and even at the present time hon. gentlemen opposite are fighting for the right to negotiate our own commercial treaties. If Canada entered into a commercial treaty as is proposed, what would she be doing? She would be giving away the right, not to the mother country that is interested in our welfare and progress, but to a country whose interests are foreign to ours, whose interests are not on the same lines, but distinctly opposing lines, and that power which was taken from Downing-street and transferred to Canada would be taken away and given to the Congress of the United States. Would that be desirable as regards Canada's interests and would she be likely to prosper under it? This would not be in harmony with the line marked out for constitutional government, and our right to do our own business as contended for by the Reform party from 1867 to the present time. But we may ask, provided the arrangements were carried out successfully, what interests would it affect? I have told this House that I believe it would be disastrous to our country, that it would give away our right to control our own affairs to foreigners, that it would prevent our being able either to raise or reduce the tariff, and it would injure the country and its various interests. I will go further. What would be those interests injured? I believe it would injure every class. It would injure the commercial class, because it would transfer our wholesale houses at Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Hamilton and London to New York, Boston, Chicago, Philadelphia, Minneapolis and St.

Paul. Those would be the commercial centres built up at the expense of Toronto and our own cities. Then we would have American commercial drummers passing over this country pressing upon the retail trade the superiority of their goods, and, no doubt, they would sell large quantities as they did before 1879. We would soon find that our commerce was virtually taken away from us. Again, it would prove disastrous to our railways. The mover of the resolution stated our trade would be directed into natural channels, and would not be east and west but north and south. In other words, our trade would pass right across the border. The hon. gentleman has complained that the railways were returning no revenue for the money invested in them. I would like to ask him if the present policy is not much more favorable to the railway companies than a policy would be which would carry the trade across the lines instead of along them. It would prove one of the most destructive elements in regard to our Canadian railway system ever introduced into the Canadian Parliament. It would destroy our commercial life. I believe it would also destroy our shipping interest. It would certainly destroy our manufactures. How could our manufacturers compete against the United States, with its advanced intelligence in manufacturing operations, with its attainments in all manufacturing departments, with the vast capital, with the improved machinery and the cheapness with which they can turn out products? That our manufactures, which are comparatively in an embryonic state, could withstand such competition, is something that no reasonable or rational man would believe. I am satisfied that if this policy were carried into effect it would prove most disastrous to the manufactures of our country, and would either cause the transfer of our capital and our labor across the lines or it would kill them out in a short time. Our manufactures and trade would pass from us, and the result would be that our money would follow, and if our money followed that must mean the impairment of the country. There is another phase of the question which leads me to believe that the policy proposed would be a very disastrous one to Canada. In whatever line you choose, if you allow the people to assemble together and associate together in trade relations, the money will follow, on the principle that the greater attracts the less, and sixty millions must absorb five millions. Our social institutions would be imbued with their manners and customs, and the result would be a complete absorption of or extinction of our national existence, and we would imperceptibly fall right into what many people on the other side desire, and I am sorry to say a great many desire here, annexation, and our country would be virtually destroyed. Let me go further, and ask what other interests would be injured by it? Perhaps the most important at the present time that would be injured by commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity, would be the agricultural interests of this country. The tone of all the arguments which have been addressed from the Opposition side, I think, without exception, was that this would be a great panacea for the farmers of our country, and that it would be a great advantage to the farmers of the country. I would like to ask them why? I would like to ask them how is it that it happens to be so? If the American people were all manufacturers and not farmers, then I could understand that it would be a great value to the farmers of our country to get their market; but the American people have a variety of climates stretching from north to south, and a varied country from east to west, with all kinds of soil and with all kinds of climate so as to enable them to raise every line in which our farmers are interested or engaged in here, and indeed to raise very many that we do not raise at all. I see in their vast wheat-growing areas of the western States, a most dangerous competition for our farmers, and with their southern climate, their northern climate and with the

climate found in the middle of the country, that they raise very largely and very extensively every line of produce raised by the farmers of our country here. If we look at their Trade and Navigation Returns we can see in what way this principle would affect the farmers of our country. I see that the policy would expose them to competition in the various industries in which they are now engaged. The United States to-day are engaged in the same line of produce, and they are exporting the same articles that our farmers export. The American farmers raise somewhere about \$2,500,000,000, in round numbers, worth of agricultural products. He consumes out of that a portion at home and he exports \$550,000,000, in round numbers. In that respect he becomes a competitor with our farmers. Our position is about this: We raise about \$400,000,000 worth of agricultural products. There is about \$338,000,000 worth consumed in the country, and we must find markets for about \$42,000,000 worth in foreign countries. The American has to find a market for \$550,000,000 worth, and is it reasonable to say that the United States, if we had commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, would not send a large share of that stuff over here into Canada? In some parts of the country they have an early season, and, consequently, their grain comes in earlier than ours. Close to our borders they raise some lines cheaper than we do in Canada, and everyone of those lines would come into direct competition with the farmers of our country. The hon. gentleman for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in speaking on this question the other night, said that we would open up a market of 60,000,000 people to the people of Canada. But he might as well have told us that we were not only opening up a market for 60,000,000 but we were entering into trade relations with a people and giving them the privilege of throwing into our country \$550,000,000 worth of agricultural products in the year if they can find a market for it here. To tell me, or to tell any farmer in this country, that that will not displace in the market a very large amount of agricultural products, is something I do not think any farmer will believe. Before we had our protective tariff we found oats coming in at Georgian Bay from the western States and being sold there. In one day the price of oats was reduced 20 cents a bushel, on account of western oats coming into the market from the States. We found that the lumbermen were bringing their pork from Chicago, because they got it cheaper. It was this corn-fed pork, raised cheaply; and our farmers were unable to sell their pork. We found that corn was coming in and taking the place of grain and oats for the purpose of feeding cattle and horses. Every one of those lines came in direct competition with the farmers of this country. I hold that, whatever trade relations we have with the United States, it would not be in the interest of the Canadian farmers to take off the duty which we have on those commodities I have referred to. So sure as it is taken off, so sure will we find the same condition of things cropping up very soon as we had before. I pointed out that while the American farmer has to find a market for that \$550,000,000 worth of products, he would throw a large share of it into our country; and when the people of the United States supplied our own people we would have to find a market four thousand miles away, and the cost of transportation over that four thousand miles would come out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in speaking on this question, endeavored to build up an argument that seemed to me to have, at least, the advantage of originality. That hon. gentleman has had an experience in educating the people of this country as to his views upon tariffs. In 1876, I understand he was a protectionist; in 1878, he was a free-trader; and since that he has been a revenue-tariff man or a free-trader, I do not know which. During the years of 1878 and 1879, when the pro-

sent protective tariff was put on, and for the last ten years, he has endeavored to educate the people of this country in the belief that the consumer always pays the duty. He has advanced various kinds of arguments for that purpose, and he turns around now and tries to prove to the Canadian farmer that not the consumer but the producer pays the duty. Because it happens to suit his purpose he turns around and preaches all over the country that the Canadian farmer loses an amount equal to the duty on all our stuff which goes to that country, and, therefore, that our farmers are at a disadvantage, and that it is a hardship to them because they pay 15 cents on every bushel of barley that goes to that country. He says the amount sent from our country to the States is so small that it cannot affect the market of that country, and yet he has been telling the poor people of this country, for the last ten years, that, by virtue of the National Policy, they were obliged to pay more for every line they used because they had to pay the tariff. He forgot that he was building up an argument against his own logic. He says in one case that the producer pays the duty, but, on the other side, he says that the poor man in this country pays the duty also on what he consumes. Is there any force in his argument? I contend there is not. The hon. gentleman from North Victoria (Mr. Barron) endeavored to give as his argument that the Canadian farmer was a very large exporter and whereas he raised the goods in this country and he was obliged to find a market for them he was obliged to pay the duty, and that, therefore, it was in the interest of the farmers that we should have this commercial union. He went on to show that we exported from Canada last year 18,225 horses, and that those horses were valued at \$2,214,338. He was correct in this, so far as the Trade and Navigation Returns go, but when I asked that gentleman a fair question he very indignantly refused either to answer it or to give a reply at all. The taunt came back of ignorance; although he intended, as he said in the outset, to debate this question upon high-toned principles. Last year we exported, as I said before, to the United States 18,225 horses; of which the value was \$2,214,338. But did the farmer, he asks, get that amount of money? No; he said the farmer had to pay \$442,000 in duties. I asked him how he got at the amount of the duty which he told the Canadian farmer he had to pay; was it by taking the value of these horses as given by the Trade and Navigation Returns, and multiplying that by twenty?—because the American duty is 20 per cent. He did not deign to give me a reply. It did not serve his purpose to enlighten the farmers of this country on this question. Now, I will show the House and the country wherein his argument was unfair and misleading. I have here the Trade Returns of the United States, and I find that the Americans imported last year 38,000 horses, whereas we exported 18,000. They valued those 38,000 horses at \$2,450,000, while according to the hon. gentleman's estimate ours were valued at \$2,214,000, that is over twice the number of horses valued at about the same amount by the Americans. Therefore the value on which the duty should be computed would be less than half of what the hon. gentleman stated. The United States returns show that instead of \$442,000 being paid upon them, there was just \$245,075 paid. This shows how unfair a presentation of the case to the Canadian farmer the hon. gentleman gave. It would lead him to believe that this \$442,000 was taken out of his pocket, when in reality, if there was any correctness in the argument advanced for the last nine years by the hon. member for North Norfolk and his friends, it was not the seller of the horses who paid the duty, but the party who got them in the United States. The buyer who purchased them here got those animals at the market price they were worth when bought. Upon what value was that duty imposed? The value put upon

Mr. SPROULE.

them by the American officer whose duty it was to collect these customs rates at the line. We only value the horses when they are going over the lines, so as to ascertain the value of what we export. The Americans who collect the duty put their own value on them. A large number of horses are taken into the United States for the improvement of their stock, and there is no duty on them. But instead of valuing those horses at \$2,214,000, he should have valued them at a little over \$1,000,000. Did the Canadian farmer get that money?—the hon. member asks. He answers: No; the duty was taken off the \$2,214,000, and he got the balance. Now, one of two things the hon. gentleman must admit, either his deliberate intention to mislead the farmers of Canada or his ignorance. If he intended to mislead the Canadian farmer, he ought to be ashamed of himself. If he was honest in his calculation, and made this childish blunder, then I say he ought to be ashamed of it. That is his dilemma, and he can take whichever horn he chooses. It is not much to the credit of the hon. gentleman, who was so very imperative in forcing his views on the people of this country. I say that this measure would injure the Canadian farmers very much. I need not discuss its effect on the cattle, sheep or other products of the country which we export, because I find that he made the same mistake with regard to them that he did with regard to horses. Therefore, that argument was most fallacious and unfair, and should not have been used. The Canadian farmer received the market value of his horses in this country, where they were bought by buyers. Hon. members will remember that a short time ago England sent men to this country to buy horses. They only picked up a few, because they said the market price was so high here that it would not pay to buy them. But those they did buy they bought at the Canadian price. The American buyer did the same—he purchased them at their market value, where he picked them up, and when he took them to the United States he got them in as best he could, whether at a reduced value or free of duty it made no difference to the Canadian farmer. If the Americans have to pay more for the horses which are taken into the United States from Canada, because of the duty, it makes no difference to the Canadian farmer. If the American comes into Canada and buys an article he pays the market price here. In the same way, if we go to the United States to buy anything we have to buy at their price, and when we come to the border line we must pay the duty, which may enhance the value of that article here. This measure would also bring the Canadian farmer into direct competition with the American farmer in his oats, his peas, his barley, his wheat, his Indian corn, his hay, his roots, and almost everything else he raises. It would do more than this; it would bring him into direct competition with the American farmer in one of the most important lines in the country, namely, the dairy interest. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns last year we exported to England no less than 73,604,000 lbs. of cheese, which represented a value of \$7,108,000. How would commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity, affect the Canadian farmer in that line? I will show you how. I have here a clipping from a newspaper in reference to an enquiry made on this subject in London:

"LONDON, March 20.—It was announced in the House of Commons to-night that the Colonial Office is about to enquire of Canada whether the alleged adulteration of imported American cheese also relates to the Canadian product, especially as regard the practice of using animal fat in making cheese."

The adulteration of American cheese has so lowered its price in the market, that it would be unfortunate if our cheese were sent to England, through the same channel, and should be known as American cheese; and if we have unrestricted reciprocity, that must be the result. While we exported that large quantity last year, we find that the

American cheese producer, with his far-sightedness shipped his cheese to Brockville, Gananoque, Kingston and Montreal in order to have it sent to the English market as Canadian cheese. That is being done every day at the present time. Over 5,000,000 lbs. of this cheese was brought into Canada during the last year, and shipped to Europe from here, so as to create the impression in England that it was Canadian cheese. This cheese is adulterated with lard, cotton-seed oil, and various ingredients that depreciate its value. I say it will be incumbent on our Government to do, as they have shown they are always anxious to do, whenever the interests of any great class of the people is concerned, to devise some means, by which the English purchaser may discriminate between Canadian and American cheese. I would suggest that the Canadian Government should label every box of cheese that comes from the United States as United States cheese, and our own as Canadian cheese, so that there would be no possibility of mistake. Had we unrestricted reciprocity, the depreciation in the value of American cheese would be a great drawback, as it would destroy the standing of Canadian cheese in the home market. The same principle would apply to American butter, which would be shipped to foreign countries as Canadian butter, and thus destroy the reputation of our article in the market. People do not know often how to discriminate between the oleomargarine, butterine and other various compounds and our own butter, and often put the two on the same level. Seeing the importance of this subject, I may refer to a discussion that we had only two years ago in this House on the question of oleomargarine, and I may be pardoned if I read a short statement made by Mr. Reall at a meeting of the National Dairy and Agricultural Convention held in New York on the 16th February, 1886, relative to this butter question:

"For ten years the manufacture of artificial butter has been growing until dairymen everywhere find their vocations almost ruined. The 18,000,000 milch cows in the country have depreciated \$10 per head, and the land on which they are kept something over 75,000,000 acres, worth nominally \$50 an acre, has declined 25 per cent. These reductions represent a loss of \$1,000,000,000. This is not brought about through honest and fair competition, but in consequence of the most outrageous and glaring fraud that can be practiced, for the substitute is not sold to the consumer for what it is, but as butter. The people of New York city alone are paying not less than \$19,000,000 for the stuff they suppose to be butter, and which brings to the manufacturer one-half profit. Some 700 grocers of the city have refused to deal in the article."

If the manufacture of this spurious article means that large reduction to the American farmers, it must mean a proportionately large reduction to the Canadian farmers. He says further:

"Boston, New York, New Haven, Cleveland, Baltimore, Cincinnati, Louisville and St. Louis have large bogus butter factories, while Chicago manufactures more bogus butter than all the other cities together."

Speaking in Prince Edward county a short time ago, the candidate supporting the hon. gentleman who represents the Opposition, said the Opposition were entitled to credit, because the hon. member for Brant, one of their number, when this subject was discussed in this House—and when 10 cents a pound was put on it of customs revenue, and 10 cents a pound of an inland revenue tax, which was supposed to be sufficient to exclude it from the country—introduced a resolution for prohibiting the importation of these spurious articles into the country. But if the policy advocated by the Opposition, of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, should be adopted, what advantage could we derive from that prohibitory resolution? What benefit would the Canadian farmers derive from the prohibitive duty of 10 cents a lb. and the inland revenue duty of 8 cents a lb. imposed on these articles to-day, if we had commercial union? All restriction would be broken down entirely, and the country would be flooded with all this stuff which the Americans chose to send us. The Americans manufacture 260,000,000

lbs. a year, a very large amount of which would come in here to take the place of Canadian butter and thus reduce the reputation of the latter in the foreign markets. What will the farmer think of these same men who took so much credit for having that policy of restriction imposed on these spurious compounds, but who now want that restriction removed. They remind me of the cow, which, after giving a pail of milk, kicked the pail over and spilled it all. I believe the Canadian farmers are sufficiently intelligent to see what would be the result to him were this restriction abolished. Were we to do away with it, what would there be to prevent the American farmer from sending to this country this very large amount of spurious butter? In what other line would this policy bring about competition with our Canadian farmer. Hon. gentlemen will remember the interest created by the announcement, a few years ago, that Sir Charles Tupper had succeeded in having Canadian cattle taken off the schedule when imported into Great Britain. Our Canadian farmers had been building up a very large and important export trade to Great Britain. It was our best and largest market. The Americans were also competing with us, and, unfortunately for them, a contagious disease, known as pleuro-pneumonia, had sprung up among their cattle and destroyed their trade in England, because the English Government refused to allow American cattle to be imported alive and transported through the country for fear of transmission of the disease. The result was the cattle were scheduled, and through the influence of the English farmers, Canadian cattle were also scheduled and excluded from the English market. Had that policy been persisted in, it would have meant destruction to the cattle business of this country; but to the credit of Sir Charles Tupper, be it said, he succeeded by his indefatigable energy and great ability in getting that order rescinded, and the Canadian cattle were taken off the schedule, and we enjoy the benefits of that important trade since. Supposing we had reciprocity unrestricted, how long would we occupy, as regards our cattle, the superior position we hold as compared with the Americans? In a short time we would stand in the same position as the American farmer. Our cattle would be scheduled, and our cattle raisers ruined. These are a few of the important lines in which the Canadian farmer is largely interested. In every one of these lines we are brought into direct competition with the American farmers, and they are brought into direct competition with us. Before sitting down I would like to say a few words in answer to the hon. member for King's, N.S., (Mr. Borden.) The hon. member for Annapolis last night, in what I think the House recognised as a fair explanation of the condition of the farmers in the fertile valley of Annapolis, read the reports of agricultural societies. At the time he gave these reports, he reminded the House that the gentlemen who composed those agricultural societies represented both sides of politics, that there were a large number of Reformers as well as Conservatives in those societies. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Borden), in endeavoring to minimise the force of this argument, said that the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) had read long reports from those agricultural societies, but that it was nothing but apples, that it seemed to be composed of apples from first to last. Surely the hon. gentleman will acknowledge that the member for Annapolis spoke not only of apples but of cattle, potatoes, oats, hay, and almost every line representing the agricultural interests of that productive valley, and that he read not only the report of one agricultural society but of a large number of them, and that he had in his hand and spoke of no less than ninety-two of them from the Province of Nova Scotia. Was not that likely to be an index to the condition of the agriculturists of that Province? He read those reports fairly, he gave very valuable information to the House, information which would prove to the

members of this House and to the country that, notwithstanding all that has been said of her unfortunate condition, the Province of Nova Scotia is in a healthy condition and her people are peaceful and prosperous. The hon. gentleman from King's (Mr. Borden) said that some one in his part of the country had purchased a farm in 1866, the year after the abolition of the old Reciprocity Treaty, for \$15,000, and had sold it to the hon. member for only \$2,000 a short time ago. If that hon. gentleman had been fair, and had drawn the proper deduction from this, he would have told the House, and through the House would have told the country, that the value of farms at that time was largely enhanced, owing to the important market we had at that time in the United States on account of the disastrous civil war in which they were engaged. Some hon. gentleman will say that was by virtue of the Reciprocity Treaty. No, it was just after the Reciprocity Treaty had expired, but it was just at a time when everything we had to spare was bought up by the United States; it was immediately after the years when 3,000,000 of the people of that country were taken away from their ordinary pursuits, from agriculture and from manufactures, and from other lines of business to defend their country, and everything that we could sell brought a high figure in that market. I was living in the United States at that time, and I know that we had to pay for pork 20 cents a pound, for beef 15 cents a pound, for a suit of clothes \$85, for a pair of pants \$25, for a pair of boots \$15. That was in 1865, the last year of the American war; and all over the Province of Ontario we had not only Americans, but Canadians, buying up our sheep in thousands, to put on the prairies in the west in order to re-establish their agricultural industries after the disastrous effects of their very long and disastrous war. We had the sheep, and the pork, and the grain, and the cattle of our country bought up at fabulous prices and taken over there, not as the result of the Reciprocity Treaty or of the negotiations of 1854, but as the result of the destruction of the agricultural pursuits of the people of the United States on account of that great civil war which lasted from 1862 to 1865. Every one of those hon. gentlemen has called attention to the very glorious times which existed in this country from 1854 to 1866, during the time that the Reciprocity Treaty was in operation, but they never tell the people that we had the Russian war in 1855, the very year after the treaty was accomplished, and that, on account of that, the Canadian farmers' wheat sold for \$2.50 a bushel. I remember a farmer selling 200 bushels of wheat in 1855 for \$2.50 a bushel. That brought nearly three times the amount it would to-day, and yet hon. gentlemen compare those times with times of to-day, when the American is only able to sell his wheat for 75 cents a bushel. I remember when a pair of cattle were sold for \$175, and beef was proportionately high, and everything that went to foreign countries that would bear long transport was sold for equally high prices. After the Russian war had passed over, we had the building of the Intercolonial Railway, the Northern Railway, and the Grand Trunk Railway. These great works were going on, and large amounts of money were brought to the country; and, afterwards, when times got harder, we had the great disastrous civil war which commenced in 1862, and we felt the beneficial effects of it in this country—as far as the enhanced value of farm products were concerned—up to 1869 and 1870, and therefore we had good times, the farmers enjoyed good times. But while those were partially, but only to a small degree, attributable to the Reciprocity Treaty, they were largely due to the fact that so many of the agriculturists of the United States were taken from their peaceful pursuits in order to defend their country, and our Canadian farmers had to fill the place by supplying what they formerly produced. Therefore, it is unfair to say that, if you give commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, you would bring

Mr. SPOWLE.

back the glorious times we enjoyed during those years. If we had unrestricted reciprocity, I believe it would be a disastrous blow to the farmers of this country. I believe it would kill out the manufactures of this country. I believe it would destroy the commerce of this country. We have in this Dominion a territory of more than 3,500,000 square miles. We are expecting to go on and develop this country; we have the resources which nature has given us to supply the wants of our people. We have not only the resources on the top of the ground, in the shape of timber, but we have the resources below the ground in the shape of minerals. We have the fish in the ocean and in the lakes. We have the minerals in the ground, and we have manufactures springing up and giving employment to the people of our country. We have those vast and fertile fields of the west raising vast quantities of wheat every year. As they grow older, they will supply us with the wheat which we require, and we will supply them with the manufactured goods which they need. We will keep our people at home and we will keep our money at home, and the people here and in the eastern Provinces, when they cannot buy a farm in this portion of the country for the amount of money which they can command, will go out to that western country and get their farms for nothing. I heard a gentleman say that the farms have depreciated in value, and he gave the reason, that we had not unrestricted reciprocity. Those gentlemen forget to tell you that we have added a vast area to this country within a few years—Manitoba, the North-West Territories and British Columbia—and that our farmers have been going in large numbers into that western country. Are we any worse off in that respect than the American farmers, if you take the return which they get for their labor? The apostle of commercial union, himself, Mr. Erastus Wiman, states that the price of a barrel of flour in New York is from \$2.65 to \$3.50. In what part of Canada do you find any such price? If the American can only get from \$2.65 to \$3.50 for his flour, and it is selling in my part of the country, where they raise flour, for \$4.10, and has been all the winter, is it likely that the American will not throw that into Canada and get the enhanced price paid for it here? But is the Canadian farmer in the east any worse off than the American farmer in the east? We hear hon. gentlemen in this House talking about the population growing less in Ontario, less in New Brunswick, less in Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia, less in Quebec, and they say it is because the people are driven out of this country owing to the high tariff. Now, I have here a clipping from the Boston *Provincialist*, which tells us that the very same condition of things is going on in the eastern States of the Union. It says:

"What advantages are there in the New England States—over Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island? We see the statement made, that the young people leave their provincial homes by the score to seek employment in 'the States.' But to these young people 'the States' mean a very few centres of business, and outside of these centres there are as many deserted farms and tenantless houses, and as great a dearth of young people, in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and other New England States as can be found in the Maritime Provinces, in proportion to the population. Take Massachusetts even—the Mecca for most provincials—and two evils are met by all—intensely close competition, in the cities, and 'no business' in the country. The exceptions to this are about the same in the two countries under comparison. Let any who doubt this take a trip to Cape Cod, or down New Bedford way, or through the central and western counties of the State. Who has not read of Fairhaven and Nantucket, the once greatest whaling ports in the world? but now almost unknown. And wise people say that Gloucester, and Provincetown, and other such places are going the same way. There are thousands of deserted farms in New England to-day—the owners having moved to Boston or other large cities."

Now, I say, that proves that the very same condition of things that is to be found in our country to-day, is found in the eastern States. The people are going westward. It is said, that "westward the course of Empire takes its way." A great many young people take Horace Greeley's advice

and go west, where they can make homes for themselves, and start anew in the operations of life, with all the energies of young people, with all the prospects of a long future before them that their fathers enjoyed when they were young. Then, I say that Canada is in no worse position than the United States. We find that the same operations are going on in both countries, and a fair comparison of the condition of the farmers in both lands will unmistakably show that our Canadian farmers, man for man, are better off to-day than the American farmers. Remembering this, I come to the conclusion that this resolution would result in great disaster to the people of Canada, to the great agricultural class of this country, and, remembering this, I can only tell the hon. gentleman opposite, that I am not only disposed to vote against his resolution, but I am disposed to fight it inch by inch, in every part of the country, wherever I may be brought face to face with the people. I can tell him that when both sides of this question are before the farmers of this country, it will not take long to show on which side the great majority rests, and these hon. gentlemen will be as unfortunate when they appeal to the people again on the strength of this resolution as they were in 1878, as they were in 1882, and as they were again in 1887. They will not only find themselves, as they are to-day, leaderless in this House, with scarcely more than a corporal's guard to support them, but they will find their party entirely snuffed out of existence, and we will have but one party in this country, the Liberal-Conservative party, the party which has always shown a commendable desire to work for the good of the people. That party which has always been ready to come to the defence of the farmer. When combines are alleged to exist, a committee is appointed to ascertain whether the allegations respecting them are true, and, if so, that party provides legislation to choke them off. And as long as we keep up that barrier line, we keep those combines at bay, and when they come within our territory we can control them by law. We do not want any great monopolies here, we want no Vanderbilt monopoly, we want no Jay Gould monopoly, in our country; but when a monopoly does come here, we can legislate to take away its injurious effects. I do not care what class of the country requires attention, whether it is the farmer, or the miner, or the shipowner, or the fisherman; as soon as there is a want apparent, the Liberal-Conservative party are ever ready to come to the defence of the people of the country and provide legislation that will do them good. Remembering this, I am prepared to oppose this resolution, and to support the National Policy, that has done so much for every class in the country but more especially for the agricultural class, who are in truth the backbone of this country.

Gen. LAURIE. I feel that it would not be right for me to give a vote on this question without laying my views before the House. During the first 15 years that I lived in this country I was a free trader, but I found reason to change my views, as they were impracticable under our circumstances. After having seen what was going on in our own country, and especially after visiting the great Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia, I came to the conclusion that it was to protection that the United States owed the progress they had made, and that if we were to make similar progress, under the conditions that surrounded us, we must copy their example and introduce a National Policy. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) has pointed out that the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government, in 1877 and 1878, was ready to go any length for reciprocity. I think he stated that the right hon. gentleman was ready to go any length for a reciprocity of trade or a reciprocity of tariff. But we have also been told by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), that the utterances of our public men in the discussions of

the National Policy in this House, and afterwards in the country, caused much irritation in the United States, and did more than even the National Policy itself to embitter public sentiment in the United States, and the minds of leading statesmen in Congress, against the people of this country. If that is the case, and if the statement of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) is true, then it is clear that it was not the utterances of the right hon. gentleman and his party that embittered our friends across the border against us, but the utterances of hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, such as I will read for the information of the House. We thereby learn what the utterances were, if the view of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) be correct, that embittered our neighbors across the border. For what do we find in the discussion on the National Policy? I read this:

"No person will assert it is proper to project industries that are not naturally adapted to the country, but when they are suited to the land it is the duty of the Government to foster them. Arts and manufactures do not spring up on a virgin soil. In the first place, trade has a tendency to remain in beaten tracks. Then the advantage is on the side of a nation in which manufactures are established, because money is more easily obtained there than in a new country. I believe that the interests of the nation at large would be promoted by protection, and that the manufacturer being brought to the door of the farmer would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were 3,000 miles away. With a home market of this kind established by protection to manufacturers, the agriculturist can benefit his soil by producing a rotation of crops."

That came from the hon. member from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton); it did not come from any hon. member supporting the present Government. If that is not enough, what have we here?

"The American Government, always alive to the interests of their people, and all that relates to the prosperity of their country, have recently passed a Treasury order, increasing very considerably the drawback on white refined sugar, the result of which, I learn, has been that the great bulk of that quality now used in Canada comes from that quarter, and their manufacture is entirely abandoned at Montreal, where formerly large quantities were made; hence it follows that if our trade with the West Indies is to be encouraged or sustained, such exceptional legislation as I have referred to must be met by corresponding legislation on our part."

He goes on to say—and this has a bearing on the present case:

"Such a system could not continue very long, for in a short time, when the Americans found that they had destroyed our trade, they would dictate their own terms, and that it would be seen how disastrous the present [Grit] policy was."

By whom were those sentiments uttered? They were uttered by the very hon. gentleman, the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), who, from his place in this House, a few nights ago, assured this House that the discussion of the National Policy embittered the Americans against us, and did more to interfere with our obtaining reciprocity than even the National Policy itself. If that be the case, then I say it was hardly fair for that hon. gentleman to throw that as a charge against us and assume that the supporters of the Government were to blame, that it was the National Policy party who were to blame, when the very sentiments he himself enunciated were the sentiments that did the most to embitter our friends across the border against us. But our friends on the Opposition benches, in the course of their arguments, have dwelt at length on the great prosperity of the United States. They have shown that the United States, not so favorably situated agriculturally, commercially or minerially as ourselves, are very prosperous and we in Canada are suffering from depression; although it is plain, from the evidence that they have adduced, they have shown that we have superior natural advantages to what the United States enjoy. Have not those hon. gentlemen proved a little too much? Have they not proved that in this case, if our neighbors across the border, with natural advantages, have prospered more than we have, there must be a cause for it. What is that cause? We, who have supported the National Policy, have maintained that

it is protection to manufacturers, that that was the cause of the great prosperity in the United States, and that we are proceeding to follow that example. Let the hon. gentlemen say what they like. I have heard it stated this evening from the Opposition benches that if the National Policy has not already developed our manufactures into such a complete state as to enable them to compete with the manufacturers of the United States, then it was a failure. It was hardly fair to assume that our manufactures can be developed in ten years and placed in as perfect a condition as the manufactures of a country that have been fostered during seventy or eighty years. I say that our friends on the Opposition benches have proved too much. Then, what is the object of the resolution placed before the House? There must be a definite object in it. Is it to increase our exportations or our importations? If it is to increase our imports, that is a question we will consider presently. If it is to increase our exports, on what description is the increase proposed to be made? I hold in my hand the tariff submitted by the Committee of Ways and Means of the House of Representatives of the Fiftieth Congress, and what do I find? Let me here say that, while it must be acknowledged that raw materials are the main product, we can export profitably. I find in the new tariff submitted to Congress, and which may very possibly be passed this session, or if not this session it will be ready to be brought forward immediately after the presidential election, that nearly every material in which the vast mass of our people are interested, as exporters, is to be removed from the list of articles subject to duty and is to be placed on the free list. Surely, then, if the United States Congress are prepared to meet us in that way, if the Government of the United States, represented by that legislative body, are prepared to deal with us in this way, is it wise for us at present to go into these details, and describe how this country is suffering? What did the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) say the other evening? Did he not say that it was unwise for us to discuss the matters relating to the fishery negotiations, and I take it that what applies to the Fisheries Treaty would apply equally to the subject now before the House. The hon. gentleman said that our neighbors at Washington would watch the discussion, and he was unwilling that any language should be spoken that might be used against us in regard to that question. Practical negotiations must follow any proposition made by us for reciprocity. Certainly hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have used much language that may be fairly used against us in any negotiation on which we might enter. Hon. gentlemen of the Opposition have assured the country that the Dominion cannot go on any longer in its present position.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Gen. LAURIE. While the hon. gentleman takes that view, the large body of the House take the opposite view, and we are prepared to justify that view. We do not merely state it, but we hold to it and we give our reasons. We are told it would be proper for us not to seek to promote inter-provincial trade for the interchange of the products of each part of the country, but that we should look to the natural market to the south of us, and that that was the object of the reciprocal arrangement. In regard to the natural market I do not hesitate to say that the term "natural market" is thoroughly fallacious. I am not prepared to recognise that those markets are in any sense natural markets to us, for those markets were artificially created. We have heard from the hon. gentleman from King's, N.S., (Mr. Borden) of the great value and the large amount of produce that, could under favorable circumstances, be exported to New England. We have heard of the large market there and the very large amount of goods that the people of the United States were ready to purchase. But why are they ready to purchase that

Gen. LAURIE.

and what has put them in a position to do so? Is not that country able to raise products for its own ordinary consumption? Undoubtedly I claim it is. But protection has artificially created large cities and large centres of population. Those in no sense are natural markets; they are artificial markets created under a system that we desire to adopt and which we desire in our own way to promote our own market. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) stated that the British market being far away from us was of little value, and that the West India market had practically become valueless. On this question, other members from the Maritime Provinces, and myself, I am happy to say, are prepared to join issue, and at the same time he assumes that the only market left to us is the market to the south because the United States are nearest at hand. I claim, Sir, if a market near at hand is the only market desirable for us that it will be better still to carry out the view of the promoters of the National Policy, and, under the same system as our American neighbors, increase our own home market. It the argument of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) is good for anything that the nearer a market is to us the better for us, then I say to him the home market that we have at hand is better still, and, therefore, out of his own mouth and by his own argument I desire to prove my case. I will deal with the remarks he made and I will dispose of them. Another point that he raised was when he said: "It was hardly fair to consider that sugar sent from the Maritime Provinces to other Provinces was a product of the country." In one sense, Sir, it is not a product. He disputed the fact whether that raw material being imported, the manufactured article produced from that raw material is a product of the country. There again, Sir, I join issue with him. The article that we have by labor changed from an article of small value to an article of much higher value, to my mind, is a product of the country, as our mechanics and laborers have reaped advantage thereby and as money has gone into the hands of the people of the country. It is a product which we have handled and passed out to other markets, and in that sense it is a product of the country. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, in their desire for unrestricted reciprocity, speak as free traders, but as a matter of fact the apostle of this commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, whichever it may be called, or whether it be both, distinctly tells us that he supports it because it is protection in a marked and more extreme form and likely to make protection more permanent than ever, even as it is at present. At present, Sir, we have a committee investigating combines, and, if this be the case, is not this the most gigantic combine that has been proposed? We are asked that the two nations should combine to hold all the consumers of those two nations in the hands of the manufacturers, and for this purpose I assume that Canada is a nation. Comparing the prospects of countries which are following out the free trade policy, we find that the exports from Great Britain have diminished largely the world over. I find that in ten years the export from England to Germany have decreased £10,000,000 sterling; the exports from England to Holland have diminished from £16,000,000 to £9,000,000, the exports from England to the United States from £33,000,000 to £27,000,000; and the exports to Belgium from £7,000,000 to £5,000,000; and yet, Sir, we are told that a free trade country is better for the manufacturer than a protected one. That hardly appears to be the case, and those figures are from Mr. Giffen, who is, above all things, an apostle of free trade. The English manufacturers lately raised their hands in astonishment when a large contract for locomotives, by one of the large railway companies of England, was given to a firm in Belgium, where strict protection and a very high tariff is granted to the manufacturers, and highly protected Belgium was able to compete with free trade England in free trade England itself. This shows, Sir, the

protection there has developed manufactures and enabled manufacturers to manufacture cheaply when they once got fairly started and under way. Again the great argument which has been used is that the farmers are suffering, and that the farmers will suffer under the protective system. I ho'd in my hand, Sir, a paper elaborated by Sir James Caird, who is a strong apostle of free trade in England. He has considered this question, and has examined the reports in the United States and he has come to the conclusion that value in agriculture is enhanced by increase of a non-agricultural population. As shown by a table prepared in the agricultural department it appears that the States in the Union were divided into four classes. The first had a population of only 18 per cent. engaged in agriculture, the second with 42 per cent., the third with 58 per cent., and the fourth with 77 per cent. In those States that had 18 per cent. only employed in agriculture, the value of the land was £7 14s. an acre, and the wages of the agricultural laborer was £5 a month. In the second class, where 42 per cent. were employed in agriculture, we find that the value of the land diminishes by £1 10s. an acre, and that the monthly wages have also diminished. In the third class we find that 58 per cent. of the population are employed in agriculture, the land is only £2 14s. an acre and the wages of the agricultural laborer £3 10s. a month. In the fourth class, where 77 per cent. are employed in agriculture, we find the land but worth £1 sterling an acre, and wages of the agricultural laborer £2 10s. a month, just half what it is in the district where only 18 per cent. of the population are employed in agriculture. This shows, Sir, if proof goes for anything, and by the evidence of the United States Returns, that the less of the population employed in agriculture the greater the value of the agricultural land and the greater the returns to the agricultural laborer. But, Sir, we are told that if we adopt commercial reciprocity with the United States, we shall prosper. Now, Sir, what are the views of the statesmen of the United States? I will read an extract from a letter addressed by Mr. Frelinghuysen, the Secretary of the late Republican Government, to Senator Miller, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, in which he says:

"Any increase of our trade with foreign countries commensurate with our industrial development and requirements can only come through our commercial relations with countries inferior to us in wealth and population."

Now, Sir, that is the position of the republican statesmen of the United States, and I think it will be found that the Democratic party take the same view. They say that reciprocity with nations equally developed with themselves would be no reciprocity whatever. They want to establish reciprocity, if they establish it at all, with such nations as will sell them their raw material, and in return take their manufactures. He sums up his argument by saying:

"It follows that the superior nation which aids in such development can monopolise the greater portion of the import trade of each and all."

That is the position the United States would take if we adopted such an arrangement as that proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford. I had a little personal experience of this very thing two years ago. Duty took me to the south of Europe. I there found a young and struggling nation with vast natural resources—Serbia. Serbia is held in subjection to Austria-Hungary, and is bound under treaty to send her raw material to that country; but she is not permitted to send her manufactures there. Theoretically she is permitted, but practically the superior advantages held by the more advanced country ensure that Serbia with its great natural resources shall only send its raw material into Austria-Hungary, and any attempt on its part to send manufactures is at once crushed out. I saw the discontent and hopelessness in which the people of Serbia lived, and I must say that if any argument were necessary to prove to me that the proposition held out to us should not be adopted

by this House, it would be the case of Serbia, which has tried the same system and failed. I should be very sorry to see Canada placed in the condition of that country, and therefore I shall do my utmost to oppose the proposition made by the hon. gentleman. Our attention has been called to the great exodus that has gone from this country. I heard the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., say that Prince Edward Island was almost depopulated. I can also say that there is also a great exodus from the Province from which I come—a very great exodus.

Mr. KIRK. Hear, hear.

Gen. LAURIE. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." If that hon. gentleman were an employer of labor, I do not think he would say "hear hear." I am an employer of labor, and it is almost impossible for us to get the labor we require. Therefore the people do not leave because they cannot get work. There was a time when work was not plenty in this country, and when men had to go to the United States to get work. They then established relations in that country, and now having relations there and wishing not unnaturally to see the world, they go, and the result is that it is almost impossible to obtain the necessary supply of labor in Nova Scotia. Last winter it was most difficult to obtain the labor we required, and now, when spring has opened, it is still more difficult. Therefore while our industries are promising, we have not sufficient labor to cultivate them. The hon. member for Queen's stated that many of those who left Prince Edward Island sent remittances home to pay for the farms they purchased. Fortunately that shows that they have some desire to go back, and intended to do so. But I am sorry to say that is not my experience. I have known a large number to go away in the spring and come back in the autumn; when they come back they have a good suit of clothes, but instead of bringing any money in their pockets, they come to live on the old people during the winter. It is not the case with us that they bring back large sums of money. The hon. member for Halifax was astonished the other evening at my saying "hear, hear," when he pointed out that it was impossible last summer for owners of vessels fitting out for the fisheries to obtain crews, because the young men had gone to the States. Why, that was an argument against himself, because it showed that while there was work, the people were not there to do it. Therefore it is not anything connected with our industrial system that has caused this exodus. I am not prepared to say what they go for, but I say they do not go because they cannot get work. The hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution expressed his belief that this country will suffer terribly if the present system of government is continued, and he told us that unrestricted reciprocity is the only thing that will put Canada on her feet again. He told us also that England is friendless, and he dwelt on the isolated condition the mother country occupied; but he assured us that if unrestricted reciprocity were adopted immediately by Canada, England would make friends again, and Ireland would be conciliated. I have seen posted on the walls everywhere Rudway's Ready Relief and Johnson's Liniment, as cures from all diseases, and it appears to me the hon. gentleman's prescription is not merely to help Canada but it is a panacea for all evils, and all ailments are cured by this wonderful remedy. The only salvation if unrestricted reciprocity should be introduced—and God forbid such a thing should ever happen—the only salvation from direct taxation would be the placing of a duty on the patent medicine which the hon. gentleman is trying to palm off on us, and in so doing we might raise revenue enough to enable us to manage without direct taxation. I will not go into all the arguments brought forward by hon. gentlemen on this side to show how our trade will be reduced under unrestricted recipro-

city and how the imports of the United States coming in here to the exclusion of the imports from other countries, will reduce our revenue from customs, so that we will be compelled to resort to direct taxation. I do not think I should reiterate the arguments advanced in support of the contention, for there can be no doubt that the position thus set forth will be one from which we cannot escape. The hon. gentleman the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) went on to say that the present system would become a great strain on his loyalty. Of course, Sir, loyalty is a sentiment. Each man is his own law in the matter of sentiment, and no one can prescribe what sentiment another should hold. The hon. gentleman holds his sentiments, I hold mine, and each of us is entitled to hold his own; but I have never yet been able to understand the peculiar position he gives his loyalty. He says that whilst his forefathers were loyal and made great sacrifices, he now considers the debt of loyalty is paid. His forefathers were right in doing what they did, but his duty is to strike out for himself. The debt is paid and squared. His loyalty was a limited liability affair, and he is now free to act independently of it. As an illustration of another species of loyalty which is not a limited liability concern, I will read a few words of a letter that I received from one of my electors I have the honor to represent. He says:

"I hope the Fishery Treaty will hasten a free market for our fish, which without a doubt, we need, but not at a sacrifice of Canada's rights and honor."

The writer of that letter is only a poor fisherman, but I am prepared to put his view of loyalty alongside of that expressed by the hon. gentleman opposite who introduced this resolution, and I am confident that hon. gentlemen will admit that the writer of this letter gave a better idea of loyalty in the few words he expressed than did the hon. gentleman in his speech and resolution. I have heard the phrase as used, in connection with the proposal of the hon. gentleman, describing this proposal as "a heroic remedy." I demur to that statement. I conceive that true heroism consists in making a sacrifice of your own interests for the benefit of others. But as I understood the proposal of the hon. gentleman, his idea of a heroism is to sacrifice other people's interests to his. That is not the interpretation that I should be inclined to give to the term "heroic remedy." I heard an hon. gentleman state that if it was a question whether he lost his nationality or his property, he would rather lose his property. The hon. member for Queen's N.B., stated that, and the reply was flung across the floor that that was a foolish speech to make, that it would be far better to lose one's nationality than one's property. But is it not possible, if this unrestricted reciprocity were brought into force, that we might lose both nationality and property? That is certainly a danger that I dread. I am sorry to see the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) is not in his place, because I would like to comment on a few points with which he dealt. He remarked, among other things, on the difficulties our fishermen had to meet when they carried their fish to American markets, in not being able to bring back their supplies. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there is no difficulty in this regard. If our fishermen go to the port of Boston to sell their fish, they can bring back Canadian produce in bond and at as cheap prices as they could American produce. All of us who have visited the eastern portion of the States, know that wheat does not grow in any quantity around Boston. New England is not celebrated for her growth of cereals. These products come from the far west, and the distance is just as far from the wheat producing districts of the United States as from those of Canada, and the products are as easily taken from the one place as from the other. Our people have found that out. At first there was a great deal of nonsense talked about Cana-

Gen. LAURIE.

dian flour being no good to make bread with, and our people would only use American flour, but after a while they discovered that this theory was absurd, and the consumption of Canadian flour has steadily increased. In 1886 we imported 213,000 barrels from the United States, in 1887 we imported 172,000 barrels, while in Nova Scotia we find we have reduced our importation from 15,000 in 1886 to 10,000 in 1887. Therefore it is evident we can use Canadian flour and do as well by buying it, though of course, it entails the purchase by carloads and not by single barrels; but as a fishing vessel can bring home 120 barrels of flour, it is not likely to come home with one barrel. One of the grievances of the National Policy is the sugar grievance. We are told that we are playing into the hands of the manufacturers in the case of sugar, and that sugar is worth only 16s. 6d. per cwt. in Liverpool (Great Britain), whilst in Canada the consumer had to pay three and a half cents per pound higher than in England. The hon. gentleman who made this statement, forgot to mention the price of sugar in New York. That would be a fairer comparison than to compare Canada with free trade England. Had the hon. gentleman for South Oxford given the comparison with the country south of us, it would have been sufficient for all practical purposes to arrive at an opinion on his assertion. Supposing we took the duty off sugar, what do we come back to? We come back to direct taxation. If the duty is taken off articles that we consume, we must admit the fact, that to raise a revenue, we must have recourse to direct taxation. He tells us that the refineries of Montreal are making \$7,000 a day profit. The shareholders will be glad to hear that, but I doubt if it is really the case. He also undertook to tell us something in regard to the catch of mackerel. He says our fishermen must take their mackerel to the United States. Well, it is very true that, to a large extent, the United States is the market for our mackerel, but is that an unmixed hardship, that our fishermen should take their mackerel to the United States? I think, when we consider the large protection we have afforded to our fisheries, while, as he says, that is, on the one hand, our market, on the other hand he forgot to tell the House that our fisheries are the source of supply to the United States, that they have to get their fish from us, and therefore the price of the fish going to the United States is largely fixed by the quantity we send them. It is true that a duty of \$2 a barrel is charged, but, if our mackerel were admitted free, the price would come down. As long as the duty is kept up, the fishermen in the United States gets that benefit, but our fishermen do not suffer. I will show the great change which has taken place in the mackerel trade owing to the protection of the fisheries. In 1880, at Gloucester, the principle entrepôt for mackerel, the total catch was 190,000 barrels; in 1881, the catch was 163,000 barrels; in 1882, 170,000 barrels; in 1883, 108,000 barrels; in 1884, 223,000 barrels; and then we come to a different state of things. We come to a comparison between the catch of mackerel which the United States fishermen made when they were allowed to go where they liked to fish, and when they were restricted. In 1885 the catch was 157,000 barrels, but in 1886, when they were kept out of our fishing grounds, the catch was only 58,000 barrels, and there was consequently a market for our fishermen; and in 1887 their catch was again reduced to 44,000 barrels, showing that practically we hold the supply of the fish in our own hands, and, if we hold the supply, the consumer is dependent upon us, and we fix the price and not the Americans, and, consequently, the duty is paid on these fish by the man who wants to buy them. An illustration was given of the hardships our people suffer in connection with fishing, by the description which was given of the work of a fishing vessel in one summer by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). As I understood

it, the statement was that, in 1885, a fishing vessel was on her fishing cruise from the 1st June to the 30th September, and the catch that was sold amounted to 800 barrels of mackerel, and all the fishermen realised for the season's work was \$30 apiece. This may be so. The hon. gentleman has stated it, and that ought to be sufficient, but it is a very curious fact in connection with this that the whole catch, less duty, must in that case have been sold for \$1,200, or \$1.50 a barrel, and that is a low price. Even with the duty added, it would be only \$3.50 a barrel. I hold in my hand the report of the Boston Official Bureau of Statistics for 1885, and the statement made by the secretary of that bureau is that Nova Scotia mackerel at that time, October and November, 1885, sold for from \$6 to \$8 a barrel. It is odd that our people, who, as I said before, are fairly hard-headed, should, when the price ranged from \$6 to \$8, have accepted only \$3.50. But there are ups and downs even in the mackerel fishing. I met a young man this year, during my canvass, who had been in the mackerel fishing in the United States. He had been urged to go there by those who said there was no chance of getting a living here, and so he had gone to the United States. I asked him what success he had had, and he told me he had made \$1 for his work during this year from the Gloucester fishing. I do not think he had been paid better than if he had remained in this country, even if, as the hon. gentleman says, he had got only \$30 instead of \$1 for his season's work. I do not think that those who told him it was better for him to go to the United States advised him well, and I think there are people who lead others astray sometimes, as they did in this case. I think the hon. gentleman from Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), stated that those of us who believed in the National Policy, "had been dangling it before the eyes of a deceived people for political purposes." Might not that be considered a fair description of the resolution which the hon. gentleman himself has submitted for the consideration of this House, that he is holding it up and "dangling it before the eyes of a deceived people for political purposes?" A complaint was made that, while we professed under the National Policy to discriminate in favor of English trade, the average duty on the imports from Great Britain was 21 per cent., and on those from the United States only 16 per cent., so that we were discriminating against the mother country and in favor of the United States. But surely the hon. gentleman knows that the large proportion of our raw material comes from the United States, and that comes in free of duty in order to stimulate and encourage manufacture in this country and enable us to manufacture at a low price, and, by encouraging these industries and helping our products of the soil, the fishery, the mine and other industries, we employ more people, and the more people we employ, the more money we have, and the better market at home we have for everything we have to sell. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) showed that England had a large trade with India, and he said that was natural because that was a dependency. The Indian Government some years ago found it necessary to protect their manufactures by imposing a duty on certain importations, and they increased the wealth of India to such an extent that now that country is able to manufacture largely from raw materials, which, although indigenous to India, would never have been established but for that policy. The people, in working up the material which they have, have so increased in wealth that they are able to utilise a much larger portion than before of the manufactures of England. He told us how much the progress of Michigan was greater than the progress of Ontario. Why, Sir, possibly because Michigan has been longer living in a state of protection, possibly because Michigan has been in a position to make a market of her products to a non-agricultural and non-lumbering population. Her goods have sold more readily. He made out, if I understood

him, that the crops of 1887, in Ontario, were much reduced compared with those of 1882. I cannot conceive that this is a charge against the National Policy. I do not know that unrestricted reciprocity would give us larger crops, it depends very much on the season. Now, I have pointed out that in the Tariff Amendment Bill submitted to Congress by the Ways and Means Committee, there is placed on the free list a large proportion of these articles that we are so anxious to send into the States, on which we now have a duty, and for the remission of which duty we are so anxious that we are prepared, almost, to sacrifice anything and anybody but our own selves, and to throw our manufacturers to the wolves. Whilst we are doing this we find that at Washington they are prepared to take the duty off most of these articles. It is true the duties remain on some others, but it will be found that of the articles on which duties remain we export already more than \$13,000,000. The hon. gentleman gave us at length a statement showing how 97, 98 and 99 per cent. of various products went to the States. They do, Sir. How will unrestricted reciprocity make more than 100 per cent. of those articles go to the States? Therefore, what benefit are we going to gain, commensurate with the sacrifices we are asked to make, in simply sending one or two per cent. more of those articles to the States?

Mr. DAVIES. It doubles the quantity of consumption.

Gen. LAURIE. But if the quantity is not available. If we have no more barley, for instance, to sell, it will not double the consumption. Then the hon. member for Halifax mentioned that Nova Scotia exported fruit. He said that had nothing to do with the National Policy, and that was the view taken by the hon. member for King's county (Mr. Borden). Now, I am inclined to think that is a little wide of the mark. I think the duty imposed on potatoes going into the United States has improved the farms of King's county very materially. As a matter of fact those properties were being considerably run down by the export of potatoes, without any fertilisers being used to supply the exhaustion of the soil. I am aware that Prince Edward Island also sends a great many potatoes to the States. But in the case of King's county the advantage has been that when that particular article was low, the farmers fed their potatoes to their cattle and made beef, and in making beef they furnished fertilisers to their land, consequently they have been able to increase the product; and I believe the product of fruit has also largely increased, owing to the fact that the farmers were not at all times able to export their potatoes and deprive their farms of fertilisers. But the potato market is not closed in the United States. There is a duty, but last autumn a very large amount of the potato product was sent to the United States. Whenever the article is wanted it goes there, when it is not, it is used at home, and the farm benefits. I believe that in the matter of fruit export the retention of the duties in the United States has really not injured that district to the extent that is assumed. Now, the hon. member for Halifax was rather joocular—at least I assumed that was the line he took in the description he gave of my visiting Shelburne county during my last canvass. I will read what he says:

"I would like the hon. the Minister of Marine to go along our coast when he visits Halifax next year, instead of allowing his gunboat to go down the shore electioneering in the county of Shelburne, instead of sending her down there to sound along every little harbor in the county of Shelburne, but of course not to make promises. Oh, no; we have the word of the gallant member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), that he made no promises. I do not say he did, but I say that, when he went down on board that Dominion gunboat, with the Dominion flag flying over his head, and the so-called engineer going into every port along that coast and sounding, and saying this would be a nice place for a wharf, and that would be a nice place for a breakwater, and you must require a lighthouse here—I do not say he made any promises, but the inference would be natural."

Now, am I to understand that is a correct statement of what occurred?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Yes.

Gen. LAURIE. Well, I say distinctly it is not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask whether that lightship did not carry him down to his election in the county of Shelburne.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is not the point.

Gen. LAURIE. The hon. gentleman asks me what did occur, and I will tell him. I think it would have been better if the hon. member for Halifax, in this statement, had not, by innuendo, implied that I had stated what was not the case. The hon. member for York asked me a question in this House the other day, and he told us something about the promises made in the election. I answered that question; I thanked him for asking the question and giving me an opportunity to make the explanation.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You did not answer the question.

Gen. LAURIE. The gunboat did not go into every harbor along the coast, did not go electioneering, did not go into every port, there was no engineer going sounding along that coast and saying this would be a nice place for a wharf and that would be a nice place for a breakwater.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Did she carry you down?

Gen. LAURIE. Yes, and I will tell you how she carried me down. Domestic affairs took me home previous to the elections. Shelburne is deprived of the privileges of a railway. We have 66 miles to travel by stage, and it only travels in the night. It does not suit me to travel in a coach at night if I can help it. It would take me two days to arrive at Shelburne, and I had appointments there. I found that this vessel was going down with some stores and fittings to supply a lightship, and I telegraphed to the Minister of Marine asking if I might get a passage in her. I obtained passage in her, and according to the usual rule on board those vessels, I paid for the three meals that I had on board. I left Halifax in the middle of the day and arrived at Shelburne at 8 o'clock the next morning, and left the vessel there. Now, is that going into every port along the coast? But there is something more. I met the President of the Yarmouth Steamship Company who complained to me that the passage at Barrington, entering into the channel, was very bad, and he wanted a wharf there. I said: Yes, I knew they wanted a wharf. But I want you to understand, Mr. Speaker, that the president of this Yarmouth Company does not reside in my county, and he has no vote there. A petition was sent in last spring signed by both political parties urging that a wharf should be built at Barrington. When it was found impossible that a steamer could be got to tow the new lightship built at Shelburne to her berth at Barrington, the *Newfield* was ordered to tow her around—hon. gentlemen will try to make something out of that—it happened that the *Newfield* was around there. I telegraphed the Minister of Marine, asking if, as the vessel was engaged in the lightship service and being on the spot, she could not be employed in ascertaining where the channel suited best for vessels to approach the shore, so as to select the best place for the wharf.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). We are getting at it now.

Gen. LAURIE. You are going to get the whole of it. I went to Barrington and saw the Collector of Customs, and asked him to select two gentlemen, one on each side of politics, so that there should be no politics in it, to go and see the captain of the vessel and show him where, in their view, would be the best place for him to examine.

An hon. MEMBER. Before the election?

Gen. LAURIE. Certainly before the election.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). How many days?

Gen. LAURIE.

Gen. LAURIE. I would ask whether the description given by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) of the gunboat going into every port along that coast and saying this would be a nice place for a wharf and that would be a nice place for a breakwater, and you must require a light-house there, is a fair description of what I have stated. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, whether when the vessel was on the spot and it was known that it was desirable to ascertain where the right place for this wharf would be—which is to accommodate steamers which cannot at present get up there, but have to lay off to disembark freight and passengers—I say it was a desirable thing that this should be done, and I particularly explained that I was most anxious there should be nothing connected with politics in regard to it. I wish further to say this: I do not know why the hon. gentleman should be surprised that when I went on board of the Dominion gunboat there should be a Dominion flag floating over my head. What flag would he like to see floating? Surely, on a Dominion vessel, the Dominion flag should fly, and I am proud that that flag is the Union Jack.

An hon. MEMBER. Pull down the flag.

Gen. LAURIE. So long as I live in Canada I hope the flag of old England will float over us; so long as Canada remains as she is I trust the flag of Canada will remain what it now is. I wish to have this matter explained, because it is most desirable that this story that this vessel was round there canvassing with me, that she visited every harbor, should be contradicted. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has himself stated it, so that I am able to contradict it; before this time I had no opportunity.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). You corroborate it.

Gen. LAURIE. I beg your pardon. I distinctly stated the vessel being there I asked that she might sound one harbor, and that she did. If that is not a different thing from the colored statement of the hon. member for Halifax, then I am not able to understand English; but I am glad I have noticed it because hon. gentlemen will now understand how everything is colored for political purposes. In reply to an enquiry as to how it is proposed to obtain unrestricted reciprocity the hon. gentleman says we should make overtures to a friendly nation—they have shown themselves so friendly in the past. I have no better friends in the world than the friends I have in the United States, but to speak of them as a friendly nation, to speak of their Government as acting on high principles, especially in regard to their treaties, is to give them a character I do not think we are warranted in giving them. What happened in regard to the Treaty of Washington in 1873? It was provided that the products of our fisheries should enter the United States duty free. On a quibble they made the products of the British Columbia fisheries pay duty during the whole term of that treaty, on the plea that a proclamation had not been issued bringing British Columbia into the Union. Under the same treaty a similar question was raised in regard to canned fish entering from the Maritime Provinces, and they imposed a duty of one and a-half cents on each can containing canned fish entering the United States. That is another illustration that it is not wise for us to put ourselves too much into their hands. What has the Minister of Finance been doing lately? Has he not been at Washington negotiating a fresh treaty in place of a treaty made by our Government, the Government of England with the United States, to which they acknowledged they were bound by law, but in regard to which they said it was not applicable to the new system of morality among nations. If they are able to shift their ground and change their views in regard to treaties, in what position would we find ourselves as a nation of five millions against sixty millions, or in that proportion if, in the event of any arrangement being made, they declared after it had been in

operation for some time that it was not in harmony with modern ideas and, therefore, they declined to be bound to it any longer. It seems to me that in view of our experience we had better be careful in dealing with them in the future. The hon. member for Halifax pointed out that it was a ridiculous argument to use that it was unfair to discriminate in regard to goods against England and in favor of the United States when we had already discriminated against England in favor of Canada, and he thought the cases were similar. I hardly think that is the case. We were legislating for our own people, and within our own boundaries. We have a right to decide how to raise our revenue, because we have undertaken the burdens that our revenue is intended to meet, and consequently we have a right to impose taxation. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), expresses a most desirable proposition, that it is desirable that we should obtain the coasting trade of the United States if possible. Undoubtedly it is desirable, and if the hon. gentleman had moved it as a separate resolution, I would have been one of the first to support it. Of course it is desirable, in fact there is a great deal that is desirable that we should obtain. It is desirable that we should obtain reciprocity in natural products. Tacking it on to the resolution which is hostile to our country, which is opposed to the policy under which we believe we are thriving, has neutralised its effect, and has prevented it from being acceptable to many members. Speaking for myself, I am satisfied that I cannot vote for it. I believe that a great many who approve of the principle of the motion, are, like myself, compelled to oppose it, because they believe it is tacked on to a proposition that we cannot support. As it is late to-night, I will touch upon another question very briefly. I asked just now what the object of this proposal was? Was it to increase our imports or to increase our exports? I assume, Sir, and I hope that it is intended, to increase our exports, to benefit our products, and in benefiting our products to afford more employment within our borders. It seems to me the right chord was struck by hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces when they said that we should not look only to the United States as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) proposes, but that we can look to other countries as well; we can look to the West Indies, to the Brazils and to South America for a large trade, and I think we may reasonably look, in an especial degree, to those Islands under our own flag, and under our own Queen. If we want to enter into commercial relations to a larger extent, as is proposed by the hon. gentleman, I think it would be better for us to initiate proposals for commercial relations with the Islands of the West Indies rather than with our friends to the south of us. Much as we love them, much as we respect them, I can see that we will be in a false position if we are placed in competition alongside of them. We are not sufficiently advanced to hold our own against them yet, and many of our industries would go to the wall. In the West Indies we have a population—in Jamaica—of 600,000. They are consuming mainly the products which we produce, and they produce what we desire to consume. It is true we would lose three and a half millions of our revenue on the imports from the West Indies, for we should lose the whole duty on raw sugar, although we might reasonably expect as a balance against that, the improved business our increased trade would give us. If the hon. gentleman's argument is worth anything, when he says that we can afford to abandon seven millions of dollars duty to improve our trade with the United States, I think we might more reasonably propose to abandon three and a half millions of duty to improve our trade with the West Indies, especially when in studying the statistics we find the West Indies consume what we produce and that they produce what we

consume. The United States are competitors with us, they are customers and we can find markets in other directions for what we want to sell. We need not confine ourselves to what has been falsely described as a market of 60,000,000 people in the United States, for have we not New Mexico, the Mississippi Valley, Arizona and the Carolines, which do not offer much market, to trade with? It is true, of course, there is a market in the border country, there is a market in New England, there is a market in the lake cities, and there is a market in Minnesota for our wheat, but this market for our wheat is simply that it may be manufactured and sold in its manufactured state to those who otherwise would be customers of ours. Why, instead of sending over millions of bushels of our wheat to Minnesota to be manufactured, should we not manufacture it ourselves. And now, as regards the cattle of our own North-West. Is there any need of sending herds of cattle to Chicago to be put into cans and sent back to the North-West for consumption; would it not be a wiser way to stimulate our industries there, if we could prepare our meat at home for consumption by the people of our country and for exports to all parts of our own Dominion. Go where you will you see canned meats, always with the Chicago brand. You will hardly see in the eastern Provinces, and certainly not in the North-West, any prepared meat without the Chicago brand. Let us not destroy the National Policy which we have been at some pains to build up, but so far from destroying it let us try to add to it and improve it. I think this is within our power to do. I feel satisfied that the members of this House will not be recreant to the duty imposed upon them to build up this country and faithfully continue in the good work which they have begun. I am satisfied that in the period of years of an ordinary man's life they will see the good results of such a course, and that we shall be able to carry, not the scalps of hon. gentlemen who now vote against us, but as a result of our policy shall so win their good will, as they see the progress that is made, that those hon. gentlemen will be the first to acknowledge the error of which they are now guilty, and to approve of the course which we have taken. Let us vindicate this principle which we laid down in 1878, which we endorsed again in 1882, and let us confirm it by our votes in this House in 1888.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, at this late hour I will only detain the House a few minutes, as it is no doubt weary of this discussion, and of the very long speeches we have had on this question. The hon. gentleman from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), who has just resumed his seat, took a long time in describing the fact that it was not our fishermen that paid the \$2 duty on the mackerel that went to the United States. If that be the case, I would like to ask what is the reason that this very Government granted a large sum of money to indemnify the fishermen in Prince Edward Island for duties which they paid to the United States on the mackerel? If our fishermen did not pay this duty, then this Government did wrong in refunding it. That is the only answer I will give to that argument of the hon. gentleman. He also says that our people who go from the Dominion to the United States do not emigrate at all, but that they go there to visit their friends. There must be some emigrants there, because they had friends there before them, whom they went to see, and those friends must have emigrated from Canada some time. I will speak of the Maritime Provinces principally, because I know nothing about Ontario and the west. I would like the hon. gentleman to come down to the Maritime Provinces and make such a declaration as he has made in any settlement or section of the country down there. Why, Sir, he would be laughed at. I have travelled among the farming community down there, and I know what I am speaking of. There is scarcely a house

that you go into, in which you will not find that one, or two, or three members of the family are in the United States. Why is this the case? Because they have left the country, and they have gone to the States in order to earn a little money, and they send considerable sums back to assist the people they have left behind them to maintain an existence in this country. I shall make my arguments short and endeavor to limit them as much as possible without making any repetition. But repetitions must be inevitable in such a discussion as this, which has taken such a wide range, and upon which so many speeches have been made. When my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) addressed this House, and pointed to the exodus from the country, showing that the lands had depreciated in value, in our Island at all events, and in the Maritime Provinces generally, that our trade had disappeared from the country, that our shipping had disappeared and that prices had been lowered for produce, he was replied to by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with the argument that this was utterly impossible, because, he said: "Look at the state of the country, look at the savings bank returns, in the year 1874, and you will find that the savings banks deposits were \$336,000, while in 1887 they were \$2,200,000. He says this is the most conclusive evidence of the prosperity of the people. That argument has been used here before; but he was answered, that, in place of being an evidence of prosperity, it is an evidence of depreciation of trade in the country, because the money has been withdrawn from industry or from other banks and placed in the savings banks for safety. Since the adoption of the National Policy one of our oldest and most substantial banks has gone to the wall, and a large number of people who put their money in other banks withdrew it and placed it in the savings banks in order that it might be safe. Before the National Policy was adopted, and when we had reciprocity with the United States, our farmers, instead of depositing their money in the savings banks used to buy farms with it for their sons, and establish them on those farms, thus building up the country, increasing its population and making it prosperous. But the same sons, who, in better times, used to get farms of their own, are now leaving the country and going to the United States. Then, we have heard about inter-provincial trade. I reply to the statement that there has been trade established between the Maritime Provinces and the Upper Provinces of the Dominion; the Minister of Marine said that there has been. He said that he found a statement that \$12,000,000 had been sent by the Province of Nova Scotia to the Upper Provinces to buy manufactured goods. If \$12,000,000 went from Nova Scotia, there would be \$8,000,000 or \$10,000,000 from New Brunswick and \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 from Prince Edward Island, and that is the very thing we complain of, that the large manufacturing Provinces do not take any of the products we have to dispose of in return for what we buy from them. We are forced by the National Policy to purchase our supplies from the Upper Provinces, and we have to send them the cash. They do not take anything, from Prince Edward Island at any rate, unless it be a few barrels of oysters. The result of fostering these manufactures is that the manufacturers are encouraged to produce materials of inferior quality, and can force us to buy them. Now, when the National Policy was adopted, we were told that everything was going to be lovely; tall chimneys were going to rise in every village, and everybody was going to become rich at everybody else's expense, and the people in Prince Edward Island were induced to vote for that policy in the expectation that these things would come. But they did not come, and in place of times becoming better and farmers getting better prices for their produce and becoming wealthier, everything has been growing worse; and to-day, I say it without fear of contradiction, the depreciation of real estate in the Province overbalances

Mr. ROBERTSON.

five times the deposits in the savings banks. I know this to be the case. I do not come here to say what I do not know and do not see. I am in the habit of talking to the farmers, and I see and hear of these things every day, and I do not come here to mislead the House. But this depreciation exists, and we believe it is going to get worse. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite: "Why you must not say anything about it; the man who does so is disloyal to his country." Although the depreciation is going on, they say we must let it go on and say nothing about it. I would like to ask this question: before the free trade policy was established in England, when Cobden and Bright and their confrères saw their country becoming poorer, their poor-houses filling up and times getting bad, did they hide the facts? Did they not get commissions sent to investigate the state of affairs and supply the remedy?—which was free trade. Now, it is free trade we want in the Maritime Provinces. When we had free trade there before, we prospered. Our farmers were able to purchase more lands, and they got better prices for their produce, and they believe that if they get free trade again they will prosper again. I would like to ask, are we more disloyal on this side of the House than the hon. members on the other side? All we ask for is friendly trade relations with our neighbors, not a political union at all. Now, I know that the House is tired of figures, but you will permit me to read a few relating to our own Province, in order to show how its condition improved while we had reciprocity with the United States. Our Island is not as old as the other Provinces, its settlement dates back only between eighty and a hundred years. I take the decade before we had reciprocity, and I find that our imports and exports were as follows:—

Year.	Value of Imports from United States.	Value of Exports to United States.
1844.....	\$ 7,160	\$ 6,285
1845.....	14,105	15,325
1846.....	20,320	6,625
1847.....	35,325	4,105
1848.....	81,905	6,420
1849.....	82,580	32,410
1850.....	41,600	55,385
1851.....	87,430	109,340
1852.....	171,290	141,850
1853.....	187,915	120,500
1854.....	195,836	81,880
1855.....	216,202	161,305
1856.....	174,580	90,075
1857.....	251,480	242,260
1858.....	210,020	319,100
1859.....	310,280	439,990
1860.....	282,145	392,025
1861.....	216,050	283,875
1862.....	234,660	217,235
1863.....	423,860	528,670
1864.....	418,300	387,210
1865.....	454,000	604,640

That finishes the period of the Reciprocity Treaty, and the decade previous to reciprocity. You will notice that in the previous decade our imports exceeded our exports, but under the reciprocity our exports increased very largely, and every year exceeded our imports, showing we had the advantage, and the balance we received in cash:

Year.	Value of Imports from United States.	Value of Exports to United States.
1866.....	\$370,930	\$198,315
1867.....	242,600	185,955
1868.....	350,038	259,392
1869.....	279,131	236,815
1870.....	227,942	408,548
1871.....	230,000	410,000
1872.....	250,060	450,000
1873.....	275,000	470,000
1874.....	394,803	198,571
1875.....	345,803	362,900
1876.....	337,967	217,710
1885.....	230,019	479,240
1886.....	179,775	679,886

Ten years after the Reciprocity Treaty had been abrogated, we did only about one-third the business we did during the last year of reciprocity. Take 1886, our exports only exceed by a few dollars the exports of the last year of the reciprocity period. This shows how important it is for us to have reciprocity with the United States, if it can be arranged, as we believe it can be, should the Government only take the proper steps. I hope to see reciprocity brought about in a short time, and that the Government will take the proper steps in the matter. In the Maritime Provinces we were under the impression that the Upper Provinces were in love with the National Policy and would not help us to get reciprocity even if the United States were disposed to grant it, but I am glad to see, since this discussion began, that in the other Provinces the same feeling exists as exists in the Maritime Provinces, and that we all look with hope to reciprocity. Were it established in the Maritime Provinces we could treble our exports to the United States. Take the article of potatoes. In Prince Edward Island, if the duty of 15 cents per bushel were removed, in place of a 1,000,000 bushels we would export 2,000,000 or 3,000,000, which it would be just as easy to raise as 1,000,000. What were the serious objections raised against the adoption of a free trade policy by hon. gentlemen opposite? The first is that since we have adopted the National Policy the Government has appealed several times to the country and have always been sustained, and the Government are not slow in boasting of their success. But there is a little lesson to be learned even by the Government from the elections. In 1878, you will remember, Sir, the Government appealed to the people on the National Policy, but in our Province we were told the National Policy was only a means to an end, and that end was reciprocity with the United States. We returned the Government to power with a majority of 70 to 80. Four years later they came back again, and neither on this occasion did they preach the National Policy purely and simply. They said we have not reciprocity, but give us a little time. The people renewed their confidence in the Government and returned them with a majority of 60 or 70. Then they came back last year, but the people had learned a little in the meantime. Yet with the assistance of the Gerrymandering Act, the Franchise Act, and other means, they came back with a reduced majority of from 15 to 20. Even that should be a caution to the Government, because there will be another election in four years, and if their numbers are reduced in the same proportion, they will be back here in the minority. The next objection is the charge of disloyalty. Do hon. gentlemen opposite seriously mean to say that we are less loyal than they? Do they mean to say that the Liberal party are more disloyal or less loyal than the Conservatives? I may refer to an incident which took place in the little village from which I came. When the North-West Rebellion started, the Minister of Militia called upon the volunteers throughout the country, and the section of the country from which I come is composed almost entirely of Liberals. We have there a volunteer corps which is made up five-sixths of Liberals. The Minister of Militia had ordered them to be ready to start for the North-West, and every man, without exception, volunteered his services. Even men who did not belong to the company asked that they might be allowed to go in the place of any who were missing. The captain telegraphed to the Minister of Militia that his quota of volunteers were all ready, and they were nearly to a man all Liberals. I know of another company not far away, composed of men who are nearly all Tories, and, when the captain of that company sent for them to come in, he only got three men to come at his call. I do not know where they were, but the captain could not find them. The charge of disloyalty which has been thrown across to this side I hurl back. It is no disloyalty for any Government or any people to ask that the trade of their country shall be made better

by the adoption of any particular policy. The next serious objection they bring up is in regard to the revenue of the country. They say, if we adopt a free trade policy, or reciprocity with the United States, we shall lose \$7,000,000 a year. I was not in the House at the time, but I am in the habit of reading a little, and if I remember aright, the present Finance Minister declared, when Mr. Mackenzie was in power, when he was explaining why there was required a revenue of \$23,000,000, that it was a million too much, and that the Government expenditure should be covered by \$22,000,000. Well, now the expenditure is \$36,000,000. Taking the story which they told us then, that the country could be governed with \$22,000,000, we have a large margin, we have a margin equal to nearly double the amount they say we are to lose by the adoption of reciprocity with the United States, and, if the country is economically governed, the saving could be made in the Government of this country, and there would be no necessity for any change in the taxation or for any resort to direct taxation, which they hold up as a bugbear to the people, but which is not necessary at all. I think it was Mr. Gladstone who was talking about the temperance question in England, when certain gentlemen said to him: "You will lose so much revenue that you cannot afford to adopt temperance principles in this country;" and Mr. Gladstone replied: "Give me a sober people and I will find the revenue." Well, Mr. Speaker, give us a prosperous people, and there will be no trouble about the revenue. The fourth objection is, that this discriminates against Great Britain. Perhaps it may, but what does this Government do, and what does the National Policy do? Has it not been discriminating against Great Britain ever since it has been established, and, if you carry out the National Policy to its legitimate end, you will stop all importations from Great Britain and from every other country, and then where is the discrimination? It is too absurd to talk about it. The fifth objection, and the real objection, they bring is that this will injure the manufacturers. That it will injure some manufactures is undoubtedly true, but, if we as a people or if this Government or this House are going to maintain a handful of manufacturers, and to make them millionaires in this country, at the expense of the trade and at the expense of the good of the whole country, then I believe our Government is getting back to the old feudal times; and, if we are to be governed by a few manufacturers, we will be in a short time in the same position as the people of Ireland are in regard to their landlords. It is very peculiar in regard to hon. gentlemen opposite that, while arguing against free trade with might and main, they almost all wind up by saying they are ready for greater commercial relations with the United States. The only conclusion to be drawn from that is that they are afraid to go to their constituencies on this point. They are the servants of the manufacturers, but they are afraid of their constituents. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. the Minister of Interior told us that we should have nothing to do with the Yankees at all, that the Yankee farmers are poorer than our farmers. If that is so, that is an argument against hon. gentlemen opposite, because, if the Yankee farmer is becoming poorer in the same way that our farmers are, the sooner they come together the better. If it means anything, it is an argument against any protective policy at all. I think I could show, if I were not afraid of detaining the House too long, that the United States was proceeding faster under a revenue tariff than she has been under a protective policy. If the Minister of the Interior had taken up the subject and made a speech on the results of protection in the United States, I think it would have been much more effective than the speech he delivered the other night. Now, I have only this to say. As far as we are concerned in the Maritime Provinces—and I am sorry to say it—if the state of

affairs which has existed for the past eight years is to continue for another eight years, the first thing the Government will find there will be such an agitation for repeal that the Province will be severed from the Union, because, unless they do something for us in this regard, and in regard to our winter communication, we will have to sue for repeal, and to see if we cannot work our own affairs better, as we did in the old times, and as we can do in the present time. The hon. gentleman who leads the Government pictured the condition of the country well, when he compared himself to the monkey in the tree, shaking the fruit to the hogs. It was an ugly picture, but it was a true one. It reminded me of a man who had a picture in which Old Nick was represented urging him on. All the boys took a pick at him, and he got no sympathy, so he took the picture to an old elder of the church, and showed it to him and the elder said: "It is a very ugly picture, but it is a true one." The picture the Prime Minister drew was very ugly but it was very true, and, if we are to be governed by combines like this, if we are going to be feeding these hogs, the yeomanry of this country, like those of the North-West, will rise and tell the right hon. gentleman to get out of this country, both himself and his hogs.

Mr. KENNY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:40 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 23rd March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ELECTORAL RETURN.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have received the certificate of the Returning Officer at the last election for the Electoral District of the County of Prince Edward, that John Milton Platt, Esquire, was duly elected for said Electoral District.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That it be resolved that in admitting John Milton Platt, Esquire, to represent the Electoral District of the County of Prince Edward upon the production of the certificate of the Returning Officer, this House still recommends a strict adherence to the principle of requiring the production of the usual return.

Mr. MITCHELL. Might I ask what the meaning of that is? Have the strict Rules of the House not been complied with?

Mr. SPEAKER. For some reason the certificate has not been before the House.

Motion agreed to.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

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

JOHN MILTON PLATT, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Prince Edward, introduced by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Charlton.

WILLIAM F. ROOME, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of West Middlesex, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Foster.

Mr. ROBERTSON.

REPRESENTATION OF KENT.

Mr. WELDON (Albert), moved the adoption of the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections respecting the West Kent election.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there are portions of this report in which we cannot concur, but I have no desire whatever to delay the issue of the writ, and, therefore, the report may be adopted, I suppose, on a division.

Motion agreed to, on a division.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 61) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Grenville International Bridge Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 63) to amend the Acts relating to the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Perley, Assiniboia.)

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Chatham Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

TREATY BETWEEN HER BRITANNIC MAJESTY AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. THOMPSON. In the absence of Sir Charles Tupper I beg leave to introduce Bill (No. 65) respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States. The Bill was ready for introduction when the notice was placed on the paper. That was done with the expectation that the Minister of Finance would be able to introduce it at an early day. It is desirable that it should be before the House at as early a date as possible, and, at his request, I make a motion for its introduction. It is thought more proper that its introduction should have been expedited, in consequence of the publication of the Bill in the papers of the country. I may state, by way of explanation to the House, that its publication was evidently through a breach of confidence in some of the persons connected, in all probability, with the printing of the Bill, and not in any way owing to the fault of those who had it in charge for the Government. It is unnecessary that I should explain the Bill at any length, because it simply gives the effect of the treaty before this House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WRIT FOR KENT.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before you call the Orders of the Day, I would like to enquire, Mr. Speaker, what is the position now with regard to the issue of a writ for the election in the County of Kent. I understand, Sir, that you issued your warrant some time ago, and we were informed to-day in the Committee on Privileges and Elections, at the time that report was up for consideration, that the reason why no writ had issued was that the Government had declined as yet to appoint a returning officer, or had failed, at all events, to appoint a returning officer, and that there was no one to whom that writ could be addressed. Now that this permission has been obtained, I suppose it is unnecessary you should issue a second warrant, but that the Government can appoint a returning officer to whom the writ for holding the election might be addressed. I would like to know exactly what the position is, as I think, the House having determined that the election ought to take place immediately, it would be well to know precisely the position of the matter at the present time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the position stands thus: Mr. Speaker having received the report, should issue his warrant.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). He has issued it. I understand that Mr. Speaker did issue his warrant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is what I said. He did issue his warrant, but, looking at the report, I took the liberty of thinking that I should report that it should remain with the House to order the writ. On communication with Mr. Speaker, the question seemed to be of so much doubt that I understand Mr. Speaker had withdrawn his warrant.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I did not so understand it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. So I understand it. If it had not been withdrawn the practice would be to move for a writ of *supersedeas* as to the previous warrant. Now, as I understand it, a warrant must issue—a new warrant must issue unless it is considered that the old warrant was effete. I think so beyond a doubt. At all events, I think a new warrant should be issued, and a writ of *supersedeas* could be moved for unless it is held that Mr. Speaker has withdrawn his warrant; if he has, of course a new warrant is necessary.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). With the permission of the House I would say that I understand the warrant of the Speaker was issued, and that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery took no action upon that because there was no returning officer appointed to whom the writ could be addressed. The issue of the warrant and the proceedings upon that warrant have not been stayed by any action of the House. The House simply referred it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections to enquire into the matter as to the propriety of the issue of the warrant under the existing circumstances. But the regularity or the validity of the warrant was not, it seems to me, questioned by any action that has taken place in this House. That warrant has been issued and is in force. It is the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to obey it, and act upon it, as soon as the Government appoint a party to whom the writ can be addressed. That is precisely as I understand the matter to stand at the present time.

Mr. SPEAKER. The writ has not been withdrawn, that is it has not been formally withdrawn, although it is understood that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery would not act upon it until the House had decided. I suppose a warrant for a writ of *supersedeas* would do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would move for a writ of *supersedeas* to that warrant. It was issued at a time it ought not to have been issued. I think if the hon. gentleman will look into the practice he will find that this is the practice. There may be a question of the legality of the issue, and the seat of the elected member, whoever he may be, might be challenged on the ground that the writ was issued on a warrant which was illegal, because it was issued before the House had declared its will in the matter. I now move:

That the warrant of the Speaker issued for the election in Kent be withdrawn.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That the writ for a new election in the riding of Kent be issued.

Mr. LAURIER. There was another point suggested by my friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Even if the warrant of Mr. Speaker had issued legally, there was no returning officer. When the warrant does issue it is the duty of the Government to appoint a returning officer, and I suppose they will attend to that promptly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes. The facts were simply these: the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, when he received the Speaker's warrant, informed the Government of it, and asked for the name of a returning officer. When that came to the Government I was acting as Minister of Justice, in the absence of my hon. friend behind me, and, looking at the judge's report, I was of opinion that the House only could take action in the matter. I communicated that to Mr. Speaker, and it was understood the whole thing should stand over till the House met.

Mr. LAURIER. But there were some instances where there was no reason of this kind and the Government did not act promptly, as in the case of Dorchester.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, we gave it every consideration.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, in desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to deal with the resolution which is now under consideration in this House, I deem it my duty, as one of the representatives of the Province of Nova Scotia in the Commons of Canada, to refer to what I consider a very remarkable and very improper statement which was made in this House on Thursday of last week. On that day, Sir, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) stated in the course of his address, in effect, that the Government majority in the Province of Nova Scotia had been secured by promises to railroad companies. I am not disposed, Sir, to cavil at anything my hon. friend from Queen's may say. During my brief parliamentary career, I have noticed that that hon. gentleman seems privileged to indulge in the wildest flights of fancy. In that *rolé* he is quite unrivalled and quite inimitable. But, Sir, when a gentleman occupying so prominent a position in this House and in this country, leads in a debate like this, one of the parties in this country, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) does, I think the observations of that gentleman claim attention. On the occasion to which I refer, the hon. member for South Oxford, referring to the remarks of the hon. member for Queen's which I have quoted, stated that "they (the electors of Nova Scotia) offered themselves to us, but Mr. Blake was too honest to buy them." Now, Sir, as a representative from Nova Scotia, I confess that I felt

humiliated when I heard that remark, and infinitely more so when I saw it recorded in *Hansard*. That statement, Sir, is now historical; these words are indelibly inscribed on the parliamentary records of Canada; and coming from a trained parliamentarian, from a gentleman who weighs his words, I regret to have to say that, in my opinion, they are insulting to the people of Nova Scotia and utterly unfounded in fact. I know, Sir, that my opinion on such a matter is of slight importance to the hon. member for South Oxford; I recognise fully, Sir, the great disparity which exists between our positions in this House; but, Sir, as a representative of the people of Nova Scotia, sent here by the metropolitan constituency of Halifax, I tell that hon. gentleman that while the people of Nova Scotia may not be so gifted in the wealth of this world as their fellow-countrymen in some of the other Provinces in Canada, yet, man for man, in manliness of character, in uprightness of conduct, in a high sense of honor, I claim that we are second to none in this Dominion or out of it; and I tell that hon. gentleman—and I am glad to be able to do it here in vindication of the good name of the Province of Nova Scotia—that the gold has never been coined that can buy the people of Nova Scotia. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am as anxious as any man in Canada can be to see a fair and honorable measure of reciprocal trade established between the people of Canada and the kindred nation to the south of us with whom we have so much in common. I am in favor of a very extended measure of reciprocal trade with the people of the United States, as great a measure as would be compatible with the interests and self-respect of the people of Canada. I have the greatest admiration for the people of the United States, and I have given as tangible proof of that as any man can give. I would consider it my duty here or elsewhere to do anything that a man fairly can do to unite the great English-speaking races all the world over in the closest bonds of comity and friendship. I fear, Sir, that the course we are now pursuing may actually thwart the object which I believe the people of Canada and their representatives here so much desire to attain—some reciprocal trade between the United States and this Dominion. The hon. member for South Oxford has introduced a resolution in favor of what he is pleased to term unrestricted reciprocity. Sir, I can understand reciprocity, or I remember what we understood it to mean a few years ago. I have some idea of what commercial union may mean; but, Sir, I must proclaim that, in my opinion at least, unrestricted reciprocity is not within the domain of practical politics. The suddenness of the apparition of unrestricted reciprocity is most startling, and induces one to enquire whence it comes. I find, Sir, that it emanates from a party which only a short year ago in the general elections held in this Dominion, raised every cry, made every appeal, advanced every argument that human ingenuity could devise; and yet, Sir, we never heard of this unrestricted reciprocity until it is suddenly bounced on this Table. Are we to attribute its appearance now to the emphatic expression of the opinions of the people of Canada as given at that election? Are we to attribute it to what the proposer of the resolution, in a moment of exuberant candor, was pleased to call “our friends of the Quebec conference?” Are we to attribute it to what some gentlemen call “our friends on the other side of the border?” Are we to attribute it to the amiable American gentlemen who, on charitable thoughts intent, have been visiting Canada during the past few months and interesting themselves in all that concerns the affairs of Canada? That apparition, Sir, is so sudden that instinctively one is reminded of the well-known lines:

“Be thou a spirit of health or goblin damn'd,
Bring with thee airs from heaven or blasts from hell,
Be thy intents wicked or charitable,
Thou comest in such a questionable shape
That I will speak to thee!”

Mr. KENNY.

I believe, Sir, that the result of the late election is the primary cause of the apparition. I believe that the utter helplessness and hopelessness hon. gentlemen opposite have of ever obtaining power in this country, and the taunts of their followers that they had no policy, have made them reckless, and out of sheer desperation they have resorted to this expedient. They know, Sir, that Canada looks favorably upon a fair and honorable arrangement with our neighbors to the south of us; but in order that political capital may be made, a great commercial question has now been prostituted for party purposes. The condition of the Opposition is so desperate that they have come to the conclusion that they must have some cry, so they shout “unrestricted reciprocity.” I do not believe hon. gentlemen are sincere in the course they are now taking. They know that their present course is more likely to retard than to advance our chances of trade relations with the people of the United States. I hold that I can prove that from their own utterances. Have these hon. gentlemen forgotten that Mr. Mackenzie, when he led the Government of Canada, told us it would be unworthy of ourselves to go “cringing” to the people of the United States. Has the hon. member for South Oxford forgotten his own utterances, when in a position of responsibility in this country, he said:

“They say we must have reciprocity and we cannot live without it. For the Dominion of Canada I take exception to that statement. While reciprocity is desirable, we are not in such a state of subjection to the United States that we cannot live without it. We have men and ships and will carry the war into Africa. We will find new markets for ourselves and cut them out. There is nothing better calculated to prevent the bringing about of reciprocity than to tell the Americans we cannot live without them. It would induce them to believe they had the power to drive us to their own terms.”

Have hon. gentlemen opposite forgotten the utterances of their own press, which I have in my hand, but will not delay the House with reading. I find that my hon. friend whose absence I regret to-day, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), is reported in the *Morning Chronicle* of July 18th, 1884, to have stated in a meeting of the Halifax Chamber of Commerce that “he thought it would not be well to appear too anxious about the matter, and there was no doubt the Dominion Government (the same Government, that we have to-day) were willing to have reciprocity, but nothing was to be gained by seeming over-anxious.” The correspondence between Mr. Bayard and Sir Charles Tupper, shows that the Canadian plenipotentiary expressed his readiness to confer with a representative of the United States at any time. Our Government is prepared at any day to discuss the question of our commercial relations with the representative of the United States. I have amply proved from the utterances of the hon. gentlemen opposite and from the writings in their press, that the line of conduct they are now pursuing is not calculated, even in their own opinions, to promote the cause of reciprocity. It is one which they themselves have pronounced unwise and undignified. I can say, therefore, that having gone back on their record, having contradicted themselves and having proved their insincerity, I cannot attach the slightest importance to their utterances, nor do I believe the country will either. This important question of our commercial relations with the United States is to be made by them a foot ball for disappointed politicians. What is contemplated by this policy which hon. gentlemen opposite call unrestricted reciprocity? Mr. Longley, of Nova Scotia, who is an authority, does not attempt to conceal the full force of the meaning of commercial union. “It implies,” he admits, “the establishment of a common tariff against the rest of the world;” and with the greatest frankness he adds: “Let no person be deceived. This will mean that we will have to adopt the American tariff against Great Britain.” Further on he says, “I cannot ignore the fact that commercial union involves to a close degree the relationship be-

tween Canada and Great Britain herself." But we have an authority across the line from which to quote, Mr. Butterworth, who has stated that he is opposed to any measure which does not contemplate a Customs union. We are forced, therefore, to the conclusion that what hon. gentlemen opposite contemplate is a customs union. Now, what are we to get in exchange for such an arrangement. In order to arrive at an estimate of the position we occupy in regard to the United States, we have to consider our trade relations with that country. I find our importations from the United States are \$45,000,000, and our exports \$37,000,000; thus the balance of trade is against us. Of the \$37,000,000 exports, \$11,000,000 are on the free list, and it is proposed, in the contemplated changes of the tariff in the United States, that \$9,000,000 shall be added to the free list. That would leave \$16,000,000 to be accounted for. Now, I have examined what these \$16,000,000 are composed of. \$13,000,000 are composed of articles of which the total importation into the United States is only \$14,743,000, so that if we acquire the whole additional trade it would only amount to \$1,600,000. These \$13,000,000 of dutiable articles are chiefly made up of the following:—

	Imported from Canada.	Total U. S. Imports.
Horses	\$ 2,300,000	2,464,000
Sheep	1,100,000	1,183,000
Barley	6,171,000	6,173,000
Hay	789,000	790,000
Malt	150,000	153,000
Cattle	883,000	979,000
Coal, bituminous	1,422,000	2,715,000
Wheat	218,000	218,867
Oats	27,600	29,500
Butter	38,000	38,100
	\$13,100,000	\$ 4,743,000

So that out of a total import of \$14,743,000 by the United States, Canada furnishes the whole amount with the exception of \$1,600,000 worth. Take out the article of coal which goes principally from British Columbia to San Francisco and you will find Canada does within half a million dollars of all the business the United States desire to do in those articles with countries outside of themselves. There is still three million dollars to be considered, and this consists of different articles which may possibly be put on the free list, but in any case the amount is insignificant. It is admitted on both sides that, as the result of unrestricted reciprocity, the loss to the revenue of Canada on our present importations from the United States would amount to \$7,300,000. But under commercial union, another serious loss stares us in the face, and that is the duties on importations from Great Britain which amount to \$9,300,000. We pay \$8 per head, on importations from Great Britain, and the people from the United States pay \$2 per head. Under any new arrangement, therefore, the result of the commercial relations between the two countries, under a common tariff, would be that Canada would lose \$7,000,000 more, or in all \$14,000,000. Therefore, under this arrangement or even under unrestricted reciprocity, if it is practicable, we would have to resort to direct taxation, and the provincial subsidies and Railway subsidies must cease to exist. As authority for that statement, I shall quote an article which appeared in a leading Liberal paper in the Province of Ontario. It says:

"The inhabitants of the Maritime Provinces are probably men of common sense. They understand that a fellow 'cannot eat his cake and have it.' They are supposed to favor reciprocity with the United States. A good many of them are believed to be free traders. The abolition of the Provincial subsidy would help them get what they want. Why, then, should they not consent to it?"

Then, I will quote the Halifax *Morning Chronicle*, which, as recently as December 2nd, 1887, defined commercial union as a customs union; and on December 3rd the same paper makes this announcement:

"It is gratifying to learn definitely and authoritatively, from his own lips, that Mr. Jones is not only favorable to commercial union, but sees no difficulty in working out a practical scheme on that basis."

Therefore it is evident that hitherto all these hon. gentlemen have contemplated commercial union. Now, I wish to place on record some more figures as regard the trade of the United States. On examination it will be found that of the whole importations into the United States, 66 per cent. enter through the port of New York, and 8 per cent. through the port of Boston. I refer to that because, undoubtedly, under a commercial union these two cities would become the distributing points to Canada. Great stress has been laid, by hon. gentlemen opposite, upon the great exodus that is going on from Canada, and they never seem to be as happy as when they are referring to the fact that a number of Canadians are leaving their own country; they seem positively to gloat over it. The westward flow of emigration has been going on for many years. It went on just as much under the Grit régime as during the subsequent period of our history. The same thing is noticed in the Eastern States, and even in the agricultural portions of the State of New York, and considering the manner in which a great party in this Dominion have been constantly belittling and traducing their own country, the only surprise is that more people do not go away. When it was suggested the other day that an additional number of *Hansards* should be issued containing this debate, I could not help thinking that some of the numbers would doubtless find their way to "our friends" across the border, and I could not help wondering what the American statesmen and politicians would think of us as they read some of the speeches. If there is one trait more than another in the American character which is estimable and admirable, it is their love of country. They all unite in praising their own land, and the riches of the English language are exhausted in finding words of eulogy. We know that, in the United States, the political differences are great and the political knife makes incisions which are deep and broad, but there is one point on which they will always rally and in regard to which you will always find them united, and that is in lauding their own country. Nothing has contributed more to their great importance and their great success than their love of country. It is much to be regretted that this feeling does not exist with us to the extent it ought. Its existence I acknowledge, but it does not exist to the extent it ought in the Dominion of Canada. However, in order to show that the exodus which has been going on for so many years, from the western flow of emigration, is no greater from our own territory than from certain of the Eastern States of America, I will read a statement of which a portion, I think, was read the other day, and which I may say, for the information of hon. gentlemen opposite, was prepared by one of their own political supporters. That document reads:

"The growth of the population during a decennial period may be influenced by transient causes, but if we take a period of fifty years and compare the growth of one country with another, during that period, we shall be able to determine pretty accurately which country has within it the greatest elements of progress. The New England States afford a fair field for comparison with the old Provinces of Canada. This is what the census reveal:

	1830-1.	1881.	Increase in 50 years.
Maine			
New Hampshire			
Vermont			
Massachusetts	1,963,717	4,010,028	2,056,309
Connecticut			
Rhode Island			
Ontario			
Quebec			
New Brunswick	1,065,215	4,141,434	3,076,200
Nova Scotia			
Prince Edward Island			

While the New England States have merely doubled their population in fifty years, the older Provinces of Canada have nearly quadrupled theirs in the same period."

I do not think that is very discouraging. It may not be very gratifying to hon. gentlemen opposite, it is true, but there are the figures, and, if they are not true, they can be contradicted. It is not fair to ourselves, it is not doing justice to our own land, or to those people who are to come after us, that unfair and misleading statements should go abroad.

" Dropping Ontario from the comparison, let us see how Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont—the States that lie immediately on our borders, whose soil and climate are similar to ours—have grown in population during the past fifty years compared with Quebec and the Maritime Provinces:—

	1830-31.	1880-81.	Increase in 50 years.
Three New England States	949,435	1,327,713	378,278
Four Canadian Provinces.....	828,513	2,227,964	1,399,451

" In other words, while the increase of population in the New England States on our borders in fifty years has been only 38 per cent., the increase in the four Provinces has been 169 per cent. Figures like these require no comment.

" If we drop Quebec out of the statement and compare the growth of the Maritime Provinces with that of Maine, which lies immediately on our borders, the result will be found hardly less remarkable:

	1830-31.	1880-81.	Increase in 50 years.
Maine	399,455	648,438	248,981
Maritime Provinces.....	275,379	869,495	584,116

" In other words, while the increase of Maine in population in fifty years has been only 62 per cent., the increase of the Maritime Provinces in the same period has been 212 per cent.

" Let us limit the comparison between Maine and the Maritime Provinces to a period of twenty years, and exclude Prince Edward Island, and we shall have a still better opportunity of judging of the comparative growth of two pieces of territory differing but little in soil or climate and where the natural advantages are nearly equal. The following table speaks for itself:

	1860-61.	1880-81.	Increase in 20 years.
Maine	628,279	648,438	20,157
New Brunswick and Nova Scotia	582,940	761,714	178,774

" Maine which twenty years ago had 45,000 more people than New Brunswick and Nova Scotia combined, now has 113,000 less; and while Maine in that period has only added to her population by 3 per cent., New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have increased in population more than 30 per cent."

I know that these statistics are very tedious and tiresome, and I shall be as brief in reading them as possible. But they are important, and I consider it a matter of duty on the part of every true Canadian, of every man who loves his country, to put the true condition of the people before them, and before the world. Now, for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite, let me read what this Grit editor says:

" Some people are never tired of telling us that if Canada had been annexed to the United States its progress would have been greater than it has been; others when they cross the line from even the least progressive of the New England States into Canada, profess to be struck with our want of progress and lament that the influence of monarchical institutions should so depress a people. The true test of the value of this kind of talk is in the census returns, and we propose to use them for the purpose of showing that people who employ such language do not know what they are talking about, and are only repeating the ignorant chatter which they have heard used by others who are as ill-informed as themselves."

These extracts are taken from the *St. John Telegraph*, of November, 1881. As regards this exodus, which seems to delight hon. gentlemen opposite, and which they are so fond of attributing to the National Policy,—why, Sir, what took our people away years ago? It was because they could not find employment in their own country, it was because we had no manufactures. Now that factories have been established all over the land, people find employment in their own country and are able to live happily here, and their labors add to the national wealth. I hope hon. gentlemen will bear in mind that, after all, we have held our own as regards population, when we compare our position with that of the neighboring States. I find that the population of Nova Scotia in 1860, was 330,000; in 1870, 387,000; in 1880, 440,572. Now, as regards the position of our working classes, I regret exceedingly that the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) is not in the House when I speak of this matter, because I cannot do so in the same manner that I should have done if he were here. But I find that we have had the usual professional wail over the

Mr. KENNY.

condition of the poor man. The condition of the laboring classes in a country like ours is one that concerns the public, and is of public interest. The Government have exerted themselves in every way to improve the condition of our working classes. We will see what my hon. colleague says about the working classes and the workingmen in Nova Scotia. I find on page 271 of the *Hansard*, that he makes a reference to Canadian girls, and this is what he says:

" Why, one of our Nova Scotian or Canadian girls who goes to the United States as a domestic servant, is able to earn from \$14 to \$20 a month with her board, while a poor girl in the Province of Quebec who, perhaps, cannot leave her home, is laboring there for \$3.50 a month and paying her board.

Now, I do not know what may be the conditions of labor in the Province of Quebec, but I do know that in Nova Scotia one of the great difficulties we have in housekeeping is to get domestic servants. For that I am disposed to blame the National Policy. Formerly, for labor of that class, there was little employment in Nova Scotia, and they either had to take positions as domestic servants, or more frequently they left Nova Scotia altogether, alienated themselves from their home associations, from home ties, and sought that work in the United States, in the mills at Lowell, which they could not obtain in their own country. But since factories have been established in the Maritime Provinces and all over Canada, that class of labor finds employment in these factories. I am quite satisfied that when the Labor Commission examines into the condition of the factory operatives in the city of Halifax, the results will be most satisfactory to those who take an interest in the welfare of their fellow-citizens. I speak from my own knowledge when I say that whilst that factory has not been remunerative to its own shareholders, it has been a great boon to the poor people and to the working people of that community. It is true that as a result we have greater difficulty in getting domestic servants, but I never heard of a domestic servant in Nova Scotia earning only \$3.50 and paying her board. I do not know, as I said before, how it is in the Province of Quebec, but I must do my hon. colleague the justice to say that while his accuracy is most commendable, he has been careful not to describe this lowering of wages in respect to the girls of Nova Scotia, and for that much in their behalf I thank him. As regards the condition of the laboring classes, I find that while my hon. colleague has not given us the benefit of his knowledge, and as no man in Nova Scotia is better informed on that point, whilst he has indulged in the usual doleful wail over the condition of the poor man, I will give you the views of a leading gentleman as to the condition of the laboring classes in Nova Scotia, and I ask the attention of the House seriously to what I am about to read; I ask hon. gentlemen on both sides to treasure in their minds what that gentleman said a few years ago as regards the condition of the laboring classes in Nova Scotia. I find in the *Morning Chronicle* of 18th May, 1884, the following report of his speech:—

" He was of opinion that Halifax laborers had no good reason to be dissatisfied. * * * He believed that a laboring man who is sober and industrious can get along, in Halifax as well as in any part of the world. * * * He was glad to know that laborers were living much more comfortably now than they did in the past. * * * He could recollect when wages were 75 cents a day, and flour was from \$12 to \$14 a barrel; now it was \$6.25 per barrel, with tea, potatoes, cotton and almost all the other necessities of life as cheap as ever they were, with wages at \$1.25 a day."

It is not fair to give a quotation without giving the author. The gentleman who made that statement, which is recorded in the *Halifax Morning Chronicle* of May, 8th, 1884, is now the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). Now, I have done that hon. gentleman the justice which he refused to do himself. I have given you, Sir, his calm deliberate opinion upon the condition of his fellow-countrymen, when

he was far removed from his present surroundings, when he was not entangled by the exigencies of party, when he could give to his fellow-citizens in Halifax, calmly and deliberately, such statements as I am sure will have infinitely more weight than the excited speech he has made in this House. I am quite sure it would be difficult, it would be impossible to find in the annals of our parliamentary records or in the outside political utterances of our public men, a greater tribute to the National Policy than has been paid in these words by the senior member for Halifax. The hon. gentleman in the course of his speech—and I very much regret his absence, because I shall have to curtail my remarks very much in this connection in consequence—wished we had the happy days gone by. The happy days of Grit politicians, when flour was from \$14 to \$16 a barrel, and wages were 75 cents a day—those were the happy days! The laboring man is now to be appealed to, he is to be called into line, they are going for the farmer and for the fishermen and for the laboring man. But the laboring men of this country are not likely to forget that when the hon. gentlemen who now profess to be their friends were in positions where they could have helped them, when the laboring men of Canada asked them to frame a tariff which would enable those laboring men to live at home with their families and keep them about them in their own country, what did they give them in answer to that application? They gave them soup kitchens then, and now they offer them direct taxation. As regards the condition of the laborer I think in Nova Scotia, at least, I have given you as high an authority as hon. gentlemen opposite could possibly expect me to give them. But to arrive at the true position I will, in order to be explicit,—and I must ask the House to give me a little time in this matter—place before hon. members a record of the deposits in the savings banks in Nova Scotia, extending over some years. It has been attempted to belittle the importance of these savings banks returns, and it has been said they are not indicative of the prosperity of a country. Hon. gentlemen, in fact, have gone so far as to say that these savings banks returns are no indications of individual or national prosperity. This is a very startling proposition, but it is quite in keeping with the whole line of argument we have heard from the other side. The fact is these hon. gentlemen have so bad a case that in their efforts to defame their own country every principle of morals and ethics has to be subverted to suit the case. I am disposed to attach very great importance to the savings banks returns as indicative of a very happy state of things. The deposits in the Government Savings Banks in Nova Scotia were:

In 1867.....	\$ 644,687
1874.....	1,830,981
1878.....	2,210,000
1883.....	5,790,733
1887.....	9,064,829

During the Grit régime the increase was \$679,024, but the increase from 1883 to 1887 was \$3,274,096, the deposit in 1887 amounting to \$9,064,829. That has been the increase during the last four years under this terrible National Policy which is ruining the country. My hon. colleague from Halifax (Mr. Jones) desires that the people should have "money in their pockets"; but the people have not only the "money in their pockets" to gratify their ordinary requirements, they are not only by his own word, proved from his own mouth, more comfortable and more happy than they ever were before, but they have been actually able to pile up this enormous surplus of savings. The people are better housed, they are better fed, they are better clothed and better educated than ever before, and they have been able to put away this large sum. Those people who are able to do that must have had "money in their pockets." We have heard something about the flour

trade, and we have heard that the people of Nova Scotia were paying 50 cents a barrel more than they should pay on flour. Sir, I remember very well in a discussion that took place in this House last year, in which I took a very subordinate part, it became my duty to say that flour was passing over the Intercolonial Railway through Halifax for Newfoundland, and was competing with American flour which started on its Atlantic journey from Boston or New York; in other words, by the arrangement made for that shipment over the Intercolonial Railway the Newfoundland market was secured for Canadian millers. We all know that the duty in Newfoundland is precisely the same on American flour as on Canadian flour, and, therefore, if Canadian flour was not cheaper it would not secure the market. I will quote a better authority than the senior member for Halifax in defence of Canadian flour, and in contradiction of his statement that Nova Scotian people are paying this 50 cents on their flour. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) is reported to have made a speech at Halifax in 1873, when he made the following remarks:—

"Now, when your leaders come down here they declare, as Dr. Tupper did the other day, that the tax on flour would not raise the price one cent, and Dr. Tupper quotes me as an authority for that statement. Well, I do believe in it. I do believe that no tax would affect the price of a commodity of which we produce a surplus."

Now, Sir, that is an answer, I think, to the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) as regards flour, but in order to give him a reply nearer home I will quote him, with the permission of the House, what was said by one of the gentlemen who occupies a position in our Local Legislature, and who, in politics, is a political associate of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). I will quote what Dr. Haley, member of the Local Legislature for the County of Hants, said:

"The duty has not increased the price of Canadian flour one fraction of a cent. We import it in bond, and can do so *via* Boston by packet cheaper than we can by railway. 'But do you not find a great deal more inconvenience in getting Canadian flour than American?' 'Not the slightest. It comes to Boston by the carload, in bond. It is just exactly as easy to get as the American. It is just as cheap, and, I think, just as good. The duty has not increased the price, but, flour being our chief import, and Boston being the city from which we can import at the lowest rates of freight, the duty has enabled us to obtain, *via* that city, the flour that we formerly bought in New York and Boston, when we had to pay higher rates of freight for bringing it here.'"

Here, then, is a complete refutation of the statement of the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that our people were paying 50 cents a barrel more for flour. Now, Sir, we have been treated, also, to a dissertation about the coal trade, and hon. gentlemen have tried to show the very great disadvantages that important industry is laboring under in the Province of Nova Scotia. The hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) favors us with a letter from Mr. Lithgow, and Mr. Lithgow is a recognised authority on all matters connected with the coal trade. But, Sir, thanks to the member for Pictou (Mr. C. H. Tupper), who has been very vigilant, we have ascertained that this letter was written in 1879. I think, Sir, that if the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) had been sincerely desirous of enlightening us as to his knowledge of the conditions of that trade, and as to the wishes and views of those who are engaged in it, he would have given us an extract from the *Halifax Morning Chronicle*, of December 1st, 1887, when that gentleman, in reply to a reporter, states the following in reference to the coal trade. He says:

"Our coal owners, to my surprise, are, I understand, not anxious to have their coal admitted free to the United States to be followed, as a matter of course, by the abolition of duty on our side, apprehending, I believe, that the Americans are strong competitors in our western markets, notably Montreal and Quebec. They do not think that the northern markets of the States would take our coal to the extent they did under the old treaty."

Well, now, Sir, if that hon. gentleman had been anxious to convey to the Parliament of Canada the very latest information which he had upon that important industry, I think

it would be better for him to have given us the views which he knows are entertained by coal owners in 1887, rather than to travel back to an old letter of 1879. But, Sir, the statistics of the coal trade in the Province of Nova Scotia are most instructive. We find, Sir, that of the coal raised in 1888, Nova Scotia consumed 460,000 tons, Quebec consumed 589,000 tons, New Brunswick consumed 176,000 tons, Prince Edward Island consumed 49,000 tons, Newfoundland consumed 72,000 tons, the United States consumed 41,000 tons, and the West Indies consumed 17,000 tons. In other words, the Province of Quebec took from the Province of Nova Scotia, last year, more coal than Nova Scotia had ever shipped in any one year to the United States under the Reciprocity Treaty. More than that, Sir, hon. gentlemen who come from the coal districts of Nova Scotia, who represent those constituencies and who are in touch with their constituents, have never said one word in favor of reciprocity in coal. Now, Sir, if they were so exceedingly anxious for it, if their districts were suffering for want of it, I am quite sure we should have had some expression of opinion from those gentlemen in favor of it. On the contrary, Sir, as far as I can gather from conversations with those gentlemen, they are not at all desirous that the present fiscal relations as regards coal should be changed. Now, Sir, we have heard a good deal about the fisherman. The fisherman is evidently growing rapidly in the estimation of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner), who favored us with the address which charmed us so much last evening, reminded us in eloquent terms of the very great value of the fisheries that surround the Maritime Provinces. I understood that hon. gentleman to say that they are as valuable as the wheat fields of Ontario. That fact was never brought so vividly before my mind as it was when I heard the statement from that hon. gentleman, and Sir, I listened to it with a great deal of pleasure and I think every true Canadian must have been glad to hear it. It is a good thing, Sir, to direct attention to Canada's diversity of wealth. Nothing could be more unfortunate for the country than that it should have only one industry. If we were simply to become agriculturists and our crops fail, what would become of us? As you all know, Sir, that is simply Ireland's trouble to-day, that she has only one industry. And Sir, that is the condition of things which we are bound as statesmen, as politicians, and as representatives of the people to do all that we possibly can to avert. No portion of our population are more useful to Canada than her fishermen. They are a sturdy, honest, industrious, thrifty lot of fellows who from the depth of the ocean gather at great risk and with great labor that wealth which Providence has placed at our doors. I believe, Sir, that their condition is steadily improving and now that like the laborers they can in the words of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) —

"Buy flour that used to cost \$12 for \$4.25 and buy tea and cottons and all the necessaries of life as cheap as ever they could."

To quote my hon. friend's language:

"They, too," —

To quote him still:

"will be living more comfortably" —

And to continue the panegyric on the National Policy:

"they will have no good reason to be dissatisfied."

But the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Skinner) made a suggestion which I thought was a considerate one and a thoughtful one in the interests of the fishermen. That was that we should push our commerce to the West Indies and Brazil. Now, Sir, to do that we must have steamers, and it will be recollected by hon. gentlemen that last year when I urged a subsidy to a line of steamers to the West Indies, I did so at the instance of the citizens of Halifax and also I believe, and I still believe, largely in the interests of our

Mr. KENNY.

fishermen. When I did urge this I was strongly opposed and almost violently personally attacked, by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). That is in the knowledge of gentlemen of this House, but, Sir, it did not discourage me. And I hope to see steamers carry our mails, passengers and fish and other exports directly to the West Indies and South America, and I believe it will benefit our fishermen, our millers, and our manufacturers. Now, Sir, for the information of the hon. member for St. John, who evidently has taken very great interest in this question, I beg to say that the fisheries exports of the Province of Nova Scotia last year to the United States, which the hon. senior member for Halifax says is our only market, amounted to \$2,782,000, while our exports to the West Indies and South America amounted to \$2,228,000, a difference of \$554,000 only. Now, Sir, these hon. gentlemen who have suddenly become so zealous about the fishermen will, I think, find in angling for them that they have not taken the bait. The fishermen know that the party opposite are no friends of theirs. Many of them remember, and remember affectionately and kindly, the late representative in this House, Mr. Power. Mr. Power was a Grit in politics, but he was a man who could rise above party in the interests of his country and his countrymen, and to help our fishermen he voted for the Washington Treaty, which was a great boon to them, as it gave them free access to the American market. But while Mr. Power was voting for the Washington Treaty, his colleague, the present senior member for Halifax, was voting against it and against the interests of the fishermen in doing so, as, to-day, in his efforts to thwart reciprocity, he is arraying himself against their best interests. Well, Sir, the fishermen, who have been so desperately appealed to in this House, knew Mr. Power and trusted him, and they bear his memory in grateful recollection; and they have still ringing in their ears the words of caution and advice which that hon. gentleman gave them, and which he was in a position to give them from his knowledge of the party opposite. Referring to the Grit party in this country, he said that it was the party that step by step and inch by inch had opposed every concession to Nova Scotia. But, Sir, I find that the Halifax *Morning Chronicle* also opposed the Washington Treaty, which was of such great advantage to the fisherman. That paper, on July 8th, 1881, said:

"Sir John has peculiar claims upon England's gratitude. He has helped the Home Government to complete the national degradation by the Washington Treaty."

Sir, we have heard something of the general trade of Nova Scotia. We were told by the hon. senior member for Halifax:

"The farmer has his wheat that he cultivates, his grains, his horses and sheep, and the various articles that he cultivates and raises; the fisherman from his hard toil has his fish, and the lumberman has his lumber; but where does it all go? It goes to the United States."

Now, Sir, that is a statement that is intended to influence the fishermen in Nova Scotia to vote to restore hon. gentlemen opposite to the Treasury benches. But what are the facts of the case? The fishery products of Nova Scotia last year amounted to \$3,899,677. Of that amount \$1,353,000 went to the United States, while \$1,693,000 worth went to the West Indies and South America; and of the exports to the United States, Consul General Phelan's report shows that a large percentage was transported to the United States in bond and transhipped to other markets. Now, Sir, from the fact of our not having steamers to carry our fish from Halifax to the West Indies, large quantities are shipped in bond to New York and then re-shipped in steamers to the West Indies. Consul General Phelan, in his report issued in August, 1887, estimates the total exports from the port of Halifax to the United States at \$1,492,115. Of that amount \$863,977 was entered for consumption, and \$628,138, or 44 per cent., was transhipped. I have not the means at

my command of ascertaining exactly what this transshipment in bond consisted of, and although I would not be understood as stating that it was exclusively fish, I am satisfied that a very large amount of it was fish. We are told that of the products of the forests all we raise goes to the United States; but what is the fact? Here is a comparison of some of our exports to the United States with those to Great Britain:

Products of	To Gt. Britain	To the U. S.
The Forest	\$788,000	\$ 345,000
Animals, &c.....	138,000	95,000
Agriculture	627,000	210,000
The Fisheries	718,000	1,358,000
The Mine.....	78,000	628,000

Now, Sir, as I may not again have the opportunity of dealing with the question of the fisheries, I wish to refer to one statement of the senior member for Halifax. That hon. gentleman said:

"What is the position of these fishermen? \$500,000 per year is what the fishermen of this country, under the present policy of restriction, pay to the revenue of the United States, that is, when they have the cash."

My hon. friend does not say the year. I did not know when the hon. gentleman was speaking, whether he was speaking solely of the fishermen of the Lower Provinces, or whether, in the expansion of his heart, he had taken in all Canada, and was speaking for all the fishermen of Canada. But I do know this, and I have taken some trouble to inform myself on the point, that the total importations for consumption into the United States of dutiable fish last year amounted to \$2,817,351, and the whole duty collected was \$611,937. Now, of that fish, there went from Canada into the United States for consumption the total value of \$1,330,832. It is a little difficult to arrive with "mathematical precision" at the exact amount that each different district in Canada may have sent, but I find that our total exports to the United States of fish, including anchovy, haddock, herring, dried salmon, mackerel, pickled salmon and others, amounted to \$1,331,832, and that amount would include fish that was afterwards re-exported in bond, the duty on which could not have exceeded \$335,000. I give my figures, and I do not pretend to be infallible. I have taken some pains to make them up, and I shall be very glad to know if I am not correct. I desire to be correct, because, in discussing a great question like this, it is our interest, at all events, if it is not our object, to arrive at the strictest possible accuracy. Well, we have dealt with the laborers and the fishermen, let us now deal with the farmers. I was very glad to learn, for I had not the pleasure of hearing my hon. colleague the other night, that he stated the farmers were doing well, that the farmers of Nova Scotia are not in a bad condition, and he correctly attributed that to the diversity of employment in that Province. He said:

"We have not only our farming industry, but we have our fish, our coal, our lumber, our shipping industry, and our farmers are all to a certain extent more or less interested in one or more of these industries."

Again he said:

"We have in a part of Nova Scotia a very large fruit industry which has grown up lately with the old country, and which has brought \$100,000 into our Province."

I quite agree with my hon. colleague that the variety of our resources adds very much to the prosperity of our people. Then he added that the National Policy had nothing to do with our prosperity, because the National Policy did not make the crops. It has never been claimed for the National Policy that it did, but we claim that the National Policy gave life and vigor to our coal trade and expanded any manufactures which previously existed. My hon. colleague forgot to mention that the National Policy had enabled us to start cotton mills, wollen mills, glass and iron works, sugar refineries, and although these have not been all profitable to the investors, they have given remunerative em-

ployment to many of our people and thus created a home market for our farmers. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), in his very brilliant speech the other evening, and the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) gave much and valuable information as to the prosperous condition of our farmers, which our fellow-countrymen will read with pleasure. Our ambition should be to try and increase the number of the manufactories in order to benefit our farmers, and that is what Mr. Parnell is trying to do for Ireland. He simply wants to get in Ireland what we have in Nova Scotia, and that is varied employment for the people. He wants for Ireland what we have in Canada, a National Policy. As regards the Ontario farmers, which is a question I feel almost like apologising to the House for referring to, because it lies more with the residents of that Province to deal with it, my hon. colleague whom I am always happy to follow in any good example, took a very great interest in that question. He seemed to have become very much devoted to the interests of the Ontario farmers. Now, I hold in my hand a copy of a record sent to Congress from a delegation, held in Washington in January, 1887, of people interested in the shipping business of the United States. There were some 329 delegates present, and nearly every state and territory were represented. The memorial states the following:—

"The fact that the people of the United States are now producing so much more of the raw material from farm and mine, and such a superabundance of manufactured goods, that our own markets are glutted and stagnation thereby produced. Stagnation, experience has shown, is the parent of financial crisis, which brings ruin to the producing class of every community."

It is evident from these words that there is a superabundance of manufactured and agricultural products in the United States, and among these 329 delegates, not one conceived the bright idea of importing the superabundant products of Canada, but they said:

"Our best markets should be those of Central and South America, the West Indies and Australasia, from which we are practically excluded by the want of shipping."

Now, Sir, the Ontario farmers know they have to meet the competition of the American farmers in the English market, and they know that it is a very sharp, keen competition. What the Ontario farmers want, it seems to me—and I make the suggestion with all due respect—are more consumers, more customers for the produce, not more competitors at their own doors. Now, let us look at the condition of the farmers in the great State of New York. I am quite aware that it would not be fair to Ontario to institute a comparison between that Province and New England States. We all recognise that Ontario's wheat fields are of infinitely more value than agricultural districts in the New England States. What do we find as to the condition of the agriculturists in the State of New York? I will read from the report of the National Bureau of Agriculture, Washington, 1885, in regard to the condition of farmers in the State of New York. I do not know whether what I am about to read has come under the notice of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, but to those who represent rural constituencies, and to the farmers of Ontario, I think this is a very important statement. This official document says:

"On the whole, farmers are more in debt than they were ten years ago, and there are a large number of farms which were purchased a few years ago and mortgaged, which now would not sell for more than the face of the mortgage, owing to the depreciation of the farming lands, which, on the average, is fully 30 per cent. in ten years. Probably one-third of the farms in the State would not sell for more than the cost of the buildings and other improvements."

Now, I do not know, of my own knowledge, whether such a condition of things prevails in the Province of Ontario, but that is the condition of things in the State of New York, and for the information of hon. gentlemen on both sides I have given them the authority from which I have quoted. As regards the agricultural districts of the New

England States, their population has only increased 9 per cent. in 30 years, as compared with a total increase of 62 per cent. in the Maritime Provinces. I was exceedingly sorry that my hon. colleague could not make out a case without referring disparagingly to the city of Halifax. When indulging in his usual dreary, doleful, dismal secession wail, he told the Dominion, from his place in Parliament, that Halifax was fast going to decay, that property was depreciating in value and that large amounts of it were sold for taxes. I say that his attempt to disparage and belittle Halifax in the eyes of the country was unkind, ungenerous and unjust. I think Halifax deserved better treatment at his hands. The hon. gentleman has lived and prospered there for many years—it is my native place—we have both spent the happiest days of our lives there. All the dearest associations of our lives cluster round that old city. Surely we can say a kindly word of it in an assembly like this, in the presence especially of numbers of gentlemen who have never visited it. Those who have will bear it in kindly remembrance. I have noticed that the most lugubrious of the hon. gentlemen opposite generally had a cheery word for his own constituency, for his own home. What hope can there be for a city, when her own sons speak so gloomily of her as the hon. gentleman has spoken of Halifax? Is the hon. gentleman's argument so weak that in this broad Canadian land, he could not find ample illustration of it, without dragging in dear old Halifax? I can not deny that property is depreciated, and very seriously depreciated in Halifax. Real estate in London and in New York is depreciated. There has been a great shrinkage in values, and it has been very great at Halifax. I find that the assessed value of property in 1876 was \$11,943,882, and in 1886 was \$14,578,930. To the latter figures could be added factories which escape assessment at present, which might make the total increase in the past ten years to be \$3,000,000. I do not say that that is anything to boast about, but I will say that the condition of things would be much worse in Halifax, if we had not, subsequent to the date named by the hon. gentleman, started some factories. These factories may not have been very profitable to the shareholders, but they gave remunerative employment to a number of our people. The wholesale trade of Halifax has been disturbed by Confederation. That is a matter on which I can speak freely, and in that respect Confederation has been of no advantage to Halifax, because it disturbed the distributing trade of Halifax. Previous to that time, Halifax supplied the Province of Nova Scotia and portions of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick with the imported goods which the people of those districts required. These goods paid tribute when they passed through Halifax; but when we had Confederation we immediately let in upon us the keen competition of the cities of Quebec, Montreal, Toronto and the neighboring city of St. John; and in a small community and a small market, you will recognise that that had a very depressing effect, and consequently, our trade has been very much diminished in that respect. I do not hesitate to say that Confederation has had that effect upon the city of Halifax. The introduction of steamboats and railways have also, of course, distributed trade. I listened attentively to the hon. member for South Oxford, in the very able speech which he made in introducing his resolution the other evening, and in referring to the distributing trade of Canada, and the probable effect of the change proposed, he said that no great political change of this kind would be wrought without some disturbing element. Now, Sir, I recognise the existence of these disturbing elements in Halifax in consequence of Confederation, and I would advise Canadians to be very cautious and careful, that the same disturbing influences do not prevail when you allow your markets to be inundated by the products of American warehouses and manufactories. I am

Mr. KENNY.

not going to express an opinion as to whether that is in the true interest of the people of Canada, but I know from experience that such will be the result. As it was in Halifax at Confederation, so it will be in Canadian cities and distributing centres, places like Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Winnipeg, &c., as soon as you remove the Customs barriers. Now, Sir, my hon. colleague has gone into the condition of Nova Scotia; he has undertaken to give us, with all the authority of a member of Parliament speaking to his colleagues in this assembly, the general condition of affairs in Nova Scotia, which was made in a letter written by a gentleman in Halifax some years ago, and the letter is given as to the condition of Nova Scotia to-day. This is the best authority the hon. gentleman can give us. He quotes Mr. James Thomson, a personal friend of mine, a gentleman for whom I have very great respect and esteem; he quotes him as saying that some counties in Nova Scotia are suffering from depression in trade, and that the value of property there is infinitely less than it was some time ago. Now, what caused this depression in the value of property in Nova Scotia? I think the hon. gentleman ought to have told us. It may be that he meant us to infer that this great depression to which Mr. Thomson makes reference, was caused by the policy of the present Government; evidently his object was to convey that impression. Now, the only authority we have had quoted here on this point, is Mr. Thomson. I will read again the last portion of his letter which the hon. gentleman quoted:

"Taking four leading counties, representing the four of our leading industries,—Cape Breton as representing the coal mining interest; Antigonish as representing the farming interest; Hants as representing the ship building interest, and Queen's as representing the lumbering interest, and we will find that the assessment rolls amounted in 1863 to \$11,316,000, while in 1884—at the time he was writing—they had decreased to less than \$8,000,000."

It was the tariff, and what tariff? and who says it was the tariff? Why, Sir, Mr. James Thomson says it is the tariff, the same Mr. James Thomson who has been quoted here to the Parliament of Canada as an authority on the present condition of Nova Scotia. If Mr. James Thomson is an authority as to the condition of Canada, he is equally an authority as to the cause of that condition. Mr. James Thomson tells us it is the tariff. I have his letter in my hands, and it bears date July 19th, 1878. He said it was the tariff; it was the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite; the tariff which was supported by the senior member for Halifax. It was the tariff of the Government of which he was a member, that caused that depression in these counties, and for that I give Mr. James Thomson as my authority. Now, Sir, as Mr. James Thomson has become historical in this matter, it is only fair to you that I should tell you the circumstances under which this letter was written. It is addressed to the electors of the county of Halifax. He said in that address

"The time is now rapidly approaching when you will be required to elect members for the Dominion Legislature, and in order that you may be better prepared to perform that duty, let me place a few facts before you."

Remember this authority is recognised by the senior member for Halifax, who quotes him in this Legislature. Mr. Thomson goes on to say:

"I think, however, you will agree with me that we ought, in the first place, to look to our own interests."

The interests of Nova Scotia,—

"We must not follow leaders, but measures. We must not support Mackenzie because he is a representative of the Grit party, nor Macdonald because he is the representative of the Liberal Conservative party; but support that party, whatever its name, which will best promote the interests of the Dominion, and which will give us that justice which has so long been denied."

That is the justice which the Grit Government had denied to the Province of Nova Scotia, and this is simply verifying

the words of the late Mr. Power which in the previous portion of my argument I quoted to you.

"The question which most affects us is the tariff. Shall there be a revision of the tariff or not? That is the question to be determined at the polls. It is not a question of protection or no. Neither of the opposing parties are free traders. Macdonald preaches a protective policy, but Mackenzie puts it in practice."

Then Mr. Thomson, referring to the condition of Nova Scotia, says:

"In other words, every laboring man is compelled to give one day's labor out of ten to support the Government.

Now. We were told the other day that the present tariff presses enormously upon the poor man and adds to the poor man's sufferings. Listen to what the best authority that can be quoted from Nova Scotia says as to the tariff which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) supported:

"The articles used by the poor man, by the present tariff pay as much and in many cases far more than those used by the wealthy. Silks and satins pay no more than woollens and cottons. The tea used by the wealthy manufacturer of Ontario pays about 10 per cent., while that used by our poor fishermen pays between 30 and 35 per cent. Out of every ten pounds of tea the former uses, the Government takes one, while out of every four pounds the latter purchases, the same Government extracts one pound. The cigars smoked by the millionaire at the bank ball pay only 30 per cent., while the tobacco smoked by the poor fisherman on the Banks of Newfoundland pays 200 per cent. The wine consumed by the rich merchant pays less than 20 per cent., while the rum drunk by the poor laborer of this Province pays more than 350 per cent. For every dollar's worth of wine imported for the wealthy, the Government gets 20 cents; while it makes the poor man pay \$3.50 for every dollar's worth of rum imported for him.

"Is it surprising that the more lightly taxed manufacturers of Ontario can send down their goods and under-sell the highly-taxed people of this Province?"

"Is it astonishing that with a tariff constructed to enable the grocers of Toronto to import from New York, that our West India trade should languish, that our coopers should lack employment, our fishermen customers, and our ships return empty to this port after having deposited their cargoes at that great emporium of the United States?"

"With these figures before you, taken from the public records, I call upon you to exercise your franchise in favor of the party which will so adjust the tariff as will make it fair and equitable in its operation. The present Government have not listened to our reasonable demand, but have refused to make any amendment. Let us try another, and let us be careful in the selection of our representatives to choose men who will not hesitate to abandon any Government that will not do us justice."

And we followed Mr. Thomson's advice, and we were exceedingly careful in the selection of the representatives, and refused to send the present senior member for Halifax back to this House. As regards the city of Halifax I have a statement of its population. The population of Halifax in 1860 was 25,000; in 1870, 29,000; in 1880, 36,000. I have already given the House a statement of the deposits in the savings banks in 1876, when we went into Confederation. The deposits in the chartered banks at that time were \$2,209,873; to-day the amount is \$8,818,763. The tonnage entered at Halifax has increased between 1866 and 1887 by 307,785 tons. I find we are dealing not only with Halifax but with the general condition of the Province of Nova Scotia, and therefore I may say that the exports of Nova Scotia in 1868 were of the value of \$1,563,363; in 1887 they were of the value of \$8,561,425 or very nearly double. The tonnage entered inward and outward in Nova Scotia has increased from 1867, when it was 1,440,382 tons, by 2,911,681 tons. I do not wish to exaggerate the condition of things in Nova Scotia, or in the city of Halifax. I admit that depreciation of real estate exists, and I admit that far more of our people are leaving than we like to see; but I say, as a public man, that it is not fair, it is not in the public interest, that these defamatory statements of the condition of our own country and our own cities should go abroad, and therefore it is that I have gone to some trouble to gather these statistics. I fear that in doing so I have trespassed very much on the time and attention of this House. We have also had a bid made for the shipbuilders and shipowners. I was told last year, when I attempted to talk about sugar, that I was talking about a business in

which I was not personally engaged and in which I had no personal interest, and that I had better not say anything about it. That is a dangerous doctrine for hon. gentlemen to lay down, because it is the duty of a public man to discuss every phase of business and every branch of industry which in any way concerns the country, and to bring to Parliament the best information he can gather on the topic. I find in the heroic efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite to obtain support for their heroic remedy that a bid has been made for the support of the shipbuilders and shipowners of the Lower Provinces by telling the people that, if they would only vote for the resolution of hon. gentlemen opposite, the coasting trade of the United States would be opened to them. Every man who owns a ton of shipping would be very glad to see such a happy state of affairs; we in Nova Scotia would be very much delighted indeed to see it. We have had reciprocity treaties before, we have had hon. gentlemen advocating reciprocity before, but they never thought so much until now of the shipbuilders and shipowners. I do not consider it fair to put this question and before the people of the Lower Provinces in such a manner as to lead them to suppose that the shipping interests of the United States were in a much more prosperous condition than our own, that we, on that account, should risk any change which under any circumstances a commonsense union must involve. I think, if I catch the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite, that more than one hon. gentleman has told us that the condition of our shipping is infinitely worse than that of the United States. I may say as regards the shipping industry, that there is no industry in the Lower Provinces which of late years has suffered so much from depression as that of shipbuilding, and when I listened to the statement of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner), to which I have referred before, of the value of our fisheries, and when I reflect upon what had been the value of the shipping industry, I come to the conclusion that previous to the depression in our shipping we were a people well to do. Gentlemen who reside in the western portions of this Dominion can have no conception of the extent of our shipping industry of a few years ago. Nova Scotia *per capita* was the largest shipowning country in the world. We not only built our ships, Sir, but we manned them, and we sailed them and their earnings came home to enrich Canada. It was an export trade and all the world contributed to it. Our freight was carried from one part of the earth to the other, and the earnings, large in those days, came back to enrich our own country. The value of that industry, Sir, I am happy to say, was recognised by the present Government, and as a shipowner I thank them for that recognition of that important industry. When those hon. gentlemen, who profess so much interest for the shipowners, come down to Nova Scotia and talk to us as regards what they were going to do for us, I advise my fellow countrymen to ask them what had they done for us when they were in a position to do anything for us—when they were in a position of power in this country? I would advise my fellow countrymen to judge them by their acts and not by their words; and they have come to the same conclusion as I have, that they have done absolutely nothing for us, but that they have rather clogged the wheels of progress than helped us in any branch of industry. I regret to say that this great shipping industry of the lower Provinces has almost virtually ceased. That has been caused by the improvement in steam and the much cheaper steamships which are now built on the Clyde, and also by the iron sailing ships. We, who wish to continue in the shipping business, have discovered that the iron sailing ship is a more profitable investment than our wooden ships, and it is very unfortunate for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick that stagnation prevails in this industry. I am sometimes astonished, Sir, that considering the great depression which exists in the shipbuilding trade, or rather

the shipowning trade, for shipbuilding is nearly extinct, that more depression does not prevail in both the Province of New Brunswick and the Province of Nova Scotia than exists to-day. Those wooden ships, Sir, became, instead of a source of profit to their owners, an actual source of loss, and loss has been involved in selling them. Now, Sir, let me look for a moment at the condition of the shipbuilding industry of the United States, to which our attention has been invited. These are the figures, and, gentlemen, they are remarkable figures:

SAILING VESSELS.		
Atlantic coast sailing vessels, 1874	2,696,842
do do 1887	1,665,076
Decrease	431,774
Coasting tonnage vessels enrolled and licensed, 1874	3,293,439
do do do 1887	3,010,735
Decrease	282,704
Total sailing tonnage, 1874	3,415,642
do do 1887	2,563,128
Decrease	1,651,914

Or, in other words, a decrease of \$10,000,000.

The coasting tonnage of Nova Scotia taking the arrivals and departures, has nearly doubled in the past year. Maine, once foremost in shipbuilding:

In 1877 the new tonnages measured	76,308
In 1886 do do	15,924
		61,284

Or a difference of value of \$2,500,000

I can say positively, Sir, that there are few vessels on the blocks in Maine, but whilst that has been going on in Maine and the United States, there has also been a decrease in tonnage in the Maritime Provinces. The total tonnage of sailing and steam has decreased in the Maritime Provinces from 1878 to 1885 by 25,190 tons, or about 27 per cent. In six New England States, by 73,498 tons, or 6½ per cent. Well, Sir, let us look at what the *Boston Herald* says about the Maine shipbuilding. The *Boston Herald* of 9th September, 1887, says:

"DECLINE IN AMERICAN SHIPPING.

"To-day a desolation of the sort which Charles Lamb noted at the South Sea House, and which he likened to the desolation at Babel, reigns over the ship yards of Bath where 10,000 men once toiled without ceasing, and another 10,000 delved and toiled in turn for them, there is now but scant employment for a slim 1,000. Thirty years ago, along the front of Ancient Bath alone, the frames and forms of barques and brigs, and sloops and schooners and full-rigged ships and wooden steamers literally fringed the river bank for three miles. Now, only the memories of these stately hulls that sailed away are left to Bath. Where giant craft were put together and yards were alive with industry, grass grows now; piles rot away, neglected wharves fall slowly to decay, or in some instances have become vegetable gardens, or well trimmed lawns. The old sheds and shops black and feeble and betraying, in their aged leanness, every rafters bone in their bodies drop gradually to pieces among the ghosts of shipping and the graves of stocks. Thirty years ago the ships of Bath sailed into every port in every clime. Wherever ships were gathered together, the masts of Bath carried the Stars and Stripes. Thirty years ago the yards of Bath launched half a hundred full-rigged ships in a twelve month. In the last two years they have not launched one, nor built one, nor planned one. Nor is there at the present time, within the wide borders of the United States, a single full-rigged ship in course of construction."

Now, Sir, I think that when hon. gentlemen compare the condition of our shipping, depressed as it is, depreciated in value as it is, they will recognise that we have not a great deal to find fault with as regards our shipping interest as compared with that industry in the United States. We are told, Sir, with great rejoicing by hon. gentlemen opposite, that we have no inter-provincial trade. We have not such an inter-provincial trade as I would like to see, but it is growing and will steadily increase. We often forget, in discussing Mr. KENNEDY.

this question that we have only had 20 years of national life, and how short is 20 years in the life of a nation. I remember the early days of Confederation when gentlemen had to come to this Parliament from the Lower Provinces. They had to take the steamer at Halifax and make the voyage to New York, then travel across the State of New York by the Suspension Bridge, or some other road, and then get around to Prescott Junction for Ottawa. That usually occupied six days. At that same time, Sir, the railroads existing in Nova Scotia could only carry one 60 miles from Halifax. As hon. gentlemen know we now come here from Halifax in two days, and I am informed that when the Short Line Railroad shall have been built we will be able to make the journey in one day. When the journey is shortened to one day, I hope, Sir, that we will have the pleasure of seeing some of our friends from Ontario down there. They will find that we have not such a bad country; that we are not such a poverty stricken people as would appear from the remarks of some hon. gentlemen; they will find that we are not "arrant fools," nor "sneaks," nor "cowards," nor "finakies." Now, Sir, we cannot only travel from Ottawa with some comfort, and ease, and expedition, but, to-day, we can go from Halifax, on the Atlantic, to Vancouver on the Pacific, and all through Canada's territory. Is not this progress? I do hon. gentlemen opposite—some of them at least—the justice to say that I have had some conversation with them, that they agreed that the construction of that great Canadian enterprise, that magnificent railroad which has raised us so much in the estimation of our neighbors as well as of the whole British public, that that road should be to us all Canadians a source of national pride. And there never was a great work so persecuted for party purposes as that very road has been. I would say to hon. gentlemen who are ever grumbling about our inter-provincial trade: Remember our short national existence; give us a chance; we are still in our national youth; we still need some care and consideration; do not drive us from the paternal roof; do not turn us over to strangers; do not be guilty of the horrible crime of strangling your own progeny. Why, Mr. Winman, the father of the fad, never abuses Canada; and if hon. gentlemen opposite are going to follow him, cannot they take that example from him, and occasionally say a kind word for their country? It was only 17 years ago that our currencies were assimilated. Have we no inter-provincial trade? The senior member for Halifax told us that the Maritime Provinces send to Ontario \$10,000,000 annually to pay for goods. Well, Sir, that may be true; I do not vouch for the accuracy of the figures. Ask the Halifax and Moncton sugar refiners how long they could work without the markets of Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba; ask the cotton manufacturers of St. John, Windsor, Moncton and Halifax where they sell the major part of their products, and they will tell you in the Upper Provinces. The products of our iron works and of our coal mines go largely to Ontario and Quebec. They say we have no inter-provincial trade because Ontario and Quebec do not take our fish, coal and lumber and we do not take all their surplus produce. Would any American statesman who values his reputation say that because Pennsylvania supplies New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire with coal, and because Pennsylvania does not take, because she does not require, the surplus agricultural productions of those States, therefore there is no inter-state trade between them, and that God and nature had decreed that it is impossible for them to live under the same policy and the same flag? No American legislator would make such a statement as that. Sir, it is surprising that we have accomplished so much. "If the doctrine of natural trade, arises from contiguity of territory, were universally adopted, there would be no stability in the frontiers of the nations; every nation whose territory is co-

terminous with that of another would find a natural trade strangled by the national tariffs, and a re-arrangement of the boundaries would be necessary." With regard to the mission of the Intercolonial Railway I expressed my views last year, and I have only to say that I cordially concur in what the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Skinner) has said on that subject. As regards the effects of the proposed policy, a gentleman who occupies a seat in the other end of this building tells us, in a Toronto newspaper of 20th May, 1887, that we have invested in manufactures \$104,000,000, and that a customs union would mean a depreciation to the extent of 66 per cent. in the value of that property. Now, Sir, is that desirable in the interests of Canada? That is not my individual opinion, but it is that of a gentleman much better informed than I am. But I know that one of the largest boot and shoe manufacturers in the Lower Provinces has stated that if we had commercial union he would have to close his manufactory in 24 hours; and other large manufacturers have expressed themselves in similar terms. Is it wise to run the risk of destroying all these industries, which are giving employment to our people and adding so much to our wealth, and drive them to seek in a foreign state that protection which a change of policy might deprive them of in their own? Our sugar refineries would be imperilled. This sugar refining industry promotes our trade with the West Indies, and consequently helps our fisheries. I have shown that 66 per cent. of the whole imports of the United States go to New York, and I believe that commercial union would drive the distributing trade of Canada largely to New York. I fear that commercial union would simply mean building up the cities of the United States at the cost of our own. I may be wrong. When the question comes before Parliament, I shall be prepared to discuss it on its merits. But this far I am satisfied, that under that system Canada would become the slaughter market of the American manufacturers. Of that I have had personal experience. I remember being in New York some years ago, and wanting to purchase some goods of a certain class, I called on a firm of bankers, one of whom was formerly in that business, Mr. George Blies. He gave me the names of certain firms from whom I could make my purchases, saying: "You must tell them you want the goods for Canada." I replied, with natural diffidence, that I was a very small purchaser. He said: "If you will only tell them you want the goods for Canada, you will get them cheaper than A. T. Stewart or Claflin could buy them." He went on to tell me that while the manufacturers would not break their prices in their own territory, they would slaughter their productions in Canada. Now, any man who has any knowledge of the dry goods business knows that for continental goods—French, Swiss and German goods—New York is a great slaughter market, and that you can actually buy those goods there at auction for infinitely less money than you could import them for in any regular business channel. Under commercial union Canada would be made the slaughter market for a portion of those goods, and I am quite certain it would mean the depreciation and almost the destruction of the distribution trade of Montreal. It would be for the people of Canada to decide whether Montreal and our other distributing centres should be sacrificed. The hon. gentleman who moved this resolution told us that England had not a friend in the world, that she was torn by internal dissension and menaced by foreign aggression, and gave that as reason for our voting for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. This language recalled to my mind, the days when, as a boy at school, I committed to memory, that grand speech of Lord Chatham, when chiding his brother peers, for their outrageous conduct in arraying in arms against them their fellow countrymen at this side of the Atlantic—that most stupendous act of folly recorded on the pages of

history—Lord Chatham told the House of Lords, that that unnatural war had so robbed England of her prestige, that none amongst the nations of the world were so poor as to do her reverence. I suppose the hon. gentleman who made this statement had some such words ringing in his memory. Sir, I recognise with the hon. gentlemen the domestic difficulties of Great Britain, I will go further and express my individual opinion, that Ireland has not been treated fairly or justly by England, but, now that the great masses of the English people are aroused to a sense of the injustice that country has so long and so patiently labored under, I believe that the remedy will be swift and sure. I pray it may be so. Ireland's wrongs, once righted, none will be more true to England than Ireland's sons, and we shall see in England, what we Canadians all wish for, a united, happy and prosperous people, and England will be in the future the beacon of justice and freedom for the world. I think, Sir, we need not give ourselves any anxiety for England's future. Since Lord Chatham spoke so many years ago, we know what her career has been, and even now that the Canadian statesman who moved this resolution has spoken, I do not think we need be so much alarmed. I am sure, Sir, that England's statesmen, wise in council and prudent in action, will be in the future, as they are to-day, ready, willing, anxious, to unite the great English-speaking peoples in the closest ties of friendship. The reference made by the hon. member for South Oxford reminds me, too, that no people in the world have ever suffered more for creed or for country than have Irishmen. Nowhere is all that Irishmen love most dearly, their religion and its clergy, more revered and respected than in this Canadian land, and the status of the Irish race is infinitely superior in Canada, to that of their fellow-countryman across the border, and any political change would mar that happy state of things. I cannot wish better for Ireland, than that her position may become like unto ours, and that when she acquires her own local self-government, she may also be enabled to inaugurate some system, by bounty or otherwise, whereby she, too, may have a National Policy as we have, which will enable her to employ some of her population in manufacturing, and not be solely dependent upon one industry, so that like us, with varied industries, the Irish farmers' best market will be the home market. I repeat, Sir, that I am in favor of a reciprocity treaty with the United States, one that may be fair, and honorable, and mutually advantageous. I believe that the Government of this country is desirous of making such an arrangement, and that the matter should remain untrammelled in their hands. But I will say this, owing to the changed condition of the two countries, owing to the greater development in the larger country and its keen competition in the products of the soil, and still keener competition in manufacturing pursuits, great care and caution must be exercised in framing such a treaty, and I do not believe, if we had the old reciprocity in force to-day, it would be as great a financial advantage to Canada as it was formerly, because the condition of things has very much changed. Believing, from the oft-quoted utterances, that the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite is not calculated to benefit the cause of reciprocity, I shall not vote for the resolution nor for the amendment of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). And further, Sir, I say this from my place in Parliament, that if the negotiations so cordially opened between Mr. Bayard and Sir Charles Tupper do not come to a successful issue, I shall hold this agitation responsible for the failure. I have considered this question from the standpoint of a Canadian, as I feel it my duty to consider all questions that come before me; and as regards sentiment, I must plead guilty to being subject to its influence and to having that share of it which I believe every Irishman possesses. It cannot be said that I have not been guilty of taking up your time, but I think you

will admit that I have not been guilty of any sentimental gush. I will simply say that I was born under the British flag, that I have lived happily under it, that I believe the Canadian people are as happy to-day under it as any people in the world, and that I believe we enjoy as great a measure of civil and religious liberty and as full protection for life and property as any people in the world. I do hope that under any circumstances no political change will be brought about, and I will do hon. gentlemen opposite the justice to say that I believe a large number of them, in their hearts, do not desire a change. In conclusion I may say, again, I very much fear the agitation they have inaugurated will retard rather than advance the cause of reciprocity.

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

After Recess.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. MONCRIEFF. I stated yesterday that the report which I read of an interviewer's conversation with the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), was taken from the *Surina Observer*, the organ of that hon. gentleman. I find that I unintentionally made an error as to the news paper in which the report appeared. I should have said it appeared in the *Sarnia Canadian*, of the 20th July last, not the organ of the hon. member, and an abstract from the *Detroit Evening News*.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 8) to incorporate the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex).

Bill (No. 9) respecting the Canada Southern and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland).

Bill (No. 18) to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland).

Bill (No. 21) respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright, the amendment of Mr. Foster, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Jones (Halifax).

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. (Translation.) It is only the importance of the question now under the consideration of the House that could induce me to take part in this debate after hearing the learned and searching speeches of the gentlemen who have preceded me. There is question, Sir, of a measure which interests not only our actual prosperity, but likewise the future destiny of one-half a continent. There is question here of knowing whether Canada must remain stationary, or continue her not too rapid progress, or soar on lofty union and vie with the neighboring Republic. I wish to say, from the outset, that I shall not treat this question in a partisan spirit, nor make it a question of party. The subject stands far above the confines of party, inasmuch as it interests the present and the future of a whole people. One fact, Mr. Speaker, which must strike those who are occupied with public questions, is, that agriculture, the principal resource of a country, is not in a flourishing condition, at least in the Province of Quebec. I shall not speak of what takes place in other Provinces, but I know, and it is my duty to say, how matters stand in the Province of Quebec, one of whose representatives I have the honor to be in this House. If you go through the

Mr. KENNY.

counties, outside of Montreal; if you make an excursion through the parishes, you will find in the ranges and concessions a number of empty houses whose tenants have left for the United States, one after one at first, and whole families following in their wake. In Berthier county, which I have the honor of representing, and which is certainly one of the wealthiest in the Province, there are parishes where one-fourth of the owners of land are away in the United States, with their families, and whose names still stand on the electoral lists, but who answer not the call when the day of voting arrives. And this, Mr. Speaker, does not represent one-half of the emigration to the United States, which starts from our country places, for besides those who have left their farms vacant, but still in their name, there is the large number of those who parted with them before leaving, and which are occupied by others. I have been told that the number who have sold their property before leaving the country is at least double that of those who have retained them in their name, to earn their bread and the livelihood of their families in the United States. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it were a capital mistake to imagine that the Province of Quebec does not afford the farmer every desirable advantage. The soil is fertile, the earth is adapted to tillage and fit to bear large crops. The acres of public land, already surveyed, but not yet occupied, may be numbered by the million. They offer room for several millions of additional inhabitants. I shall not say that the Province of Quebec does not advance, because it certainly progresses slowly, if you will; still it progresses. But most assuredly the progress is not commensurate with what it should be. Why are things thus? There is one sole reason. If the soil is productive and adapted to cultivation, if the climate is wholesome and the people sound and robust, it is because we have not a proper market thrown open to us for the surplus of our produce. In Canada, Mr. Speaker, we know that there is no restriction to the disposal of the surplus of our products. We know besides that there is no restriction of exportation in England of our farming staples, but that there is such restriction in the case of the United States. If the British market is not more favorable, it is because the profits of the farm produce are wholly absorbed by the cost of transit, freight and insurance, and when our grain has reached England, it enters into competition with that of the Western States and such European States as Turkey, Russia, Egypt and others. On our borders, Mr. Speaker, we have a nation of 60,000,000 souls who already absorb a great part of our surplus, but the cost of transportation is replaced by very high duties, a circumstance which operates just as disadvantageously in regard to agriculture. The following is a list of some articles which we export to the United States; and if we compare the total amount of the exportation of these products with the United States, we shall find that they absorb from 92 to 95 per cent:—

Articles.	Amount exported to the U. S.	Total amount of exportation.
Barley	\$5,245,988	\$5,277,889
Horses	2,214,338	2,350,926
Eggs	1,821,364	1,825,559
Sheep	974,482	1,595,340
Hay	670,749	743,398
Potatoes	328,852	439,208
Woolens	288,251	317,250
Beans	206,317	207,402
Malt	145,012	146,012
Poultry	98,919	107,909
Flax	78,422	78,422
Vegetables	75,517	83,639
	\$12,149,291	\$13,162,950

Thus, on twelve articles of agricultural production, we exported for \$13,162,950; the United States bought of this for \$12,149,291, leaving for all other points \$1,013,659. In other words, the United States bought 92 per cent. of our

surplus. Let us set aside this Customs barrier. Let us abolish these duties which absorb 20 to 40 per cent. of the value of goods, and at once we increase by so much the value of the products of this country, because the surplus which we export to the United States is as a drop of water in the sea compared to the consumption of the United States and, consequently, cannot affect the price. If then the abolition of duties did not tend to lower the prices in the United States, our farmers would reap the advantage, and add to the slender profits which they reap to-day, the amount of duties that they are obliged to pay. These duties, in the case of certain articles, are equivalent to one-third or 40 per cent. of their value. Thus, in the course of last summer, we could purchase hay in Berthier county, which is one of those yielding the most and the best, for \$6 a ton. The duty on hay in the United States is \$2 a ton. This makes 33 per cent. of the farm produce of Berthier county—and there are many such counties in the same predicament—absorbed by American duties. On barley there is a duty of 10 cents a bushel, and of this grain we exported 9,437,717 bushels. That makes \$43,771 taken from the production of the country before reaching the American market. It is the same with many other articles. Before our farmers can place a single particle of their farm surplus, they are forced to take one-third or one-fourth, and deposit it in the Treasury of the United States. Once more, Mr. Speaker, if these Customs duties were abolished, we should see what we saw in 1854, when the old Reciprocity Treaty was concluded. During the year 1853, the united Province of Canada, that is, Upper and Lower Canada, had exported to the United States:

Animals and their products	\$ 966,196
Farming products	3,281,092
	<u>4,247,288</u>

Twelve years later, that is, during the year expiring 30th June, 1866, the same two Provinces had exported to the United States:

Animals and their products	\$11,184,741
Farming products	13,298,608
Total	<u>24,483,749</u>
	4,247,288
Increase in 12 years of	20,025,461

Or nearly 500 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we mean to say that this is a natural progression which would have taken place without reciprocity, I should draw the attention of the House to the fact that in 1867, the year which followed the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, the exportations from Ontario and Quebec of agricultural products and farm produce show the following difference:—

	1867.	1867.	Reduction.
Animals and their products....	\$11,184,141	\$ 3,696,191	\$ 7,487,950
Farming produce	13,298,000	11,186,227	2,111,773
	<u>24,483,749</u>	<u>14,871,418</u>	<u>9,611,331</u>
	14,871,418		
	<u>9,611,331</u>		

In 1866, our total exports to the United States, leaving aside the export of specie, rose to \$34,770,261; in 1867 they fell to \$22,859,034, showing a reduction of \$11,911,177. Further again, after twenty years' experience of this policy of exclusion, after having expended so many millions to facilitate commercial relations, we find that the exports of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec to the United States are less considerable than they were in 1866, as is shown by the following figures taken from the Trade Returns of Canada for the year finishing the 30th June, 1887.

Exports to the United States, Ontario	\$20,803,434
" " " Quebec	4,710,370
	<u>\$25,513,704</u>
Exports in 1866... ..	34,770,201
Decrease in 21 years.....	<u>9,256,547</u>

But if we take the whole Dominion; if we add to the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, the five new Provinces and Territories of the North-West, we find that our total exports to the United States are still less than the total exports of the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec in 1866:

Total exports, 1866	\$34,770,201
" 1887	<u>34,668,275</u>
Decrease.....	\$ 111,926

Therefore, during these twenty one years, from 1866 to 1887, our agriculture, making no allowance for any progress, it may have made during those twenty one years, has lost, each year, a trade of over \$9,000,000 with the United States; or say \$190,000,000 since the abolition of reciprocity. But it is clear that the actual loss must be much more considerable, because our agriculture undoubtedly continued to make progress from 1866 as it did during the preceding twelve years. It is, therefore, clear and undoubted that the American market is the natural market for the Canadian farmer, and that our agriculture, under reciprocity, would rapidly become developed and prosper, while under the system of exclusion adopted and maintained by the United States and Canada since 1866 it languished and became impoverished. Now, I believe there is no divergence of opinion, either in the House or the country, as to the advantages which would result from a treaty of reciprocity with the United States in all that concerns our natural and agricultural products. But there are two ways of looking at this question. There is a way of being in favor of reciprocity which is effective and practical, and there is one which is not. Assuredly we cannot present ourselves before the American Congress and say to it: We have every interest in obtaining free admission into the United States for our products, and we ask that you grant us reciprocity in respect of them, but we have nothing to offer you in return. We cannot ask the Americans to make with us a fool's bargain. Were we to make such an advance to them, we could not hope to succeed. We must, on the contrary, go to them with full hands so as to obtain in return the advantages we require. In fact, the United States say to us: We have already refused you reciprocity on natural products alone; we have had already with you reciprocity on such products, which, when it came to an end, we had no desire to renew. We are now ready to make a new treaty with you, but only on condition that it embraces also reciprocity in manufactured products. Then, Mr. Speaker, the attempt is made to induce this House and the country to believe that there is a real antagonism between reciprocity and the National Policy. This pretention, Sir, is absolutely false; no such antagonism exists. I am one of those who believe in protection. I advocated that policy at a time when a certain number of those who accept it to-day, believed in free trade. From the time I began to study the economic position of Canada, I formed the opinion and gave expression to it, as I do again this evening, that we require protection to create home industries; I came to the conclusion that protection was essential to the development of our resources, and to our becoming a great people and a great country. That doctrine I preached in 1871 and 1872, under a Conservative Government, and in 1875 under a Liberal régime. My opinions have not since changed. But, Mr. Speaker, must free trade with the United States imply that we cannot have a protective tariff against other countries, which, being governed by different economic conditions, would destroy our industries if we opened

our doors freely to their productions? Assuredly not. But do we not know that Canada and the United States stand in the same economic conditions, and that manual labor is as dear in the United States as it is here? Do we not further know that the raw material is as plentiful in Canada as it is among our neighbors, and cheaper? Have we not boundless water power and the most potent in the world? And are not our mines of extraordinary richness? And are not our forests the finest in America? In every respect of natural resource, are we not equal, if not superior to the United States? If such is the case, Mr Speaker, I defy contradiction from any member on the other side of the House. It is evident that we have the wherewithal to meet American competition, and can not only hold our own, but even go ahead of them. It would be different, Mr. Speaker, if there were question of England, Germany, France or Belgium. We know what are the wages earned by the workingman in Europe. We know what the European proletariat is. In America wages are high; the workingman may earn, by his honorable toil, the livelihood of himself and family. We cannot, therefore, put into competition the proletariat of Europe with the independent labor of our continent. This is why we can with profit throw open our portals to Americans, and send our produce to them, while we cannot the same thing in the case of Europe. Wherefore it is I assert that we should maintain the protective tariff, in so far as Europe is concerned. There is another important question requiring solution, and which cannot be solved except by thorough reciprocity with the United States. The adoption of a protective tariff, in 1879, had as immediate result, the establishment of numerous and powerful manufactures, whose productive capacity exceeds by a good deal the wants of local consumption. At the end of only three or four years, competition had grown so keen, production so great and the prices so low that a fearful crisis ensued which had well nigh carried away the most of the manufactures and the capital staked therein. The companies found their market overdone; their stock became enormous without any possible way of disposing of it, even at a sacrifice, or any other market, and with liabilities to banks which they were unable to meet. The consequence was that they had to suspend and suppress their dividends. Public trust was so shaken, that stocks worth 125,150 and 200 per cent. fell to 50, 40, 30 and even 10 per cent., and at a given crisis, ruin loomed up certain and inevitable. It is from this imminent common peril that arose combinations among manufacturers to lessen production and raise prices, so as to pay dividends on an inflated capital with reduced production. Thus, to-day, the public pays an excessive price, out of proportion with the cost price of the goods consumed. This is an abnormal state of things which cannot last. Public opinion is already stirred and moving. The attention of Parliament has been drawn to the subject, and the motion of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is only the first muttering of the storm. We cannot materially increase the industrial production of the country. We cannot rely on a consumption much larger than that which we have at present. We are already obliged to reduce production in order to prevent the ruin and extinction of manufactures. Consequently there is only one remedy, and that remedy is not to be found in the country, but elsewhere and outside. Certain hon. members said yesterday, Let us go to the West Indies, let us go to Brazil, to find markets for our products. But, Sir, why go so far to find markets when there is one so near? What advantage would it be for us to go to Brazil or the West Indies, when within fifty miles of Montreal we can find a much more advantageous market, and a population of 60,000,000 souls, which can absorb, not only what we now produce, but what we will be able to produce in the future? I would be glad if some of the hon. members opposite would reply to this simple question, since

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

they admit the existence of the evil and the necessity of a remedy. There is one fact to which the hon. Minister of the Interior wished to draw the attention of the House, but on which he did not much insist. He pretended that reciprocity with the United States would destroy the shipping trade of the St. Lawrence. This pretension is somewhat strange, and it is rather remarkable that no business man of Montreal or Quebec, and no member of this House has been willing to endorse it. For the past twenty-five years the Government have been spending in the deepening of the canals between Lake Superior and the St. Lawrence considerable sums, amounting probably to \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000. Now, what is the object of these works? It is to create a line of navigation, a line of transportation between the United States, Western States and the Atlantic *via* the St. Lawrence. We have never considered that our sacrifices to that end were too great, and we are ready to continue them so as to offer the commerce of the west a larger and more advantageous route by enabling our canals to admit vessels of the heaviest tonnage. We know that the North-West is the granary of America and Europe, and that the St. Lawrence offers uncontestedly the most advantageous and the shortest route for the transportation of the products of the one to the markets of the other. Well, Mr. Speaker, in what way could the abolition of the duties on American imports affect injuriously our shipping trade? Is it not evident that instead of the American merchants sending their grain in bond through Canada for transhipment from Montreal or Quebec, our Canadian merchants would buy American grain and do the business themselves to their own benefit? What will thwart this transit trade when we have a direct line without bonding system, without business embarrassments, which will extend from the Western States down the great line of the St. Lawrence? Is it not evident, rather, that by making the St. Lawrence free we can use it, not only to transport to England the grain of the west, but also to distribute in the west manufactured articles of which these immense agricultural states have need, and open also to our industries an immense field easily occupied. The price of the transportation of grain could thus be lowered to a minimum, and in a few years an exchange could be established, equally profitable to both countries, and making Montreal the worthy rival of New York. But I am quite surprised to hear the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. White) express this pretension in face of the result which the Government policy has had on the commerce of the St. Lawrence. It is only one week ago the Montreal Board of Trade held a meeting specially to consider the question of commercial transit between Canada, the United States and Europe. It is not Grits, nor Nationals, nor Liberals who complained of the Government policy; it is their own friends such as Messrs. G.A. Drummond, Ogilvie, Edward Murphy and Hugh McLennan all patriots and devoted to the Government. And these gentlemen said that, in consequence of its policy, the Government are completing the ruin of the transit trade of the St. Lawrence, and while, in 1872, we transported 80 per cent. of the grain shipped to Europe, to-day the figure has fallen to 12 per cent. Such are the facts unanimously set forth in the resolutions unanimously adopted by the Montreal Board of Trade and the citizens assembled. No condemnation of the Government could be more energetic whose policy, far from widening the popularity of the St. Lawrence route, is fast achieving its destruction. The resolutions are as follows:—

“Proposed by Mr. G. A. Drummond and seconded by Mr. Ogilvie, and resolved:

“That the charges imposed on the port of Montreal are so burdensome as to drive business from the St. Lawrence River and the Canals, forcing it to seek another channel toward American ports. Therefore the commerce of the St. Lawrence is not developed in proportion to the lines and bulk of its business, inasmuch as during 1872 we exported nearly 28 per cent. of the grain and flour shipped to Europe from the American continent, while now we export only 12 per cent.

And such influential Conservatives as Messrs. Edward Murphy and Hugh McLennan complained of this policy and went so far that it was of a character to shake their loyalty not only toward the mother country, but also toward Canada. In respect of the commerce of the St. Lawrence, I am pleased Mr. Speaker, to be able to cite before the House certain documents which I submitted to the Montreal Board of Trade. A few years ago, this institution ordered the drafting of a plan indicating the shortest route and the easiest and cheapest means of transportation between the United States and Europe. Mr. Thomas Keefer, the well known engineer, who was commissioned to draw up this plan, came to this result :

"That if a thread be stretched upon a globe, from any point in the British Channel to Toledo, on Lake Erie, and arranged so as to be upon the shortest line, it will be found that the River St. Lawrence does not deviate at any point more than 30 miles, connecting, in the shortest possible distance, with the most capacious, steady and economical mode of communication, the greatest food-consuming country in Europe with the greatest food producing country in America—inhabited by the parent and offspring of the most favored race of men."

And Mr. Keefer added :

"The distance of Chicago to Montreal, *via* the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals, is 1,261 miles,—involving a lockage of 553 feet by 54 locks, there being 71 miles of canal, 185 miles of river and 1,005 miles of lake navigation. While the distance from Chicago to New York city *via* Buffalo and the Erie Canal is 1,419 miles, involving a lockage of 685 feet by 72 locks,—there being 352 miles of canal, 204 miles of river and 865 miles of lake navigation."

Consequently, the St. Lawrence route is, for all points of the North-west, not only American, but also Canadian, the most direct way between Europe and America. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Pacific Company have just completed a second line between the States of the west and the St. Lawrence in summer, and the United States seaports in winter. They have completed a railway between Sault Ste. Marie and the Northern Pacific. It is already advertised that, next summer, the company will move over 200 to 250 grain cars daily in the single port of Montreal, which will thus soon become too narrow for accommodation. Thus we have routes which are the shortest, in summer and in winter, to transport the products of the Canadian and American seaboard to the markets of Europe. Reciprocity will furnish them with all the traffic which they can handle and even more, since commerce always seeks and finds the straightest and cheapest line. It is useless, Mr. Speaker, to recall to mind that if navigation is benefited by the establishment of reciprocity, railways will equally profit thereby, for navigation lasts only six or seven months of the year, and the balance of the transportation is done by railway. Now, the country built the Pacific Railway at a cost of hundreds of millions, and it is important to the future of the country that this company should be enabled to realise profits sufficient to obviate further sacrifices on the part of the country. Several of the gentlemen who preceded me, on the opposite side, have claimed that we are assuming an attitude of humiliation in regard to the United States, and that we fall before them like paupers in search of alms. That is not a correct picture, Mr. Speaker. As I had the honor of setting forth, Canada possesses resources and advantages which the United States appreciate very much, because valuable to themselves. We can offer Americans as much as they offer us. Reciprocity would be equally beneficial to both countries, by stimulating production, increasing business in such proportions that millions would profit on both sides of the line. Some of the members of the House have also maintained that this question is a novelty, an entire novelty, of which they never heard. They were quite surprised to learn that there were folks who dreamed of laying the foundations of a commerce more advantageous to the United States. They evidently have not studied the history of the establishment of protection in the country. In 1871, the choice was squarely put between a

protective tariff against the world or a protective tariff against Europe and free trade with the United States. The question was a second time put in 1872. On each occasion, politicians, farmers and business men in both countries declared that it was the policy the most advantageous for both countries. In 1874, the hon. the Minister of the Interior—he was not then Minister—moved before the Dominion Board of Trade the adoption of commercial reciprocity, in an eloquent speech, which he has the secret of making, and moved the following resolution:—

"That this Board desires to express its gratification at the growing sentiment among our neighbors in the United States, in favor of more intimate reciprocal trade relations between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, as evidenced by the resolutions passed by the National Board of Trade:—

"And that it be an instruction to the Executive Council to take whatever steps it may deem necessary in order to secure the adoption of a treaty for reciprocal trade with the United States, upon a broad, comprehensive and liberal basis."

And the seconder of this resolution was no other than Mr. Adam Brown, who has the honor of representing the city of Hamilton in this House. The reason given by Mr. Brown for supporting this resolution is that it was absolutely essential to establish the warmest relations possible between the two countries. These are his words :

"In seconding the resolution I feel indisposed to make any lengthy remarks after the eloquent speech of Mr. White. He has established the fact that this Dominion can prosper without the renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty; and he has also established the fact that in the interest of the progress of both this country and the United States, we ought to have reciprocal trade between the two countries. This question should be regarded in the broad light of humanity. It is a matter of the greatest consequence to us in this country that we should live on the most amicable terms with our friends across the lines. We should cultivate peace in every possible way, and I believe there is no manner in which peace can be more thoroughly cultivated between two great nations, than by reciprocal trade relations between them. I have simply to say that I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution."

It seems to me that the hon. member would have had great pleasure in seconding the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Now, these are the terms in which the hon. Minister of Interior expressed the advantage which we could derive from the Reciprocity Treaty, not only in natural products, but also for manufactured products :

"I think the figures I have given prove that this country has prospered and can prosper without that treaty. But I think no one can look to the position of both countries on this continent—coming to the discussion of this question on equal terms, each feeling that it can prosper without that treaty—without realising that it would be to the advantage of both to have the freest possible intercourse. Here we are with a common line of frontier extending some four thousand miles, with many interests in common, with the same language, religion and traditions, each proud of and loyal to his own form of government, but willing to respect the national sentiment of the other; and it does seem to me, that the closer we can bring our commercial relations the more prosperous will both countries become."

Mr. Speaker, I have positively nothing to add to these words of the hon. Minister, and I believe that they would be as true to-day as they were in 1874. Now, as to the objections urged against the proposition before the House. The first is that we should lose an income of seven millions and a quarter by adopting this policy. That is perfectly correct. We should certainly lose the revenue which we raise to-day on American products coming to Canada. And is there no way, out of the \$35,000,000 which we spend every year, to practice the small economy of \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000? Is it not possible to bring the country back to its condition of a decade back and manage the affairs of Canada with \$25,000,000 or \$26,000,000 a year—a sum which was looked upon as extravagant in 1878? Is it not possible to inaugurate a system of economy and put an end to the extravagances and the presents made to the Pacific, and which, it appears, are about to be repeated? Is it not possible to foresee that the great progress which is going to be made in the country will bring on a much larger emigration and yield a revenue

much more considerable on European goods, wines, silks, and other luxuries imported into the country? It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing herein to terrify a Minister of Finance, prudent and wise and determined on administering the country in the wisest possible manner. At all events, everybody knows that the matter is feasible; and the bugbear of direct taxation is invoked because that tax is known to be unpopular—and with reason—while indirect taxation deprives the people of part as much, without their noting it. As for me, I prefer the easiest method of collection and administration, that which gives rise to least disfavor, and I should certainly oppose all attempts of imposing direct taxation. And the great objection is this: It is said that, if Canada once gets a taste of the American market, there is no certainty that it will remain true to Britain. Mr. Speaker, our loyalty is above all suspicion—I speak for the French Canadians. A few years after the cession of the country to England, in 1775, the French Canadians had the opportunity of proving their loyalty. Great temptations were set before them, in the way of promises, by the revolted Americans, to induce them to desert the British cause. But we fought for the English flag in 1775. We fought for the flag in 1812, and we did it with glory. It will ever be one of the most glorious recollections of French Canada to be able to say that, in 1812, he was the first to uphold the Crown of Great Britain. To-day the French-Canadians do not desire annexation; they are loyal and they have reason to be loyal. They are loyal because they wish to retain the protection which they derive from the British Throne; they are loyal because they count on England's continuing to respect the treaty of 1763, and because they are confident that under the ægis of the British Crown their institutions, their language and their laws will be respected and in surety. We French Canadians know that we can always reach the foot of the Throne with our petitions and grievances; we know that there we will be listened to with respect and with the intention of granting us justice, should justice have been elsewhere refused us by intolerant inimical factions. It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that we have no desire to change the protection we enjoy under the British Crown to enter, as one of the American States, the neighboring Republic, in which, it is true, our rights might be guaranteed, but in which also they might be torn from us through the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution. These are the reasons why we are loyal and why we desire to maintain British connection, and we will continue to be in the same frame of mind as long, at least, as we enjoy the advantages and guarantees which we possess to-day. But, Sir, we must not forget that history teaches us that it is not by starving the people you can make them loyal, contented and peaceful. We must not forget the condition in which the country was in 1849, when the Galts, the Holtons, the McPhersons and the Abbotts signed a manifesto declaring that they despaired of the future of their country, and that their only hope lay in annexation to the United States. We must not forget, Sir, that at that time the country was in a highly excited condition, and that it was only in establishing reciprocity, that is to say, in giving to Canada the commercial advantages of annexation without its political drawbacks, that a crisis and a revolution was averted, and the political annexation to the United States avoided. And what followed the establishment of reciprocity? Prosperity was re-established, the disloyal became the leaders of the loyalists, and to-day we behold these gentlemen bearing proudly the marks of royal favor, which no doubt they highly merited. Well, Mr. Speaker, like cause produce like results. If you allow agriculture to perish, the results which were produced in 1849 will be renewed. You will again have agitation and uneasiness. You will create

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL.

a new annexation movement which you will not be able to stay except by again having recourse to the same remedy, reciprocity with the United States. That is why, on this side of the House, we desire to give to our commerce, our agriculture and our manufactures, all the extension and development of which they are susceptible by giving them access to the American market, convinced that in this way, and in this way alone, we will be enabled to avoid political disturbance, and to long continue loyal subjects of Her Majesty, while remaining faithful to Canada, our country.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, Canada for Canadians! This was the watchword emblazoned on the Conservative standard in 1878 and it led to a triumph, salient and unprecedented in our political annals. The loyal adherence to the same principle, and the good faith with the Conservative party carried it out, paved the way to a second victory in 1882. Then, by the same token, and in spite of some mistakes committed in the interval, between 1882 to 1887, the party was a third time victorious over its adversaries in 1887. Canada for Canadians! After these three trials and triumphs, it is idle to insist before this House and with those who are versed in politics, on the fact that the system of protection is unquestionably accepted by the country, in spite of what was said, the other day, by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), who declared that this policy had never been loyally submitted to the constituencies. We are bound to believe and every one ought and does believe, except the hon. member for Montmagny that these three Conservative contests have definitely established protection in the country. Everybody is convinced by the way in which these contests were conducted that the people understood what they were about in approving the establishment of protection. In 1878, 1882 and 1887, several representatives of the Province of Quebec, at present in this House, took part in the contest and remember that the issues were, on the one side, a protective tariff, and, on the other side, opposition to this tariff, on the ground that it would increase the burden of our taxes. No contest could have been carried out more honestly and no can one deny that the people willingly accepted protection, as pledged to establish national manufactures. There was a popular motive in all this, Mr. Speaker, and it lies in a retrospect of the condition of tariff throughout the Dominion from 1874 to 1878. The Americans, after the civil war, strove to reconstruct their industrial institutions, and develop the resources of their country, especially in respect of agriculture. In 1874, the Americans had so far succeeded that their farming products competed with those of Canada, in our own market. It will be likewise remembered that, at that time, the products of American manufacturers were working ruinously against us, in spite of a revenue tariff which afforded us a protection of 14 to 17½ per cent. In this competition with the United States and the foreign nations, our industries came near being wrecked, and it was high time that protection intervened to save them altogether. I fail to understand how the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) can declare to-day that if we had absolute free trade, or no tariff on goods coming from the United States, our present manufactures, which owe their present developments to a protective tariff, could stand the shock of competition without being shaken. It is impossible to substantiate such an assertion by facts. From 1874 to 1878, our industries were absolutely stagnant. The barns of our farmers were packed with produce for which they could find no opportunity of sale. Our manufactures were, in great measure, closed. Our tradesmen were, in too many cases, in the toils of bankruptcy and our people left the country in crowds, crossed the border, and sought labor in American factories. I remember distinctly that, during this dismal period—1874—1878—nearly one-half of the lands, in the parish which I inhabit, were sold

at sheriff's sale. I remember also that wealthy tradesmen, political friends of gentlemen opposite, went into insolvency, dragging many others in their wake. Things were pretty much in the state throughout the other counties of the Province of Quebec. Such was the condition of torpor into which our trade, our industries and our agriculture had fallen. It was to remedy these evils that the policy of protection was introduced, and to the same redeeming cause may be attributed the popularity which it has since enjoyed. It is the remembrance of the misfortunes borne under a revenue tariff that has secured the steadfast attachment of the people to the system of protection and animated them to maintain the present Government in power. It is singular that gentlemen of the political intelligence and experience of my friends opposite, have not yet seized the real significance of the popular feeling, as clearly expressed in 1882 and 1887. Let us now examine, Mr. Speaker, the condition of affairs in Quebec since 1872, the date of the establishment of the protective policy. There is no gainsaying the fact by anybody that, since then, our industrial interests have revived. Our farming interests have grown and flourished, our trade, in all lines, has spread and prospered, and the progress has been substantial, that, since then, trade has not slackened, manufactures have more than held their own, and the farmer—I fear not to affirm it notwithstanding the contrary from the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), and other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House—is content with his lot, however hard it may be to find a man in this world who is wholly satisfied with his condition. The changes brought about by the National Policy have been such that we have, at present, a local market for consumption, not only of a large portion of the products of our own fields, but also for the consumption of the products of our manufactures. I heard the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) say that our industries were as developed in the Province of Quebec, as to leave a surplus of manufactured goods in the hands of wholesale houses, which was set down as a grievous drawback. The glutting of the markets is a frequent occurrence in the United States, and we all know how the Americans act in the premises, which the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) must surely be aware of it. They form what the hon. gentleman calls coalitions, and they troop over to Canada and sacrifice enormous lots of merchandise at lower prices than they could sell them on their own markets. It is for the purpose of holding their prices on the American market that they make of Canada and other nations, slaughter markets. It is by such a policy that they succeeded, as was the case here from 1874 to 1878 to ruin the industries of those countries which they thus overflow with their overproduction. Why do not the United States, with their sound industrial institutions, dating back fifty years, not adopt free trade with Great Britain? Why do they not open their markets to all the nations of the globe? The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) says that in Europe labor is too cheap. But, Sir, if labor is cheap in Europe, there is the great distance to be covered to reach the Americans on their own markets, and there is the transportation of merchandise which represents something. How do the Americans, who keep their own markets to themselves, in manufacturing and farming products, manage to go forward and compete with Englishmen on their own market? They should find themselves on an equal footing with the British manufactures. The Americans appear to understand their own interests differently from my hon. friend. The member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) and other hon. members of this House have asserted that if we had reciprocity with the United States, Americans would come in here and build manufactories for us. It is a fallacy, Mr. Speaker. A nation which, for fifty years, has been

making sacrifices in the interests of its manufacturers and developing its natural resources would wantonly waste its capital in a foreign country to develop its industries; and, do that, too, when this foreign country had removed the barriers between them and when it was free to transport its merchandise into that country and there ruin the manufactures founded at the expense of the national credit. I do not credit the Americans with any such line of conduct. Certainly, under the former reciprocity treaty between 1854 to 1866, not a case can be pointed out where Americans supplied capital to establish factories in our midst. I hold, and every sensible person must hold, that we have no right to rely on the lack of patriotism in the American people to foster the national industries of our Dominion. A nation must lean on itself in this respect. If we, ourselves, cannot develop our industries, nobody else will do it for us. If we do not do it, or if we let existing industries perish, that will happen again which took place from 1874 to 1884. Our workmen will take refuge abroad; our farmers will have no local market for their produce and emigration to the United States will assume alarming proportions. We have been told that our manufactures can hold their own against those of the United States. That proposition is untenable, for the reason assigned by me a moment since, and there are powerful reasons as well. American industry has a far broader character than ours. The capital invested there is immense, representing hundreds of millions for every million that we have allotted to ours. As I just said—and I like to repeat it, that the House may catch the full force of my argument—it is quite easy for American manufacturers, representing hundreds of millions of capital, to undergo sacrifices to make war on Canadian manufactures of the same description, in which only a few millions are laid out, and then, when these industries are swept away, control our market as they do their own. Such would be the result of absolute free trade between the two countries. Sir, a distinguished statesman, a deep thinker, in speaking of the national industries of France, made use of these words:

“I understand that a nation should hesitate before undertaking the heavy sacrifices necessary to the creation of a national industry, but what I cannot understand is that a nation having undergone those sacrifices, should afterwards allow them to perish.”

What does the gardener do in ornamenting his dwelling with fruit trees, and sheltering these young trees after plantation? He subjects them to what may be termed a tutelage. When they have grown and begun to bear flowers, with the certain promise of fruit, he sets up before them screens against the high winds blowing across the fields, endangering their branches and shaking the fruit to the ground. Thus will act the sagacious men who set about founding a national industrial policy. After planting it firmly in the soil, they give it a tutor in the shape of protection. Their screen is the protective tariff, meant to prevent foreign competition from strewing the ground with the ruins of the National Policy. A nation having no national industries is unfit to bear the name. A nation that cannot suffice unto itself, and which is always obliged to buy from abroad, will never attain the highest rank. It will occupy an inferior position among the nations, and, in spite of its numbers, will pass in the fifth or sixth place. Surely, Canadians have a higher ambition than this. The hon. gentlemen on the other side are forever praising the American Republic, dazzling our eyes with reflections of the progress which it has achieved in its brief career. Why do they not tell us of the sacrifices which Americans have made to create their national industries? The hon. member for Berthier has not always been a representative of the people, and although ranking high among the political men of the party, he is also a distinguished publicist. He owns having been a protectionist. Not only a protectionist, but a prohibitionist. We have on record

what the hon. gentleman and the counsel he gave rural representatives in 1871, at the very period when he informs us that he was a champion of protection. To those who were desirous of favoring, at all cost, our foreign commerce, without regard to our national industries, he said :

"Owing to the lack of economical knowledge among the representatives of country constituencies, those hailing from cities and towns easily made them believe that trade is everything; that the imposition of high duties would tend to weigh most on agriculture and raise the prices of the staples of life. Thus it is that the farmer has been imbued with a horror of taxation, and that any sensible improvement of the economic standing of the country has been impossible. Furthermore by the aid of brilliant theories, the farmer was led to believe that trade is the source of all wealth. The example of the large cities came opportunely to convince those who at first believed to be sceptical."

This was the gentleman's advice to country members, and it was well if he himself would now follow it. What does he say, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the objections alleged by free traders? He makes no exception in favor of the United States, but holds that we must protect ourselves against all nations, and even against the mother country. This is what the hon. member for Berthier said at that time, and you can compare with what he says now. You will be able to judge, Mr. Speaker, as well as the House, whether he was right then, or whether he is right at present. Personally, I fancy that he reasoned with more force at that time than he does at this moment. In respect of the attempts made as in 2878 to raise the tariff and introduce protection, here is what he said :—

"There were two obstacles to success—the interests of importers and shippers first; and next, the prejudices and sophisms which had been spread among the people. The followers of the present Government have had to meet a multitude of obstacles to economic reformation. But the chief one from which all the others flow, is generally set forth in these terms :"

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that here is a thorough refutation, to my mind, of the arguments laid before this House, by the hon. representative of Berthier. He continues :

"To protect national industries is to tax the larger number for the benefit of the few."

Exactly what the advocates of free trade affirm to-day.

"It is to increase the price of all merchandise, and in consequence, to oppress the consumer and oblige him to pay dearer for articles which he might otherwise get cheaper. Thus too, it becomes a burden on agriculture, whose prospects are none too bright as it is, and generally impoverishes the whole country. No doubt this reasoning looks conclusive at first sight. We hope, however, to be able to show, from facts, history and reason, that it is fallacious and the contrary of what ought to be said."

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question? Does he mean that I hold another language to-day? Did I not say that I was in favor of protection? I think that I am a protectionist and will remain such.

Mr. DUPONT. I hardly understand, Mr. Speaker, how a man can be a protectionist and a free trader, at one and the same time. The hon. gentleman is for free trade with the United States, and still says that he is a protectionist. That goes beyond my logic, and I fail to see how the hon. member can be for his country and in the same breath, favor free trade with the Americans. I beg to be allowed, Sir, to cite one more extract from the admirable writings of my hon. friend when he was not only a protectionist, but a prohibitionist :

"We lay down these principles, with the right of expanding them later. The Government should prohibit the importation of every article of foreign manufacture which may be wrought in this country. They should likewise forbid the importation of raw material, unless it has no existence in the country, in which case importation should be free."

To illustrate the wonders achieved in this country by the policy of protection, it is hardly useful to recall a few. As I said in the beginning, despite the mistakes which the Government may have committed, the people have thought fit to maintain them in power, as the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House must admit, precisely

Mr. DUPONT,

because the nation had confidence that the Government which established protection would maintain it. I was astonished, the other day, to hear the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) tell us that Cartier, in his youth, had given expression to the free trade views.

Mr. LANGEЛИER (Quebec Centre). Not in his youth, but in his old age.

Mr. DUPONT. That Cartier, in his mature age, had favored free trade. I was surprised, Sir, to hear the hon. gentleman declare in this House that he did not recognise the followers of Cartier in our present body. I believe that if Cartier, the great French Canadian patriot, was in the place of his successors, he would have done as his successors did and are doing. Cartier would not have consented to see his country in a state of poverty; he would not have seen the industries of his country in a state of agony; he could not see the business of his country in a condition of bankruptcy; he would not have witnessed general misery through the country, without being stirred to action. Cartier was patriot enough to sacrifice the dearest of his theories for the good of his fellow-citizens. If Cartier had understood, as he would have been obliged in 1873, that a revenue tariff was no longer available to prevent the ruin of the Canadian people, Cartier would not have hesitated a moment to lay aside his theories and establish a protective tariff. It is insinuated, Sir, that we are far behind the American people. We have only to take the trouble of comparing our trade with the foreign trade of the great republic to understand the foreign trade of the two nations, in the ratio of their numbers. On consulting the trade and navigation reports and tables of the United States, for the past year, we find that with a population of 60,000,000 they have a foreign trade of \$1,408,000,000, while the Canadian population of the same year has a foreign trade of \$202,000,000. What is represented *per capita* of the population, \$1,408,000,000 for the United States, and \$202,000,000 for the Dominion of Canada? Might we say, Mr. Speaker, that our foreign trade, in respect of our population, is inferior to that of the American Republic? To do this, it were necessary to make a statement founded on facts and figures, and there are none which hon. members can adduce that would convince this House or the country. One hon. gentleman, the member from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I think, established that the inland trade of the American Republic was equal in tonnage to the inland trade of all the nations of Christendom put together. These statistics precisely prove that if a nation wants to spread her inland trade it must of necessity establish a protective tariff, provide for all its wants and the development of national industries. This, therefore, confirms what I stated that a nation cannot be a nation, and never its own master, unless able to meet all its requirements. The Americans did not always have inland trade so widespread and flourishing as the one they enjoy to-day. They were the prey, for a certain period, of a number of theorists. In 1824, the illustrious orator and statesman, Henry Clay, depicting the desolation which then prevailed in the United States, under free trade, said :

"We have under our eyes examples of the terrible effects on our manufactures of the undecided and vacillating course of the Government in this regard. Villages and parts of villages sprung up under the influence of protection, as I said before, have fallen into ruin and been abandoned. Going through New England, one sees lofty and spacious buildings, with broken windows, torn shutters, sad, noiseless and without activity. If you ask the cause of this pitiful state of things, you are told that these buildings were formerly cotton factories, or otherwise owners were obliged to quit work on account of the overwhelming foreign competition."

Mr. Speaker, is not this picture analogous to that of our own country, before the introduction of the protective tariff? In the small town, our neighbor, St. Hyacinthe, filled to-day with thriving factories, under the old system, we used to gaze at tall buildings tenantless and abandoned,

where previously was heard the hum of active trade. Since the advent of protection, not only have these buildings been occupied by other manufacturers, working on full time, but a host of other factories have risen under the inspiring breath of the National Policy. I heard the hon. member for Berthier read, a while ago, a long list of agricultural products exported by us to the United States, and tell us that on them we paid duty, whereas, with free trade, we should pay nothing. The hon. gentleman took care, however, not to add that, with free trade, there is another list of products, which he might put alongside of the other, which would come into competition with the produce of our agriculture. He forgot to mention this other fact that, with free trade, our local market would be lost, and our industries ruined by American industries more powerful than ours. I shall take leave to read to the House a table of prices of different farming products from the United States, with the view of showing that it is only here that agricultural products have gone down in price, but that this fall has been felt in all the markets of the world. Take the Americans as the largest exporters of agricultural products, and where is the advantage, I enquire, of having free trade with them, inasmuch as we trade on the same lines? Is it not better to open up more distant markets, with nations devoted exclusively to manufactures, and which must reach, outside of their territory, the products necessary to the sustenance of their inhabitants, as Great Britain, for instance. In 1881 Indian corn was worth, in the United States, 55 cents a bushel. In 1887 it was worth only 47 cents. What would be the result if American corn, exported to the tune of about \$20,000,000, came free of all duties into Canadian ports? This corn would compete with our peas, oats and other grain. And what would be the result? We saw what it was in 1874 down to 1878, and the farmers of the country cried aloud for duties on the produce then exported in less quantities from the United States, while they could not be imported to-day if we had free trade. Corn meal has also gone down. Bacon from 10½ cents fell to 8¼ cents a pound; salt pork from 9½ cents to 6¼ cents; pickled beef from 6½ cents to 5¼ cents; butter from 19 cents to 15¼ cents; cheese from 11 cents to 9¼ cents. The first list of prices just given is that of 1881. The next, which is the lowest, is that of the prices in 1887. Thus, it is not here only that farming products have lowered. There is a surfeit of agricultural produce. This glut was chiefly caused by the immense development of the American great west, able to export to-day wheat and fresh meat enough to feed the world. Mr. Speaker, the exportation of hay to the United States has been mentioned as one of the articles that we could not advantageously export. But we forget, as shown by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault), that the hay export to the United States gradually decreases. The cause of this decrease is that the United States have immense tracts of land exhausted by the raising of wheat. When it was learned that in New England fodder could be sold, prairies in the Western States were started, and immense prairies are made every year. Hay becomes more plentiful, and even to-day, if the duty were raised for this article, we should be obliged, as we are now, to suffer the competition of western hay. I wholly deny that our farmers would reap all the advantage of this reduction of duties, for, as soon as there is competition in a foreign market, the duty is paid partly by the consumer and partly by the producer. Our market, the most advantageous for the sale of our farming products, will ever be Great Britain. The day is not distant, I fancy, when the United States will be obliged to do as, in 1842, England did, under the government of Sir Robert Peel—establish free trade, at least for natural products. Their agriculture will soon reach a state of perfection and development such as will preclude all foreign competition. Besides, Mr. Speaker, you understand

the present condition of things in the United States. You are aware that the American treasury is gorged by the funds accumulated therein. The President lately declared to Congress that it was absolutely necessary to curtail certain duties, and at one stroke it was determined to knock off the worth of \$30,000,000. In that sum is comprised the timber and lumber going from Canada. It is one of the articles that would be entered free hereafter. We have been told that the United States are a favorable market for the export of potatoes, and it appears that this root is laid down on the list of the exports that shall henceforth go free to the United States. Many other articles, to favor the export of our products to the United States, have been placed on the free list. Then why does the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) come and ask us, under such circumstances, to establish free trade with the United States? Why this hurry if the Americans, precisely because of their economic condition and the development of their manufactures, are on the point of granting us free trade. The President of the United States, apprehensive of the accumulation of millions in the exchequer of the American Union, declares that it is necessary to lighten the burdens, and it is certain that before lifting the barrier which bars manufactured articles from the United States, the Americans will remove all obstructions to admit the entrance of the natural products of every country in the world. Hence, Mr. Speaker, by asking now for free trade from the United States, it is quite within the possibilities that we shall demand what Americans would like to give, because perhaps in the necessity of granting it. But, if that is the case, the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) imposes on the nation a useless sacrifice; and there is even more, Sir. As was so well said by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), can we reasonably grant free trade to the United States and refuse it to Great Britain? What can the United States do for us that England has not long since done? Free trade with the mother country we have. Then why raise a preferential tariff against Britain, who allows us to export to her our agricultural and manufactured products? And it is worthy of remark that we export more of our agricultural products to England than we do to the United States. But as England enters into no competition in farming produce, what reason could we have that would drive us to give free trade to the United States, by removing the duties which prevent their importing their merchandise and agricultural productions, and competing with ours for certain classes of produce? What reason could we allege to refuse England what we allow to a foreign people? It were a false and singular situation which the mother country would not tolerate, for it would be laughable to expect the defence and protection of Britain over the Dominion of Canada. Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, free trade is not feasible, however earnestly its practicability was demonstrated by the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) and the other hon. gentlemen who followed him on this question. If we must have free trade, we shall have to choose either the United States tariff or the Americans must adopt ours. If we take the American tariff, who will pretend that we have sufficient capital, or a business class numerous enough to cope with the business classes and the capital of the American Republic? The Americans will do the imports for the Dominion of Canada; all goods will be imported for us in American ports, and then will come the downfall of our commerce and the ruin of our maritime towns and our sea ports. And next, Mr. Speaker, have we ground for belief that the Americans would embrace our tariff? It does not look as if we could reasonably entertain any such pretence, and it were best to give up the whole thing and say no more about it. Another result of free trade will be direct taxation. The hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) who is not among the least of the men of his party, by any means,

took care to make the House understand, and to say, that his electors may be made aware of it, that there is no danger whatever of direct taxation, that with the help of a little saving we shall reach the surprising result of lowering the figure of the public outlay to the point where it was when these gentlemen quitted power. Sir, our guide to judge men is by their past record. I shall take the liberty of examining, for a few moments, with the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), what his friends did when they were at the head of affairs and whether they brought back expenses to the lowest of Conservative years. First, as to the public debt, from 1874 to 1878. They raised it rather above \$40,000,000. As to the increase of outlay, that took place in the following proportions:—The expenses during the last year of the Macdonald-Langevin Administration were \$19,174,000. During the first year of the Mackenzie Administration they slightly exceeded \$23,000,000. The next year they reached \$24,000,000. The third year showed \$23,000,000, and the next, \$23,600,000. This schedule proves, in respect to the administration of both parties, the contrary of what was asserted by the hon. member for Berthier. If the country keeps on growing and prospering, the outlay, so far from lessening, will increase. From 1874 to 1878 the increment took place, although the country did not much improve. It was, indeed, one of the periods in our political history which showed least progress, an epoch of real decadence under a revenue tariff. And yet the public debt and the expenses increased considerably. How can the hon. member reasonably hold that a country keeps on progressing and producing that prodigious anomaly which no Government has, nor will ever produce, a diminution of expenses while the country progresses. Hence, Mr. Speaker, despite the fallacious promises made by hon. gentlemen on the other side, we have no hope, if we judge by their past record, of seeing a decrease of the public expenses. I do not care to upbraid them with the increase from 1874 to 1878, because this is not the time to discuss that point. I wish simply to establish the fact that, under their administration, the public debt notably increased. I establish further that a country advancing in the ways of progress, must increase its outlay as the public service requires. The hon. member for Berthier having turned the small end of his telescope, sees that it is not possible our Customs income should lessen by more than \$7,000,000. He adds that this is about the amount we draw on our present exports from the United States. But, Sir, I ask you and the House whether it is reasonable to say that our Customs revenues must diminish only in the ratio of the amount we receive from United States importations? Is it not more sensible to say that American industries, developed as they are, could export into Canada whatever they liked, when we shall have, as the hon. member for Berthier, along with the Americans, has said, a protective tariff against all the nations of the universe? Is it not true to say that the United States will supply Canadians with almost all the articles they require for consumption? What is there that the United States cannot furnish in the way of woollens, cottons, leather, agricultural produce, and iron ware? Now, Mr. Speaker, if the United States can supply all these objects under a reciprocity treaty, what will we have to ask of other foreign countries? I believe, indeed, that we should reasonably presume on a diminution in our Customs of \$7,000,000, but that this decrease will rather rise to \$15,000,000 or \$16,000,000. To make up the Customs revenue we shall have to pay about \$15,000,000 of direct taxes, and we shall gain by importing, without duties, on products to the United States, about \$3,000,000. This will probably be about the amount of duties which will be left to pay on our exports when the American tariff shall have been modified by Congress, as will shortly be the case. Thus we shall lose \$15,000,000 in Customs to obviate the payment of \$3,000,000 of direct taxation. And

Mr. DUPONT.

these \$15,000,000, imposed on fancy goods, are not borne by the farmers, as my hon. friend insinuated, but by the wealthy classes of the towns, who can afford the luxury of wearing fine clothes. That is the class of persons who are called upon to carry the burden of indirect taxation, as these taxes do not weigh on the farmer, who generally gets his raiment from home-spun. If the produce of the farm is not sold, the farmer does not purchase clothes of foreign markets. He is thus able, every year, to control the amount which he pays to the public exchequer. If the products of the farm find no sale in the local market, or in foreign markets, and he is compelled to keep them, he economises on his purchases, and consequently loses less in taxes. But when we have direct taxation, in wet or shine, the farmer will always have the same sum to pay. On \$12,000,000 or \$15,000,000, which we shall be called upon to distribute among a population of 5,000,000 inhabitants, he will pay, every year, \$3 a head for each member of his family, after the assessment of his property or income is taxed. But, good year or bad year, he will have to pay that tax, and will not be able to control the amount which he pays in to the public treasury. I say, therefore, that the direct tax weighs more heavily on the farmers than on any other class of citizens. Mr. Speaker, is direct taxation possible in this country, especially under the control of the Dominion Government? In England they have the income tax, but it must not be forgotten that the British Government exercise control on the municipalities. It is the officials of the municipalities, over which they have control, who assess the incomes of citizens and laid estate, while here, the Federal Government has no jurisdiction over municipalities, neither for property assessments, nor for income assessments. What will result from the composition of direct taxation? There will be required a legion of public functionaries. Not long ago, I joined the hon. members on this side of the House and gave them a hand in opposing a Government measure. One of my reasons for this conduct was that there was question of preventing the increase of public offices. The hon. members do not hesitate, at the present time, to praise a system which tends to launch on the country, and every municipality of the Dominion, a considerable number of tax-gatherers. When we determine the amount of direct taxes which we must impose, under free trade. I think we are again mistaken by placing the figure too low. An enormous amount will be needed to cover the collection of these taxes, and pay all those who will be required to make this collection. The hon. members have complained of the Franchise Act, and of the subdivision of counties carried out by the Conservative Government, because, seemingly to them, the Administration exercised a pressure on the electoral body at their expense. What would the situation be if a legion of officials had the electorate under their hands and could control it by the payment of the direct taxes? What would happen at election times, when the people are called upon to pronounce judgment on the Government, no matter what party is in power? The result would be that Government officials would bear down on the electors for their vote in favor of the powers that be, whoever they are. The hon. members do not seem to fear this state of things. It strikes me that they have lately waxed in hardihood. I think we should not be justified, under the circumstances, in adopting the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It were a strange position to assume toward the nation, if we accepted such treaties. I think that, although we have the power to do it, it is not reasonable to adopt such a proposition when scarcely a year has elapsed since the whole nation declared in favor of protection, since the Government carried the elections, for the third time, on that question, in spite of all the forecasts of hon. gentlemen opposite. The country would be justifi-

fied in blaming our attitude toward it. Our conduct would resemble that held at the wedding—the father had pledged her; the mother had made her over and the whole family rejoiced at the wished-for union. When the priest's turn came to ask, as usual, if she accepted the alliance proposed to her, "Good sir," she said, "you are the first who dreamed of asking me such a question." And she refused. Mr. Speaker, in the day of popular meetings, when the officer of the law will ask the nation whether she accepts the commercial alliance set before her, she will reply: "Good sir, you are the first one to ask such a thing," and she will withdraw her trust in the present Parliament, if it means to engage in an alliance fraught for her with such fatal consequences.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, this important subject has been discussed at such great length and with so much ability, that there is very little left for me to say, and I do not know that I can add any interest to the debate. I can, perhaps, hope to do no more than to answer an objection or two that have been raised, and can, perhaps, endeavor to impress upon the House a few of the points that have been touched upon. I am aware, Sir, that in discussing this question we were called upon by the Minister of Marine to give weighty and important reasons why we should introduce this resolution, because, he said, it was a question so far reaching in its importance, so vast in its magnitude, that he considered the responsibility very great for any one to introduce such a resolution into this Parliament. Well, Sir, our reasons have been given, given more ably than I can hope to do. Instead of reciting them, I would say that I consider they might, perhaps, be summed up in this, that the reason that we have introduced this motion is in order that we may materially benefit the people of Canada. Sir, it has been charged upon us that we picture the country in blacker colors than it should be pictured. It has been charged upon the Opposition that they decry their country, charges of lack of patriotism have been hurled at us because the mover of this resolution, and some of the gentlemen who succeeded him in debate on this side, have felt it necessary to point out that there has been, during many years past, a large exodus of the young men and the old men of this land into other lands, and they claim that is decrying the country, and say that we ought virtually to be ashamed of our-elves. Now, Sir, I do not think that we have decryed the country, I do not think these gentlemen, in stating what they do, decry the country. I hold, Sir, that we have a good country, I hold there is no country under the canopy of heaven that is a better country than Canada. If I were asked to prove it I think I might do so by asking hon. gentlemen present if they know of any other country under the sun that could manifest so great a degree of prosperity as Canada does to-day, whose affairs have been so mismanaged as those of Canada, Sir, it is the mismanagement of the country, it is the mismanagement of the Government, that these gentlemen complain of; and when they point to the fact that our population is leaving us, it is not that they glory in it, they regret the fact, they point out the causes, they seek for a remedy in order that this exodus may be stopped. But I do not wish to dwell upon this point. I am one of those who would be delighted if it were not necessary to allude to these things at all. But when we find that during the last decade, instead of 20 per cent. being added to our population, which would only be a small estimate of the natural increase of this country alone, to say nothing of immigrants coming to us of other lands, there has only been an increase of 16 per cent. to our population, in 10 years, when, from the natural increase alone, it should be 20 per cent.; when you find that you have lost every immigrant that came to the country and 4 per cent. of your natural increase besides, it is time to enquire whether we are managing affairs in such a way as will redound to the best interest of the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, when

we look out to see where the hundreds of thousands of Canadians that have left us, have gone, where do we find them? In England? No. In France? No. In Germany? No. In Australia? No. Where then? Almost wholly within the borders of the nations to the south of us. Why did they go there? Was it because they loved the flag that floats o'er that nation more than the flag that they left? No, for they loved the old flag. Was it because they admired the political institutions of that country more than the political institutions of this country? No, I am satisfied they would tell you that was not the reason. Was it because they had greater liberty there than in this country? I am prepared to say that was not the reason. On being asked the reason, what would they say? They would tell you that they went there because they thought they would obtain there a larger field and a better field for their energy and their enterprise. To the Minister of Marine who asked us to give an answer why we had brought such an important question as this before the House, I would say that one of the objects we hoped to attain by this resolution is to ascertain upon what terms we can acquire the right to work that field without leaving our own homesteads to do it. That, Sir, is one of our reasons. It has been said to us, it was said to us by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) who spoke so fluently and pleasantly the other night, that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and others who instituted comparisons between this country and the United States did so in a very unfair manner. The hon. gentleman was forced, however, to admit that when a comparison was made it was not to the advantage of Canada, and he took refuge in a statement, which I think upon reflection he himself would not have cared to make. Possibly I am wrong, possibly the growth that is expected in this country by our Conservative friends may be measured by the standard he set up on that occasion, possibly their desires with respect to the development and extension of the country may be no higher than the standard he set up; but I must say for my part that I am not content to measure the standard of Canada, and Canadian progress by the standard set up by the hon. gentleman on that occasion. What did he say when he lectured those who had preceded him on this side of the House for instituting comparisons with the neighboring republic? He said that it was not fair to compare Canada with four or five millions of people with the United States with sixty millions. Could anything, he asked, be more unfair? If they had been honest and fair in their desire as regards making a comparison, hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would have compared the progress made by Canada with the progress made by the United States when that country contained four or five millions. Sir, is that the standard set up by the Conservative party by which to measure our country and to rest content with it. No wonder we are depressed, no wonder that we are confined within narrow bounds, no wonder there is a lack of enterprise on the part of the men controlling our destinies if they are content with Canada progressing in the same ratio as the United States prospered when they had the same number of inhabitants as Canada has at the present time. In 1800 the United States had half a million more people than Canada has to-day. Seven years before the waters of the Hudson were disturbed by the steamboat that Fulton built upon its banks, thirty years or more before Stephenson built his first locomotive to run upon an English railway, thirty years before Faraday had experimented with electricity, forty-four years before Morse had flashed the first message across a telegraph wire, the United States possessed half a million more people than we are to-day. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) asks us in this nineteenth century, in this year 1888, with a cable lying in the depths of the Atlantic ocean across which we flash our commercial and other messages to the

people of England, when the whole world is encircled with telegraph wires by which we can read in newspapers the news transpiring in every part of the world, when we have steamboats traversing the ocean and arriving in fleets at our ports, when our country and the countries all about us have lines of railways built, not hundreds, but thousands upon thousands of miles—with this state of things existing we are asked to be satisfied because we prosper as well as the United States did in 1800? What labor-saving appliances have we had since then? The hon. gentleman talked of the volume of trade, and said that even in 1840 the volume of trade in the United States was not as great as that of Canada to-day. Would he expect it? Has it not been by the great labor-saving appliances brought into use that the rapid advance has been made of recent years? Would you expect an increase of commerce in 1840 in proportion to the advance and development that might be expected in a young nation like Canada? No, the standard is too low. I regret that such a standard is set up by one of the principal speakers of the Government in this House as a standard by which we are to judge our progress, and if it comes up to that standard we should be content. We have been told that this is a bold and revolutionary measure we propose. That was one of the utterances, I think, of the Minister of Marine, that it was a bold and revolutionary measure. Yet the same hon. gentleman before he finished his speech declared that this Government had on the Statute-book of the land a standing offer to the Americans to reciprocate with us in trade. And the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) told us that the Finance Minister had in Washington made an offer for reciprocal trade with the neighboring nation in the broadest and freest possible manner, and yet we are denounced as guilty of treason because the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has seen fit to introduce a resolution to sanction just what Sir Charles Tupper, the British plenipotentiary, according to the statement of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) offered to the American plenipotentiaries when in the city of Washington but a few weeks ago. The hon. gentleman for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) told us that this proposition involved national degradation and abject surrender, and that we are called upon to commit a deed of infamy. What does the hon. gentleman think of the Minister of Finance proposing the consummation of such a deed of unparalleled infamy? The Minister of the Interior told us in his speech, in reply to the hon. member for South Oxford, that he very much doubted if people so high spirited as Canadians would be content to accept a measure of unrestricted reciprocity, even if Great Britain were willing to grant it. I was rather amused when the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) called our attention to the fact that if that were treason now, if that was a mean and despicable thing to propose, the members on this side of the House were not alone in venturing to propose such resolutions. He brought to the attention of the House the fact that leading business men in this country assembled in convention, sent to advise upon this question and to promote the welfare of this country as well as possible, meeting in the National Board of Trade had discussed this question in the year 1874, and in the year 1874 the representative business men in Canada had decided that it would be a wise, and a proper, and a just thing, and a prudent thing to do, to initiate measures looking towards the renewal of the reciprocal trade arrangements that existed between the United States and Canada for some years previous. Sir, it will not weary the House, I think—for, perhaps, some gentlemen present now were present then—if I read the propositions of those prominent gentlemen, so as to let you know what their views were, and to show you that this is not a question suddenly sprung upon the country, as those gentlemen would lead us to believe. It is a question which has exercised the business men of this

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

country, and those who have thought of the interests of this country, ever since the day that the treaty was abrogated. It was in the year 1874 that this matter was brought up. At that meeting which I have referred to there were representatives of the National Board of Trade of the United States and Canada present and a prominent gentleman of our Board, always active, for he has always been an active man in business so long as I can remember, made some remarks upon the desirability of renewing the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States prior to submitting a motion for adoption by that body. He had been speaking of the abrogation of the treaty and stated that we had got along without it, and he says:

"Therefore I believe we have great reason to trust that before long we will realise what is the fond desire and hope of every true patriotic Canadian—that we should have more extended commercial intercourse with our neighbors."

And again:

"Now, Sir, although the figures which I propose to present indicate that we have prospered in spite of the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, yet the progress of the country during reciprocity will show that it cannot but be for the advantage of Canada as it certainly will be for the advantage of the United States that closer commercial relations should exist between the two countries."

It would be well worth while, Sir, to read it all, but I am not very fond of reading extracts or of troubling the House with them, but to get the views of an eminent a business man as this upon this question, I think we should hear something of what he says. He concluded with summing up the figures of how the country had prospered without the old Reciprocity Treaty and continues:

"I think the figures I have given prove that this country has prospered and can prosper without that treaty. But I think no one can look to the position of both countries on this continent—coming to the discussion of this question on equal terms, each feeling that it can prosper without the treaty—without realising that it would be to the advantage of both to have the freest possible intercourse."

I do not know any stronger words than those: "The freest possible intercourse." And again:

"Here we are with a common line of frontier extending some four thousand miles, with many interests in common, with the same language, religion, and traditions, each proud of and loyal to his own form of government but willing to respect the national sentiment of the other; and it does seem to me that the closer we can bring our commercial relations the more prosperous will both countries become."

Entertaining those views, Sir, and expressing them in such admirable language you will not be surprised to learn that he closed his remarks by moving the following resolution:—

"That this board desires to express its gratification at the growing sentiment among our neighbors in the United States in favor of more intimate reciprocal trade relations between the United States and the Dominion of Canada as evidenced by the resolutions passed by the National Board of Trade;

"And that it be instruction to the Executive Council to take whatever steps it may deem necessary in order to secure the adoption of a treaty for reciprocal trade with the United States upon a broad, comprehensive and liberal basis."

Sir, the mover of that resolution upon which every patriotic Canadian should unite, is the name of a distinguished gentleman, a gentleman whose name has long been known to the Boards of Trade of Canada, a gentleman whose name is known in the history of this country—the name of the Hon. Thomas White, Minister of the Interior. This is the gentleman who thinks that Canadians ought to be too high spirited to accept a treaty with the United States of America, even if England consented. Sir, this resolution was seconded by another prominent gentleman and in seconding the resolution he said:

"I feel indisposed to make any lengthy remarks after the eloquent speech of Mr. White. He has established the fact that this Dominion can prosper without the renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty; and he has also established the fact that in the interest of the progress of both this country and the United States we ought to have reciprocal trade between the two countries."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I commend the next statement to the gentlemen who greeted me with "hear, hear."

"This question should be regarded in the broad light of humanity. It is a matter of the greatest consequence to us in this country that we should live on the most amicable terms with our friends across the lines. We should cultivate peace in every possible way, and I believe there is no manner in which peace can be more thoroughly cultivated between two great nations than by reciprocal trade relations between them."

Who was the seconder of that resolution? It was Adam Brown. Yet, Mr. Speaker, you saw how that patriot's breast heaved and how he throbbed with feeling as he contemplated the dire act of treason about to be consummated by my friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright); how he looked into different authors, if possible in order to find words that would faithfully describe that member, yet he was the gentleman who, in 1874, seconded that resolution and seconded it in the "broad spirit of humanity."

Mr. LANDERKIN. He has got inside of the tiger since then.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, he has got inside of the tiger. Possibly it may be so. It is nothing much in the debate of course and it is nothing much to be considered because those gentlemen in time have altered and changed their views. But I would just say this, that when their views have changed and changed so radically, it would befit them in describing their opponent to use somewhat milder terms than they did, for as they have seen new light it is possible others may see new light too, and, therefore, they ought not to despise men whom they consider to be now in the darkness in which they themselves at one time groped. We are told, Sir, that this is "cringing" to the United States. I do not see any cringing to the United States in making this proposition. I do not consider it cringing to the United States when Mr. Bayard, a leading statesman of that country, invites a proposition like this on our part. When Mr. Bayard writing to Sir Charles Tupper, a couple of months ago, used such language as this:

"I am confident we seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement and there is but one way to promote it and that is by a straight forward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

When Mr. Bayard makes a proposition of that kind in writing to Sir Charles Tupper, I see no "cringing" to the Americans if we say: "We are willing to accept the proposition you have made, we are willing in the great legislative halls of this country to pass a resolution stating that we also desire that which you have said." And, Sir, it seems to me it would have been a fit and proper thing, if the health of Sir Charles Tupper had permitted it—and we all regret his absence through illness—for him to be present and move the resolution which has been moved by the hon. member for South Oxford, to give effect to the very views he expressed in reply to those entertained in common with him by Mr. Bayard; for what is the reply that he made to Mr. Bayard's letter proposing that we should take this means of dealing with the entire commercial affairs of these people:

"I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straight forward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

Can there be stronger language? We cringe not to the Americans. The proposition suggesting the solution was first made to us by Mr. Bayard in this letter to Sir Charles Tupper; Sir Charles Tupper concurs in the sentiment; and the proposition of my hon. friend from South Oxford simply asks this House to concur in the sentiment held both by Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Bayard. But we are told by the hon. member for Pictou that Mr. Bayard receded from that position on the 7th of December in his reply to the offer of the British plenipotentiaries. I do not so read it. I understand Mr. Bayard in the correspondence—and I

have read it carefully—to say, that we do not desire to mix up in the consideration of the question we are now met to consider, another question of great importance. I understand him to be ready and willing to enter upon negotiations in regard to that matter, and to endeavor to carry out what he himself had suggested; but he did not deem it wise to ask Congress to give the Administration power to do it in that connection; for he looked for a solution of the fisheries question, as he said, by agreeing to an interpretation or modification of the treaty, and in that way alone. But we have no right to say, because he took that position in reference to the method of dealing with the question, that he had receded from the position he had taken, that it was in the interest of both countries that the entire commercial relations of both countries should be reviewed with the view of effecting reciprocity of trade between them. But, Sir, it has been charged upon us that in this proposition submitted by the hon. member for South Oxford, there is some covert treason; it has been hinted that there is a desire for an annexation, and that the adoption of this resolution would mean a change in the political relations of the country. Sir, I do not believe it; I trust it is not necessary for me to say in this House that I do not desire that. Where is the danger? What does Mr. Bayard say in reference to that matter? Does he stipulate that in adjusting our commercial relations, and in effecting reciprocal trade relations with the United States, either country shall alter its political status? No; he is very positive on that. After having used the words I have quoted, he adds:

"I say commercially, because I do not propose to include, however, indirectly, or for any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to affect the legislative independence of either country."

I say, Mr. Speaker, that no words can more fitly describe the resolution offered by the hon. member for South Oxford. And now, we come to consider the question as to how it will affect us. Our opponents have argued on this matter, it seems to me, on different lines. Their arguments have been somewhat contradictory; the positions taken by them have been—I trust I may speak it without offense—somewhat mixed; I have endeavored to listen to them. I have noticed, and I think, you, Sir, cannot have failed to observe that they would in many cases lead off with an argument that no reciprocity could benefit the agriculturist, the miner, or the fisherman, that instead of that, it would possibly do them harm, and yet before they would resume their seat, they would point with pride to that standing offer which we have on the Statute-book of the country as something they could boast of. Why, Sir, I can scarcely understand their position; yet it may, perhaps, not be as contradictory as it first appears. It may be that, they think they are safe in offering that, as the United States will never accept reciprocity on such terms. That may be the solution of their position. Now, Sir, we had a reciprocity treaty with the United States for twelve years, and what was its effect on the trade of the two countries. I do not intend to use more than one or two tables of figures. I do not think they have been given just in the way I propose to give them, or I would not submit them to the House; but in considering this question, I think it well to look at the extent of our trade with the United States under that old treaty, to see whether the Americans have been to blame in refusing to treat on the old lines; and if it should be found that that old treaty was working much more advantageously to Canada than to them, we could not find great fault with them if they manifested a reluctance to renew it on precisely the same basis, but that there would be much to be said for their contention that if there was to be a renewal of trade relations, the treaty must be somewhat broader, and they must participate somewhat more in the benefits intended to

be secured by it than they did before. What are the facts in regard to our trade in the last year of the treaty? I have looked up in the Trade and Navigation Returns the trade in horned cattle, horses, sheep, wool, butter, and cheese under the head of animals and their produce, and I found that our imports from them and exports to them compared with our total imports and exports in these articles in that year were as follows:—

Article.	Total Imports.	Imports from the U. States.	Total Exports.	Exports to the U. States.
Horned cattle.....	\$ 92,224	\$ 91,624	\$4,312,222	\$4,312,142
Horses.....	104,404	101,767	2,590,725	2,590,505
Sheep.....	20,403	16,222	570,202	570,194
Wool.....	483,079	435,698	756,239	753,113
Butter.....	11,193	9,344	2,094,270	1,254,436
Cheese.....	232,472	217,850	123,494	33,943
Total.....	943,775	872,505	10,447,152	9,514,333

The only item in which we took more from them than they took from us was that one item of cheese. I then took agricultural products—barley, rye, oats, corn, flour, beans and peas, and vegetables—and I found our imports from them and our exports to them compared with our total imports and exports in these articles in the same year to have been as follows:

Article.	Total Imports.	Imports from the United States.	Total Exports.	Exports to the United States.
Barley and rye.....	\$ 49,655	\$ 49,093	\$4,623,341	\$4,618,808
Oats.....	11,301	10,366	1,615,185	903,158
Corn.....	1,062,012	1,062,012	46,687	19,142
Wheat.....	2,164,749	2,162,862	3,106,112	3,047,022
Flour.....	402,277	390,604	15,198,746	3,671,250
Beans and pease.....	2,104	1,559	1,282,801	376,938
Vegetables.....	20,805	17,407	24,696	18,405
	3,712,903	3,693,903	15,897,468	12,659,723
Timber and lumber	200,125	167,764	13,846,986	6,461,015
The fisheries.....	852,178	333,100	980,311	171,908

Now take the totals and we find:

Animals and their produce.....	\$ 943,775	\$ 872,505	\$10,447,152	\$ 9,514,333
Agriculture products.....	3,712,903	3,693,903	15,897,468	12,659,723
The forest.....	200,125	167,764	13,846,986	6,461,015
The fisheries.....	852,178	333,100	980,311	171,908
	5,708,981	5,067,272	41,171,917	28,806,979

Total Exports to United States.....\$28,806,979
Total Imports from United States..... 5,067,272

Balance in our favor\$23,739,707

*Price per barrel, \$4.90. †Price per barrel, \$6.

Thus you will see that of these different articles which I have enumerated, the products of the farm, the fisheries and the forest, we imported from the United States to a total value of \$5,067,272, while we sold to them to the extent of \$28,806,979; or in that year we sold to them \$23,739,707 more than we bought. Looking at these figures, it will hardly be expected that the United States would be very anxious to renew the treaty upon the basis of the old Reciprocity Treaty; and you must remember that I have quoted only the figures from the two Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. I have not had time to examine the returns of the Maritime Provinces, but no doubt they would very much swell the balance in favor of our exports. I

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

was a little anxious to ascertain how the trade is running to-day; and on taking the returns of precisely the same articles, I find that although the treaty has been abrogated we send a very large quantity of the products of the farm, the forest, the sea and the mines to the United States, despite the imposition of heavy duties. The following is a list of our exports to as compared with our imports from the United States of animals and their products since the abrogation of the treaty, for the year ending 30th June, 1887, taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns:

	Imports from the U. S.	Exports to the U. S.
Horned cattle.....	\$60,497	\$ 887,756
Horses.....	83,624	2,214,338
Sheep.....	73,447	974,482
Wool.....	2,098	288,251
Butter.....	51,733	17,207
Cheese.....	4,573	30,667
	\$275,972	\$4,412,701

Or, we imported from the United States of these articles to the value of \$275,972, while we sold to them to the value of \$4,412,701, so that you will see the balance is in our favor even to-day, notwithstanding the very high duties imposed against us. I will now give you, Sir, a statement of our imports from and exports to the United States of agricultural products:

	Imports.	Exports.
Barley.....	\$ 2,557	\$5,245,968
Oats.....	9,611	12,210
Corn.....	184,125	105
Wheat.....	18,307	265,940
Flour.....	630,592	3,204
Beans.....	7,588	206,617
Peas.....	6,399	331,349
Rye.....	2,539	12,350
Hay.....	4,936	670,749
Potatoes.....	35,837	328,602
	\$1,600,491	\$7,077,094

Product of the forest.....\$103,707
Exports.....\$9,082,951

Products of the sea.....\$452,917
Exports.....\$2,622,584

Or, taking the total of these statements, I find we imported from the United States goods to the value of \$2,433,087, while we exported to them to the value \$23,195,336. Hon. gentlemen will therefore see that the United States having access to Trade returns just as we have, will find the balance of trade too largely in our favor, and it seems to me that when we are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that they are willing to negotiate a reciprocity treaty on the basis of natural products, which was the basis of the old treaty, they are simply declaring that they are prepared to accept something it is not likely they themselves believe the United States will be prepared to concede.

Mr. BOWELL. Are you quoting from the Trade and Navigation Returns of Canada.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, I am. Does it make any difference?

Mr. BOWELL. It would take too long for me to explain.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think I know what the hon-gentleman means, judging by a question he asked the other night; and I contend that the duties paid on this \$23,000,000 worth of goods, which we send to the United States, and on which the United States levy a heavy duty, comes almost entirely out of the pockets of the farmers, the lumbermen and the fishermen of this country. The reason is clearly to be seen, and has been fully explained by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Macdonald). There is such an immense production of these articles in the United States, that the quantities sent in by Canadians do not swell the volume of supply to such an extent as to affect the prices; and there is this further fact to be borne in mind, that the amount I have mentioned here is already embraced in the volume of supply in the United States, because the

goods have been sent there notwithstanding the duty. I contend, therefore, that if the duty were off, the supply being no greater, the demand remaining the same, the prices would remain almost stationary. Thus nearly the whole of the duty would go into the pockets of the Canadian exporter, who has to find a market for those articles in the United States. The hon. the Minister of Customs asked, how do you know there is any duty paid on them at all; they might have gone there in bond? So they might. It is true our trade returns do not show that; but in order to be sure on that point, I also took the returns of the United States, and I found that the articles I have enumerated are on the dutiable list in the United States returns, equal in amount to the total amount of the returns sent from here. There need, therefore, be no doubt about that matter, and the American tables are here for reference if the hon. the Minister thinks I have made any mistake. The hon. the Minister of the Interior gave us tables to show that the products of Canada were selling in the United States at lower figures than in Canada. He solemnly read the figures here, and almost wound up his speech with a table of that kind. What was his object? If the hon. gentleman believed that that was the actual state of the American markets as compared with Canadian markets, then I ask him how he can justify himself in keeping an offer on our Statute-book to induce the farmers of the United States to send in their cheap products here and to put down the prices in all agricultural products? He knows, and in another part of his speech he admitted that the price of products was higher in the United States than it was in Canada, and, if we had a free market there, the duty which is paid into the American treasury would go into the pockets of the Canadian exporter, and we would be so many of millions of dollars richer than we are now. You will find that he admits that the farmer would get more for what he sells to the States if the American duty was removed. He said the whole of our exports to the United States upon which duty was charged amounted to about \$26,000,000, and the duty paid on that amount to about \$5,000,000, and that assuming that we paid that duty we would save by unrestricted reciprocity that \$5,000,000, but would sacrifice the duty on American goods coming into Canada, amounting to over \$7,250,000. That is his position. He admits that we would save the \$5,000,000, though we would lose \$7,250,000. Is not that rather hard on the farmer? If that amount were saved, it would go into the pockets of the farmer and the lumberman and the fisherman. Is that to be taken out of the pockets of these classes in order to benefit one class alone? Certainly not. I notice that he uses another argument and that is this: Admitting, he said, that we paid the duty, as he did admit, the price could only be increased to the farmers of Canada in relation to one-tenth of their whole product. They produce \$400,000,000 and they only export \$40,000,000 of goods, and, therefore, he says, you would only benefit them by one-tenth of their whole yield, if you had reciprocity. What he said you wanted to do was this: Do not be so careful to enhance the price of the surplus export of one-tenth of what you produce. What you have to do is to improve the home market where you sell the great bulk of your produce. Let us examine that statement a little. He admits that the 10 per cent. which we export would be advanced in price by the amount of the duty. Let us illustrate that. We will take Buffalo and Toronto or Montreal, and Boston and Halifax, or Charlottetown and Boston. We have a reciprocal trade arrangement with the United States. The duty of 20 per cent. is taken off horses. The horse that was selling in Canada at \$50, the buyer from Buffalo offers \$100 for, because the duty is taken off. He buys that horse, he gets, according to Mr. White's own admission, \$20 more for that horse than he would have got when the duty was on; but he says, what does it matter if

you do; there are nine horses that you have to sell in Canada; that is what you want to look at. We will suppose that the buyer from Buffalo is there and has paid \$100 for the horse. A buyer from Toronto wants the other nine horses for \$80 a piece. No, says he, I want \$100 for those horses. I got \$100 for the horse I sent to Buffalo, and, if you do not give me \$100 for the others, the man in Buffalo will get them instead of getting one; and therefore, if you increase the export price of your horses, which he says amounts to one-tenth, you increase the price of the horses for sale at home as well as in the foreign market. I think that is patent and apparent to every one. The hon. gentleman asked how the home market was to be improved. He says it is by building up an urban population, that the market is to be improved. How is that going to be done? Look at the city of Toronto, I am glad to agree with the Minister of the Interior in this matter. I hold that it is a benefit to the farmers of this country to have towns, and cities, and villages built up in this country. I have always maintained that the justification for the incidental protection that was given to the manufacturers of this country by reason of the imposition of duties was to give a market to the farmers; I thought it tended to build up towns and cities so that the farmers would find a market for their produce. I thought it was a great thing to see cities like Toronto, Hamilton, Halifax, Charlottetown and other cities spring up, because, as you increase the number of the dwellers in towns and cities, you are creating a larger demand for the products of the farm and the field. But, while that is true, it is also true that we are growing more produce in this country than will supply the market, and a portion has to be sent abroad. Nevertheless, it is a benefit to the farmer to have a home market, to have cities and towns built up in his own country, and I desire to see them built up, and to see these cities and towns that will provide a home market for the Canadian farmer, giving more demand for what he grows, and I propose to accomplish that by voting for the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford and by seeing it carried into effect. The growth of Toronto has been great, the growth of Montreal has been great, but, if you carry out the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford, what do you have as a home market for the Canadian farmer? You have the city of New York, you have Brooklyn, you have Jersey City for a home market, with their two millions of people, and if you pass the reciprocity treaty, you have Buffalo with its 200,000 people for a home market, you have Boston with its 400,000 inhabitants for a home market, you have Chicago with half a million people for a home market, you have the great and growing city of Detroit with its 200,000 people for a home market, the moment you carry this treaty into effect. If the hon. Minister of the Interior wants to see towns, and cities, and villages built up to give a market for the Canadian farmer, I point to a more excellent way by which the Canadian farmer can get a home market with millions of people in cities which have not to be built up but which are built up, and are waiting to buy the produce of the Canadian farmer, and will become his home market. One of the very serious charges made against the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and more particularly against our honored leader, is that we have broken faith with the people of the country and have broken faith with our late leader, Mr. Blake—who, we are glad to learn, is being benefited in health by his residence abroad—by the introduction of this resolution, and they say that we, as a party, are pledged by Mr. Blake in his speech which they refer to as the Malvern speech, fully pledged to the National Policy, and not to disturb existing arrangements. This has been dwelt upon by every speaker, I think. It has been one of their strongest points. The Minister of the Interior, the Minister of Marine, the member of Picton (Mr. Tupper) and, I believe

all the other gentlemen who have spoken on that side, have urged this point very strongly. A breach of faith, a something that should not be done—and the Minister of the Interior gave to us a portion of that speech as delivered by our leader at Malvern, and, Sir, I may just repeat again what was said, and which he quoted as being said :

" We have no longer a large surplus to dispose of. We have a large deficit and a greatly increased scale of expenditure to meet, and it is clearer than ever that a very high scale of taxation must be retained, and that manufacturers have nothing to fear. I then declared that any re-adjustment should be effected with due regard to the legitimate interests of all concerned. In that phrase, 'all concerned,' I hope no one will object to my including, as I do, the general public. In any re-adjustment I maintain that we should look especially to such reduction of expenditure as may allow of a reduction of taxation, to the lightening of sectional taxes; to the lightening of taxation upon the prime necessities of life, and upon the raw materials of manufacture, to a more equitable arrangement of the taxes which now bear unfairly upon the poor as compared with the rich, to a taxation of luxuries just so high as will not thwart our object by greatly checking consumption, to the curbing of monopolies of production in cases where, by combination or otherwise the tariff allows an undue and exorbitant profit to be exacted from consumers, and to the effort—a most important point—to promote reciprocal trade with our neighbors to the south."

And, Sir, here is the speech which the late leader, the hon. Mr. Blake, delivered at Malvern. Now, I would like to know what breach of faith there is with reference to this matter. Do not the hon. gentlemen opposite know what the National Policy is? Do they know what it was they propounded to the country? Do they believe that they themselves are standing by the National Policy as they said they would? Let me recall to them what their National Policy is. Let me read to them the resolution that was offered by the present Prime Minister of Canada when he was leader of the Opposition, in 1878, the resolution upon which, he said, they took their stand, upon which they would fight their contest, and which, if they were victorious, they would carry into effect when they came into power, and which they claim, having come into power, they have carried into effect. Here is the resolution :

" That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that this House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which by a judicious re-adjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; and such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen, now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active inter-provincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada will demand, will greatly tend to produce for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade."

What does that mean?

Mr. HESSON. It does not mean unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Oh! Well, I would like the hon. gentleman, as he has been kind enough to give an explanation—I would ask him, in all good faith, what reciprocity of trade it referred to?

Mr. HESSON. The natural products of the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The natural products only? Yes, I see. Very well. Then here is the position gentlemen are in now. They represented—for I have the right hon. gentleman's words and could read them—how agriculture was depressed as well as the manufacturing industry, and mining, and all others, and the only remedy proposed for the agricultural depression, as well as for the manufacturing depression, was this, that they would put the duties upon Yankee grains coming into this country, so that the farmers might have relief, by the imposition of these duties, just as the manufacturers were to have. And now we are told that since they did that, they are willing to take these duties off Yankee grains and let that come in here, but you cannot take it off your manufactured goods, for it will do them harm. Is that the position the hon. gentleman takes? Sir, there is no distinction in the in

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

dustries there, and hon. gentlemen are as much bound by that resolution to promote reciprocal trade with the United States in manufactures as they are in agricultural products, every bit, and in mining, and in all other interests. Why, Sir, I can read you where the First Minister, in making this speech, pointed out the condition of the farmer; I can read you how he alluded to the fact that his interests were being greatly damaged by the introduction of these articles. Why, he gave us the case? He said :

" I find that the farmers of West Canada and East Canada could not understand there was anything in barley, for instance, being obliged to pay a duty of 15 per cent. upon going in the United States, whereas the produce of the American farmer was allowed to be brought into this country free."

And his voice trembled, I can remember, almost, as he pictured the state of the farmer. I put a simple case said he—which I have done frequently, and I can get no answer—I put the case of a man in the Eastern Townships, dwelling near the imaginary line between this country and the United States. Suppose a man has 100 acres on the Canadian side and 100 acres on the American side of the line. He grows 100 bushels of barley on the American side and takes it to the American market and gets \$1 a bushel for it; he takes his 100 bushels of barley grown on the Canadian side to the same market and gets but 85 cents a bushel for it, because he has to pay 15 cents for taking it across that imaginary line. How can it be said in this case that the consumer pays the duty? It comes out of the pockets of the Canadian farmer. And so he goes on to show why the agricultural interest was depressed as well as the manufacturing, mining, and all other interests, and there was only one remedy that would give us relief and that was reciprocity with the United States, and failing getting reciprocity with the United States in all these industries, duties were to be imposed upon all the products of the farms as well as upon manufactures in order that Canadian farmers might get relief. And these are the gentlemen who say that faith is broken with the country; these are the gentlemen who, themselves, stand pledged by their own policy to secure reciprocal trade arrangements in all the industries of the country, as soon as it can be effected. They have to do that or they have to take the line already adopted by the hon. member for North Perth, that when the First Minister moved that resolution, he was moving it as a direct fraud on the farmers of this country, to treat them differently from other classes. They can adopt which horn of the dilemma they choose.

Mr. HESSON. The farmers are not fools.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The farmers are not fools, but all men are not farmers. Now, then, what did Mr. Blake say? Mr. Blake was the leader of the Liberal party. It was not a strange thing for Mr. Blake to think that it was possible that he might be successful in the contest, that the Liberal party might be called upon to assume the reins of Government and to manage the affairs of the country. Sir, I say it was not an impossible thought for him to harbor, if he did harbor it, of which I am not able to speak positively, because I think the people of Canada, if they had understood their own interests, nay more, if the battle had been fought out in a fair, honorable and manly manner, would have put the Liberal party in power; and he had a right to expect it. Canada should never, in my judgment, have sent back to power a party with such a record as gentlemen opposite left behind them, a record foul with injustice, a record of which they themselves ought to be ashamed. I say it was not an improbable thing, then, that he should have thought that it was probable that the country would, when it had the opportunity, say to hon. gentlemen opposite: You have misgoverned us, you have mismanaged our affairs, you have heaped up the debt of the country, you have demoralised our public sentiment, you have done things unmanly and unfair, you have used

your power to place your opponents at a disadvantage and you have not dared to meet them on a fair and open field. He had a right to expect that the Liberal party would be entrusted with the reins of Government. What did he do? He did what it was his duty to do. Expecting he would be called upon to take office, knowing he had protested against the burdens placed upon the country, knowing that he had set his face as a flint against imposing burthens, he perhaps thought within himself; the people will expect that when I am in power that I will be able to greatly reduce the burdens of taxation upon them, but this Government has so increased the expenditure of the country that no man, however desirous he may be to reduce the burdens, can accomplish it except by doing it gradually. He, therefore, gave the country to understand just in what position the people had been placed by the extravagance of the Government, and just what they might expect him to be able to do when he attained office. In stating that he said he was not able to promise such reductions in taxation as he would desire should be made, and therefore there was no danger that the taxation would not be enough to afford all protection to the manufacturing interests of the country, and his policy would be in the future, as it had been in the past, that in raising revenue he would levy duties upon the articles such as could be produced in this country, and at the same time allow the manufacturers to have that degree of protection that was afforded through the operation of a revenue tariff. That was the position Mr. Blake took at that time. But, as the Minister of the Interior read himself, while that was to be the position of affairs so long as the then condition of trade between the two countries existed, he stated in the very same speech, as the Minister of the Interior was fair enough to read, that a most important point to which he would devote himself was the procuring of reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States; and therefore if he had been with us this year, he would have been found, I have not the least doubt, moving on the same lines on which we are now moving and seeking to attain the same object we seek to attain by endeavoring to carry the resolution offered. He did not propose to take off the duties that we had imposed on manufactured goods coming in from the United States, unless the United States removed the duties they charged upon manufactured goods going into that country. The manufacturers were therefore safe, but he told the manufacturers, as he told others: If the United States will consent to have reciprocity trade relations, and will take the duties off goods going into that country, we will remove the duties from their goods coming into this country. That is the position he took at that time, that was his faith, and that was the faith he was obliged to keep with the manufacturers, and that was the faith he did keep, that if the Americans did not consent to remove their duties, then our duties would remain as at the present time. That brings me to consider the point as to how this resolution will bear upon the manufactures of the country. No one attempts to prove seriously—they cannot prove it—they cannot refute the arguments given by a dozen speakers during this debate, that it is impossible for our agricultural, lumbering, mining and fishing interests not to be benefited by reciprocal trade relations with the United States. But they say they will be benefited, but you will drive out one important industry and that is the manufacturing industry. Therefore, the manufacturing industry must be saved at all hazards, even though at a great loss to other interests. Would that be just; would it be carrying out the principles of good government, the greatest good for the greatest number? Is that the principle that governs the hon. gentleman's administration of the affairs of the country. It certainly ought to be so. No one will believe I am anxious or desirous to kill off our manufacturing interests. I certainly would not desire to see the manufacturing interests of the country destroyed, but I am satisfied that our manufactur-

ers will not be destroyed by a reciprocal trade arrangement with the United States. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) gave us some instances of gentlemen who telegraphed him and whose telegram he read to the House, and to them I desire the attention of hon. members. The hon. gentleman has made them part of the history of this country. He has assumed that responsibility, I have not done so. I desire to injure no man in his business, and many of them are gentlemen whom I do not know. I suppose they were conscious of what they were doing, and that the hon. member for Hamilton had permission to read those telegrams to the House. At all events they have become the property of the country, and no one will wonder if they are canvassed over; and all I say in regard to them is to express my surprise that there were in an enterprising city like Hamilton gentleman who would be willing to say over their own signature that in a fair field they were not able to hold their own. That is the position in which the hon. member for Hamilton has placed certain manufacturers of that city. The amusing part of this is the evidence of the peculiar patriotism that affect some of our friends on the other side. Listen to this:

"Commercial union would close our forge and preside at the funeral of our rolling mills."

I would not have found such fault if the writer had stopped there, for his declaration would then have been simply a statement that they were unable to hold their own with other people. But the writer adds:

"As loyal Canadians we protest against the possibility of our tariff being arranged for us in Washington."

They protest against the tariff being made at Washington because commercial union will put out our forge and preside at our funeral—there is the prophecy, there is the argument. I can respect one or two of those gentlemen who simply say—I do not find many of them say what I thought, but all speak in about the same strain—I think there was some one here who had stated that commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity would be hurtful to the interests of the country, and abstained from saying it would have a disastrous effect upon themselves. It seems to me that most all of them seem to think that the prosperity of the country is depending on those gentlemen from Hamilton in their own estimation:

"If commercial union should be adopted it would utterly destroy the pipe industry and certainly lead to annexation. Don't let Washington dictate our tariff."

Which are they most particular about—"the destruction of their industries or annexation?"

"Under commercial union we would have to shut down our works entirely."

"ONTARIO ROLLING MILLS."

I much more admire that statement than the other. They say we cannot stand under that, they do not put in any of your loyalty and try to raise up a patriotic cry. This is one of the telegrams I was looking for, I admire that:

"Commercial union would destroy our business in carriage and saddlery hardware, and scales, and would seriously damage stove business."

"BURROW, STEWART & MILNE."

Another telegram saying that we are not equal to our fellow men, not equal to fight our battle on a fair line. A humiliating confession to make, but nevertheless they do not put the loyalty cry into it:

"Unrestricted reciprocity would close every sewer pipe factory in Canada."

"CANADIAN SEWER PIPE CO."

"Unrestricted reciprocity would be hurtful to the country and ruin our business."

"OSBORNE-KILLEY MANUFACTURING MACHINISTS CO."

"We consider that commercial union would be most disastrous to our interests."

"HAMILTON COTTON CO."

That is the kind of telegram I like. They simply state that they are not able to hold their own in competition with their fellow-citizens, and with the men who dwell in the States. If men wish to take that position I have no objection, but I object to people working in their loyalty cant as they do in others of the telegrams. The Managers of the Wheel Works, who employ a large number of people, say:

"After considering the question of commercial union in all its different bearings, political, commercial and social, we are of decided opinion that it is not for the interests of this country to entertain the idea. It is but the stepping stone to annexation. As far as our particular business is concerned we are positive it would injuriously affect it, if not altogether destroy it."

Again I want to know whether it is their dread of annexation or their dread of their business being ruined that dominates in the minds of those men. Sir, it makes me suspicious.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is both.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is both, I think the hon. the First Minister says. Well, he will agree with me in this. I have no doubt they are excellent gentlemen and enterprising men, but if unrestricted reciprocity should be carried and as a result it benefits the nine-tenths of the people of this country, is it necessary for the other tenth—comprising Mr. Gartshore, Mr. Beddoe, the Canada Sewer Pipe Co., and D. Morton & Co, who make the National Policy soap, and who say that unrestricted reciprocity if it came into force, they would at once take their business to the United States—is it necessary to keep those gentlemen up at the expense of all the other people of this country? That is the question that is to be considered. Now, they are very important men I have no doubt, and I also think that those gentlemen feel they are important. If Mr. Morton feels he must take his soap works to the United States, I presume that Canada would be able to establish another soap works. I fancy so. There have been important men in this world, Mr. Speaker. Palmerston was considered a man of great importance and of great use in his day, but Lord Palmerston served his generation and he fell asleep. The commercial affairs did not pause one moment in England. There was not even a lull in its rush, and he was quite as great a man as the makers of the National Policy soap. The late Emperor of Germany was a man exercising great influence, and it was considered that it would be a serious matter if he should be removed by death. Death came and he was removed. But the German Empire exists to-day, and the German Empire is going on. I fancy, Sir, that probably he was of as much use and as necessary to the existence of Germany as Mr. Beddoe is to the existence of Canada. I fancy that if those gentlemen feel that they must go that Canada will exist. It is not for me nor for you, Mr. Speaker, to take the position because the industries we have will be destroyed that we will not be in favor of a project of a proposal or of a plan that will give millions of increased wealth to be scattered among all classes of the community. And, Sir, I think it is a piece of unparalleled cheek for any member of Parliament to rise in the Canadian House of representatives and seek to sway the people from carrying out a measured designed, and admitted to be greatly in the interest of nine-tenths of the people of this country, because he has secured half a dozen telegrams from as many men in his city saying:—"If you do that it will ruin our industries." Sir, I do not believe it would ruin our industries. I trust our manufacturers have got more backbone, pluck, spirit, courage and enterprise than they seem to manifest here.

An hon. MEMBER. Are they Tories or Grits?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Tories, every one of them. I do not know that, but I went over the list and I was told they were Tories.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Every man of them is a Tory.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Now, Sir, it is not only those men who have said this. They can afford to do it. The representatives of the Canadian people have risen in their places, Ministers of the Crown have risen in their places, prominent supporters of the Government have risen in their places, and others will follow them I suppose, and told you "if you adopt reciprocal trade relations with the United States in manufactured goods you will destroy and wipe out the manufacturers of the country."

Mr. HESSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." What an insult is implied in that "hear, hear," to the men of Canada, to patriotic men, for others to talk and mouth their loyalty and their patriotism, and declare to the whole world that Canada has produced a race of men inferior to the men growing in the United States. That Canada is unable to hold her own I deny, that Canada cannot compete in a fair field without favor from Americans or any other nation under the sun I deny too. The enterprising manufacturers deny it, and, Sir, if this proposition is ever given legislative effect I venture to say that the people of Canada and the manufacturers of Canada by their enterprise and their energy will cause the blush of shame to come on the cheeks of any one who in the past has risen to say that they were not able to hold their own with any man come from where he might, and against all nations of the earth, if they have but fair play. Sir, I ask that gentleman opposite as I ask any hon. gentleman opposite, do you deny that there are hundreds of thousands of Canadians in the United States to-day? You deny it not. Your census placed in your hands and prepared by your own officers declare it. I ask you what position do those Canadians occupy in the neighboring Republic? Are they hewers of wood and drawers of water.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) No, I think not. Go into their cotton and other industries in the neighboring States, and what will you find? You will find that the energy, the enterprise, the skill, the brains, which have made those successful factories, have been supplied, and largely supplied, by the Province of Quebec.

Mr. FISHER. And members of Parliament too.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) Yes, go to the legislative hall, and high among the highest you will find Canadians. Sir, they undertook an enterprise of tunnelling one of the everlasting hills. The task defied the skill of their best engineers. Their State took hold of the enterprise, but was a failure; the work was stopped. Money was sunk; what was to be done? Two Canadians say: We will take the job, we will tunnel your mountain. They undertook it; they tunnelled it, and to-day it is a success—a wonder in the eyes of the world. Yet hon. gentlemen tell us we cannot hold our own with the Americans.

Mr. BOWELL. And they were cheated out of their pay.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, you say they were cheated out of their pay; but does that lessen the fact that Canadians were able to do the work that the most skilled engineers in the United States were afraid to attempt? Go into their churches, and you find that their pulpit orators are drawn from the people of Canada. Who are the foremost among their leaders in the legal and medical professions? They are Canadians. And take any position you please, and you will find Canadians at the top.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And who commands the Gloucester fleet? A Nova Scotian?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes, who sail American ships? Why, Canadians. A great portion of the power

and the development that has been given to that country has been given to it by Canadians; and I ask the hon. First Minister, if he is logical, to give an answer that logic demands to this question: If Canadians can leave their native land, and go to that which is another land, and there, unknown and unfriended, take positions and work their way up to the highest places in the land—not a solitary instance here and there, but the most of them attaining positions as high as the most of the other inhabitants who are native born to that country—if under these conditions they can go and compete with the inhabitants of that which is a foreign land, will he say that they cannot hold the trade of their own country when it comes into competition with that of the Americans in a fair field and with no favor? Sir, I am glad that it is left to hon. gentlemen on the other side to declare that Canada has grown a race of men who are not able to hold their own with the people who dwell in the United States. Why, Sir, go to their marts of commerce, and there their finest business men are Canadians. Go and examine their farms, and then come back and tell me if they know how to till their lands as the Ontario farmers do. My experience is that they do not. No, Sir; in every department and walk of life, in every trade and profession, Canadians are the equals of the dwellers in the United States and the peers of any other people under the sun. But some hon. gentlemen may take the ground that we are equal to the citizens of the United States, but claim that they have a larger field for their operations than we have, and therefore we are at a disadvantage. Well, if they take that ground, there is some force in that. A manufacturer in Canada could not be expected, in my judgment, to hold his own in Canada if the manufactured products of the United States were allowed to come into Canada free of duty, while the United States charged a high duty on Canadian manufactured products going in there. The Canadian would be at a disadvantage. The American would slaughter his goods in Canada, as we have been told; and therefore Mr. Blake took the position, and it was the policy of the Mackenzie Government, as it is the policy of this Government, only to a greater extent, to impose duties on articles coming from the States. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Kelny), who spoke this afternoon, for he is a large business man, speaking of the slaughtering goods in Canada as a result of the adoption of reciprocal free trade with the United States. Sir, they could not do that, under our proposition. I say Canadians are able to hold their own with the people of the United States, but I do not think you ought to ask Canadians to hold their own weighted down against Americans. But how are you going to slaughter goods under reciprocal trade between the two countries? It is absurd for hon. gentlemen to make a statement of that kind. They lose sight of the fact that the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford is not to take the Canadian bars down and leave the American bars up; it is to take all bars down, to let Canadians go into their fields and then come into ours, and to let the best men win. Under reciprocal trade relations with the United States we will suppose an American manufacturer to try to slaughter goods in this country. We will suppose that a manufacturer of the city of Ogdensburg comes to the city of Ottawa with that intention. He is dealing in a certain line of goods, the price of which at home is 10 cents a lb.; but he has manufactured more than he can sell at home and keep his price up to that figure; so he says: "I will run over to Ottawa and sell my surplus stock there at 8 cents, and I will not break my home price. I will do very well; I will get cost for what I sell in Ottawa, and for what I sell at home I will get 25 per cent. profit." That might be a very good arrangement, and he might do that if the Canadian bars were down and the American bars were up? But the proposition is all bars

down; and how long do you suppose it would be under those circumstances before the manufacturer from Ottawa would be in every store in Ogdensburg offering that same article at 8 cents a lb.? Not twenty-four hours. It would be utterly impossible for slaughtering of goods to go on under reciprocal trade relations, because we could go into their markets and do the same thing there. We would be to all intents and purpose commercially one country; and therefore to say that Canadians cannot hold their own under perfectly equal conditions, is to say something that is not warranted by the facts. Now, I do not wish to read a great deal from the books, but I wish to read something which I think is rather valuable. If you remember, we had a committee on trade depression in the year 1876, when trade was very bad in Canada. There was a committee appointed by the House which took evidence to ascertain what was the cause of the depression in trade and whether any remedy could be applied. Some of the first men of the country were summoned before that committee and examined with reference to the condition of business, and the difficulties in its way. I have not time to read all the evidence; but there was one question put to all these gentlemen, as to whether reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States would remove the difficulties they were laboring under, the answer to which will be found interesting. Many of these gentlemen were advocates of the National Policy, and were seeking to impress upon the committee the necessity of imposing higher duties, which the right hon. the leader of the Government proceeded to do as soon as he obtained power in 1878. I will give you first the statement of W. G. Perley, lumber merchant—I suppose, the present member for Ottawa. Among other questions, he was asked:

"Q. Have the lumbermen any theory as to any steps that might be taken by the Government to relieve this depression of the lumber trade? Do you know of any remedy which the Government could apply?"

Mr. Perley answered:

"There is no definite theory among us that I am aware of. Of course, we are all anxious to have the privilege of sending lumber into the United States without duty, if we could have it on fair terms. That would help us greatly. I do not know that there is any direct way of relieving us in any other way.

"Q. Reciprocity, if it can be secured, is the only practical remedy that can be applied? A. I do not know of any other practical remedy."

That is the statement of Mr. Perley. The lumbering industry is the largest manufacturing industry in the country, engages vastly more hands, and, I think, has four or five times more capital invested in it than any other except the flour industry. The next person examined was Mr. J. R. Booth of this city, also a large lumberman. He was asked:

"Q. Do you find the lumber business very much depressed at present? A. Yes.

"Q. Can you suggest any remedy that might be adopted by the Government for your relief? A. I think reciprocity and free trade would relieve it.

"Q. You think free trade would be the best relief you could get? A. In my opinion it would.

"Q. You mean reciprocity with the United States? A. Yes."

Mr. John Ferris, a very large lumberman from New Brunswick, was also examined, and gave the following evidence:—

"Q. Your trade with the United States, because depressed when the Reciprocity Treaty was repealed? A. Yes, I have no doubt of it."

Mr. A. H. Gillmor who has been a large lumber merchant in his day was examined. He is a member of this House at present, and I need not read his testimony as he can speak for himself. His testimony was to the same effect as the others. They also examined Mr. George A. Drummond, manager of the sugar refinery, which is an industry that is a good deal talked about and its value to the country debated. Now, he was not asked that question direct. Mr. Drummond was complaining that he was subject to unfair competition by the United States, and what he wanted to urge on the committee was that they should lower the duties on the raw sugar which he imported or else impose

a higher duty on the refined sugar; and I think you will find that he claimed he was not fighting the United States without the aid of any protection, but that he was fighting the United States refiner upon some grades with 55 cents per 100 lbs. discrimination against him. He said:

"It is capable of proof for example, that under the old tariff of Canada I have been paying higher *ad valorem* duties on raw material than have been charged on refined sugar coming from Boston or New York. It must be admitted that I have been at a disadvantage. I have been carrying on my business not in consequence of the tariff, but in spite of it, not in consequence of protection but in spite of discouragement."

Now, there is the testimony of that gentleman, head of the sugar refinery, that he had held his own against the refiners of the United States, not on equal terms, as he would have under reciprocal free trade with the United States, but with a positive discrimination against him. If that were true, why could not that gentleman hold his own in fair competition with others? I want to refer to the flour industry, which is the next largest industry to that of the saw mills in this country. And here I might, in passing, allude to the remark of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who contended that under the old Reciprocity Treaty a large quantity of flour came into Canada, and that it was a very ruinous business. If that hon. gentleman would only take the trouble, he would find that if we brought a large quantity of flour into Canada from the United States under the old reciprocity treaty, we sent out a vastly larger amount, and the difference was what we imported we paid \$1.90 for, while for what we exported we got \$6 a barrel. We simply brought in their wheat and ground it into flour and made money out of the transaction. So the millers, I think, will not be found among those who will object to a reciprocity treaty. Let me read you the following letter from Mr. W. H. Howland:—

"It may be said that, in spite of all disadvantages, in spite of the bulk the supply for the Lower Provinces comes from Ontario, and why? Because we poor devils have no other market on this side of the Atlantic; and if we do not sell to our own people, we must ship our stuff 3,000 miles away, and take very serious risks of markets. Rather than do this, we are glad to be permitted to undersell the Americans."

He thought we should shut out American flour because they charged duty upon ours. His complaint was not that we could not hold our own against the United States, but that we had to hold our own with our bars down while the United States' bars were up. Here is also the testimony of Mr. William Lukes, of the Millers' Association, one of the fathers of the National Policy, whose testimony will certainly be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite. He was engaged in a flour mill, and having been summoned to give his evidence, gave it as follows:—

"Q. Why could you not manufacture a particular grade? A. From the fact that I am under the necessity of manufacturing a certain percentage of a very superior grade which must bring me a corresponding value with the American superior flour which they manufacture and sell. If we had the United States market to-day, we would be pleased."

"Q. Then that which would cure all your grievances, as far as legislation could cure them, would be reciprocity? A. I don't know that will be all we would ask. I would, as a miller, rather have the United States market than any tariff or duties."

"Q. If the United States markets were opened to you, you could fairly compete with the millers of the States? A. Yes. There are grades of flour manufactured in the United States at \$1 or \$2 per barrel higher than in Canada."

Now, then, I propose to give you the testimony of James Goldie, one of the largest flour manufacturers we have in the country, a gentleman who became a supporter of the National Policy, and who opposed my hon. friend from South Wellington, I think on three different occasions, but nevertheless he is one of the largest flour manufacturers in this country, and he was examined in reference to it; and what is his statement when he is asked whether he, as a manufacturer, would be afraid of reciprocal free trade with the United States and of holding his own with them. He was asked:

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

"If you had free trade with the United States, would you not be able to get wheat in this country from which you could make as good flour as the United States?"

He says:

"I would undertake to compete with all the world if we had the United States market to send it to."

Then he was asked:

"Q. What effect would reciprocity in wheat and flour with the United States have? A. I would not like to say."

"Q. You think that would be the best thing which could be had? A. Of course we would not ask any favors."

"Q. At the time you had reciprocity did you not manufacture very largely for the United States? A. Yes, very largely, and since that, even since paying the duty, I had a large trade—10,000, 15,000 or 20,000 barrels a year."

It is absurd to state that a manufacturer like James Goldie, who sold 15,000 or 20,000 barrels a year in spite of the duty, could not hold his own under free trade, with the United States with their bars down as well as ours. Then, there is the evidence of Mr. Millarky, boot and shoe manufacturer of Montreal, representing an industry which, I believe, employs some seventeen or eighteen thousand hands and has a very large amount of capital invested. What is his testimony in this matter? He was asked:

"Q. Then reciprocity of tariff you think would benefit you? A. Yes."

"Q. Would you prefer a rise in our tariff or a reduction of the American tariff? A. I do not care which it is."

"Q. Then you do not come here to ask for protection? A. I come here to ask for reciprocity of tariff with the United States. If they take their tariff away altogether, I am perfectly willing that ours should be taken away. If they ask for a 35 per cent. duty, I want a 35 per cent. duty."

"Q. You are willing to compete with the United States if we have reciprocal trade with the United States? A. Yes, I should be perfectly delighted with reciprocal trade."

"Q. Free trade then would suit you very well? A. Or reciprocity in tariff. It is immaterial which."

There is the representative of the Boot and Shoe Association of the Dominion, who was summoned here as a witness, to give his testimony in reference to that industry. Then, take the agricultural implement industry, which is one of the largest we have in this country, and is a growing and extending industry. Do you mean to tell me that the men who are engaged in that industry, who have built it up, the men who have the enterprise, and skill, and the inventive mind, the push and the determination of these men, would not be able to hold their own even in the New York market with the Americans. I give their testimony, and first I give that of Mr. Frost, a well-known and prominent manufacturer of agricultural implements. He was asked:

"Q. How does the cost of material, rent and labor in the United States compare with the cost in Canada? A. The machine we sell at Prescott for \$75, twelve months' credit, is sold by the American manufacturers at Ogdensburg at \$100, American currency, cash down. The difference between the American and Canadian prices is 25 per cent. We can sell at 25 per cent. cheaper than they can in the United States."

"Q. Then it would be an advantage to you to have reciprocity with the United States? A. Yes, we could undersell them."

He says further, when the question is asked:

"Q. You drove the Americans out by being able to undersell them? A. Yes, there was one firm at Worcester, Mass., which took machines into Nova Scotia, to Halifax, from Boston. They sold them for \$95 or \$100. We sent our machines of the same class down by the gulf port steamers to Picton, and sold them for \$75."

So he does not fear that he will not be able to hold his own. Then John Watson, one of the most enterprising manufacturers in the west, is asked:

"Q. How does the cost of production here compare with the United States? A. I think we can produce as cheap as they."

"Q. What would be the effect, if we had reciprocity with the United States, in your line of business? A. We would hold up both hands for that. There would not then be so many manufacturers conflicting with each other here, for we would strike out with particular branches of the trade, say in one or two articles, and after we had supplied Canada, we could send the balance into the States."

He proposes to do a great business, as a live Canadian, and not to allow the Americans to do it for him. That is the stuff of which true Canadians are made. Then we have Corsitt Bros. They were not able to attend the sittings of the committee, but they wrote a letter which wound up as follows:—

"What we have written answers your enquiries, but we beg leave to remark that our idea of the cause of depression in trade is summed up in this: The supply exceeds the demands in all departments of trade, also, that if allowed an equal chance in honorable competition, we can successfully sell our machines anywhere against American manufacturers."

The Massey Manufacturing Company were not able to come here before the committee, but they sent a letter. They are known to be one of the largest firms we have in Canada, and they sent the following letter:—

"GENTLEMEN,—In reply to a communication received this day from the Clerk of Commons, would say. We are engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements and farm machinery. Our average trade is about \$100,000 per annum, and this season we are increasing the business about 20 per cent, and with very fair prospects. During the past season we did a foreign trade in Germany to the extent of some \$8,000 or \$10,000, and we anticipate a continuation of that trade. We may also add that the existing tariff is satisfactory to us, and is sufficient protection; perhaps even a little less would also be. A still further advance in the tariff would certainly prove adverse to our interests."

Now, I have given all these industries and I propose to refer to the cotton industry. What did the manager of the Hochelaga cotton industry state in reference to this matter? He was asked:

"Q. There were a great number of Canadians engaged in the cotton mills of the United States, and now they are desirous of working in Canada, are they not? A. The majority of the help I have, learned in the United States. I have had applications enough from the States lately to fill two or three such mills as mine."

Why, Sir, I have often heard the hon. the Minister of Public Works talk about repatriating his fellow countrymen, and inducing them to come back to Canada. I should not be surprised if one of the results of the adoption of reciprocity were to induce them, that modest, temperate, moderate and able race of people to come back to Canada so that our manufactures could be worked by these men, who would be only too happy to come back to work under the flag they had to leave in order to get work elsewhere. This witness was also asked:

"Q. What would be the effect on your trade providing the duties of the United States were repealed? If we had free trade, could you compete with the American manufacturers? A. I should go for free trade very quickly."

"Q. Do you think you could compete with the American mills? A. We would try."

Then, I give you another, the Cornwall Cotton Co., on page 143:

"Q. Can you produce in your mills, with the same amount of money, labor and machinery, as large an amount as they can in the United States? A. If we had the same labor, yes."

"Q. You say the cost of production in the United States is about the same as here? A. Yes."

He is asked again.

"How do your goods compare with American goods? A. They compare so favorably that we have no trouble in selling against them."

"Q. Are yours not superior to American goods? A. Some kinds are; the Americans make some very fine goods."

"Q. Do they not use more waste than you do? A. No; we try to make good use of all our waste."

"Q. How would reciprocity with the United States affect your business? A. I think that our people would be inclined to go for that, as it would give them access to a larger market."

"Q. You think you can compete with them in their own market? A. Yes; it might bother us for a little while, but I think in the long run it would come out better for us. It would give us what we want by putting us on an equal footing."

The managers of that cotton mill, the largest mill I suppose, we have in the country, give this testimony. I do not know that I have time to read it all, all the other testimonies given here; but I merely mention that the testimony of Robert Mitchell, brass founder, of Montreal, is to the same effect; the testimony of Samuel Platt, Goderich, in

the salt industry, is to the same effect; the testimony of Edward Gurney, with reference to the foundry business and stove business, one of the largest manufacturers in that line, is to the same effect. I think it is worth while to put his testimony on record in reference to this matter, because it will be interesting to some to know what his views were, for he is a leading man and considerable importance is attached to his views. Edward Gurney is asked:

"Q. Have they any facilities for manufacturing stoves any cheaper than you can? A. No."

"Q. Suppose you were selling at cost, do you suppose they could sell as low as you can sell, looking at the rents, labor, taxation and everything? A. About the same when you come to take into consideration all the circumstances, and their having to introduce their goods into a new country."

"Q. But yours is an established business? A. Yes. Well, assuming what you presume to be the case, we could make the goods a little cheaper than they. Then we have connection in this country already established, and they have to form one, and any difference there might be would be overcome by this fact."

Then he is asked again:

"Q. If we had reciprocity with the United States in your business, you would be in favor of it? A. I would be more than content."

That is the testimony of Edward Gurney, one of the leading stove founders. Here is the statement of Mr. James Smart, founder, in reference to the same, only he does not speak as positively; the testimony of Wm. Buck, in the same industry, but he does not speak as positively as Mr. Gurney in reference to the matter; he declared that at the time he was making as good a stove as they could make in the United States; and I will vouch for it that he is making as good now. He says, theoretically, he believes free trade would be right, but he is not as sanguine as to holding his own as some others profess to be. I have not tried to overstate these testimonies. These are the men who say that if you give them free access to the United States market, you may let the United States manufacturers come in here and they will be able to hold their own. R. H. Smith, with reference to saws, knives and similar goods, and D. McCrae give the same testimony. In the Canadian market they can hold their own. B. Rosamond, woollen cloth factory, representing the tweed industry, the strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, and their candidate in the elections—let me read what Mr. Rosamond says with reference to our woollen cloth industry, on page 208:

"Q. Is the present rate of duty satisfactory to you? A. Yes, under ordinary circumstances it would be. We are in an exceptional position, being alongside of a country which has a high tariff against us; but, under ordinary circumstances it would be satisfactory. The duty is certainly high enough; if we had a country alongside of us which was reasonable, as our people are disposed to be, we would have no difficulty."

"Q. You would be content to have reciprocity with the United States? A. Yes, I believe it would be to the benefit of everybody."

That is the testimony of Mr. Rosamond, of the woollen mills. I am afraid I have wearied the House with these quotations, but I thought it would be worth while to place the views of this gentleman upon record in order to show that he and others, who were contending against the Americans when gold was 112 and when there was only a 17½ cents tariff here, were willing and able, under those circumstances, before they had acquired the strength they have now after many years' prosperity, they were willing then and anxious, "they were ready to hold up both hands," as some of them expressed it, for reciprocal free trade with the United States. Now, the hon. the Minister of the Interior made one statement that struck me as having considerable force, and I gave it a good deal of consideration, as, I am bound to say, I endeavor to do with all the statements that come from the other side. He said that if we made a treaty with the United States, it would have to be necessarily a time treaty, and that at the expiration of that time, if the United States were to abrogate the treaty, we might find ourselves, as one result, probably, of reciprocal trade relations, with larger manufactures established

and running on special lines—he thought that we would find ourselves in Canada with large mills and a vast number of them, and would be shut up to the restricted market of 5,000,000 instead of having the enlarged mutual market of 65,000,000 as we had during the continuation of the treaty. I say, Mr. Speaker, that statement struck me as having considerable force, and I have given some reflection to it. I do not know whether the conclusion I arrived at would be shared by other hon. gentlemen, but it seemed to me to solve the difficulty, and to remove the danger which I confess I thought there might be. Under reciprocal free trade with the United States there would be an accession to the number of our manufactures here; and I believe, of course, there would be some displacement of capital, there would be some disarrangement of trade. I speak quite cognisant of the fact that I do not know how it would be in my own business. I do not know whether I should be able to hold my own with them. I would be sorry to say that I could not, but I am free to say this, as a representative of a Canadian constituency, charged with the duty of trying to promote the best interest of the people of this country, that I am bound to go for what I consider would be the best interests of the country at large, no matter how it might affect me. There will be displacement, no doubt, of capital, and some men may have to fall in the change. There are misfortunes overtaking people all the time; there are changes taking place even now, within our limits. These things cannot be avoided. Suppose this change were brought into effect, there would be warning given of it, men would arrange their matters accordingly, and I look for this, I believe Canada will not secure all the manufacturing establishments that are going to manufacture goods for the whole continent of America. I do not believe they will all come and locate in Canada; all I expect is that a certain number will, that we will get our full shares in some lines, that we are suited for, will get more than they will, and that having got them, there will be a prosperity to the country resulting from these reciprocal trade relations that will give us an increased population in a ratio greater, I believe, than we can venture to hope at the present time. Therefore, I think that is the solution of the difficulty suggested by the Minister of the Interior. Yes, we will have more factories, the ones that we have in existence will be enlarged and we will be enabled to turn out more than enough products for 5,000,000 people. But I consider before the time limited would expire you would have as many more inhabitants as would make a market for such mills as were erected within the bounds of your own limits. Therefore that objection, to which I attached considerable weight when I first heard it, I have worked out to a satisfactory solution according to my own idea, whether it answers the difficulty in the minds of others I cannot tell. What is the condition of the manufacturers of Canada to-day. Some of them are enjoying very great protection and some are not, and one of the difficulties experienced by many hon. gentlemen on looking at this question is this: they look at the tariff and see that a certain article is protected 20 per cent., another 25, another 30, another 35, and they say: If those manufacturers require that protection in order to exist, and you wipe out that protection, does that not mean the crushing out of the industry? That would appear to be so on the face of the tariff. I am glad the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is present, for he is a business man and will understand the argument I will address to the House, and will be able to correct me if it is not true. While it is a fact that there is that amount of duty levied on manufactured products in this country, you must bear in mind that the manufacturers are not protected to that amount of duty in many of those lines. That circumstance does away with a great part of the difficulty. Let me explain. I do not like to talk about my

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

own business, but every man understands his own business best, and it may serve as an illustration, and no doubt the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) can give other illustrations from the locomotive works and other industries in which he is interested. The article may be taxed 20 or 25 per cent. and may increase the cost to the consumer, but it is not due to the manufacturer having, say 20 per cent. protection, but it is due to the system of protection itself running through all its ramifications, protecting that which is the raw material as well as the finished product, thereby increasing the cost to the consumer. The protection the Canadian manufacturer has is the difference in the duty on the manufactured article and the duty on the raw material out of which the article is manufactured. Applying that test you will find the great bulk of the manufacturers of Canada are not enjoying as great a degree of protection at the present time as some suppose.

An hon. MEMBER. Give them more.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No. The consumer has to pay more for the goods, but the manufacturer does not get the protection, owing to the system running all the way through and the duties imposed on raw material. For instance, one line in which I am engaged myself will serve as an illustration. There is a manufactured article upon which 20 per cent. duty is imposed. You would naturally say that the article is protected to the extent of 20 per cent. Not so, because on 40 per cent. of the raw material entering into the manufacture of that article there is a specific duty of 2 cents per pound, which is equivalent to from 25 to 33 per cent. duty. The House will, therefore, readily see that the protection that is upon the manufactured article is the difference in the duty between the duty on the finished article and the duty on the raw material. There is on some other goods of the same kind, sweet goods—I have been speaking of a line that embraces nine-tenths of all manufactures of that kind, while as regards the other tenth sugar comes into it, and as the Minister of Customs seeks to obtain as much revenue as possible, it comes in under the sugar duty—when you come to that class you have an extra cent a pound on the sugar, and 30 per cent. on the molasses, in fact all the ingredients that enter into it are protected, and therefore the protection given to the manufacturer is only the amount of the difference between the duty placed upon the manufactured product and the duty on the raw material. Take agricultural implements. There is 35 per cent. protection. It means an increased cost to the consumer, but the manufacturer does not get the benefit of the 35 per cent. protection, because the duty he has to pay on the raw material reduces the protection he obtains, and in this case again his protection is the difference between the duty levied upon the raw material and the duty on the implement itself. There is a firm, I may be pardoned for mentioning names, and I do not think individual instances prove anything, but the cases are useful as illustrations—there is the Osborne-Killey Manufacturing Company who declare that under unrestricted reciprocity they could not hold their own. But the Watrous Engine Company located in my own city, one of the most enterprising firms in the Dominion, have been doing for years an export trade and have successfully competed with the Americans in Australia, Hungary, Russia and Chili, and they say that if they have been able to hold their own against the Americans in distant lands, they would be able to hold their own against Americans in the United States, because much of the raw material that goes into the manufacture of their articles pays a duty of 30 per cent. on coming from the States, while in that case it would be free. They say give us the American market, and as proof of their desire to obtain it two of the sons

of members of the firm have left Winnipeg, I am sorry to say, and have removed to Minneapolis, and in that young giant city they are carrying on business by their own energy and enterprise, and in a competition by tender for a fire engine they have been successful against rivals in the United States. Those young men who are unknown go into that city and build up an industry, and no wonder the Waterous firm says: If we can do that among people with whom we are unacquainted we can hold our own in this market and we will manufacture for the United States in portion as well. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), whom every one regrets is unable to say what he would like to say in this House, asked me to do this for him. He received a letter from a manufacturer and he desired a portion bearing on this question be read. He did not feel himself at liberty to mention the name of the manufacturer and therefore he could not give me permission to use it, and so if there is any danger of hon. gentlemen opposite requiring me to give the name after reading it I will prefer not to read it, and will not read it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Read it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It bears directly on this question. I may state that this is from the president of a large wood-working company, who make waggons and agricultural implements, and a great many other things in that line. After alluding to some private matters he says:

"There are some points that, in my opinion, have not been so fully demonstrated as they should be."

That is in reference to the discussion on this question,—

"Take the injury to the manufacturers for instance. In our own business, that of the ——— Manufacturing Company, of which I am president, when Messrs Fuller, Wiman and Smith commenced their crusade, Mr. ——— our manager, was wonderfully exercised and feared a flood of waggons from the American side would be slaughtered in our Canadian market, and that we could not receive any return therefor. I argued that free and unrestricted intercourse with them would open up a trade beneficial to both, and that we would get a fair share of American trade. He thought that impossible, but while we were discussing the question an order came from a railway contractor in the State of Maine for thirty carts, on condition that we should pay the duty. The price offered was such that we paid the duty of 35 per cent., and realised our regular Canadian prices, and subsequently sold 120 carts in the same country alone. Had we had free access to the American market our trade would have been largely increased and profitable. This is only one example. Give us a chance to enter the markets of America untrammelled and we have the energy, intelligence, skill and resources to take the lead in our own markets, and secure a fair share of the United States trade. The extra profit on stock, such as horses, cattle, &c., if sold to American buyers without or free from duty impositions would more than quadruple the loss of such revenue. Dozens of American buyers come to East York annually to purchase horses, who plainly tell the farmers that, if it were not for the duty they, could and would pay \$20 to \$30 more for the animals they purchase than they now pay. So that our farmers, whether Reform or Conservative, are rapidly becoming supporters of unrestricted reciprocity."

I, Sir, was requested to read that. It is just on the line of what I have stated that our manufactures will not be inferior to any others in competition. I grant you that if there are a class of men who naturally may feel timidity in this matter it would be the manufacturer, but it is our bounden duty, as he says, in the interests of the whole country to take this course, and I believe that what is in the interest of the whole country must be in the interest of the manufacturers too. We cannot increase the wealth of the people of this country; we cannot put extra money into the pockets of the farmers and other industries of the country without their being able to expend more money, and in the end it must redound to the benefit of all. What has been the progress of our manufactures? They have extended and increased, I grant you, but to what extent? And what is their position to-day? Is there not a stage of congestion? Is there not debt? Is there not trouble? Is there no trouble among combines just now, and is it not being enquired into? What has brought about those combines? It is because men have combined, when they were

not able to get prices that were remunerative, and when they were losing money, to try and form arrangements and agreements among themselves in order if possible that they might save themselves from bankruptcy. Others, I believe, have been formed for the purpose of getting more than a proper profit out of their investment. But, Sir, our over-supply has brought it about, and our export trade, owing to our protective system, is almost a nullity. In 1878 we exported some \$4,000,000 worth of manufactured goods, but this year we have exported only a little over \$3,000,000. So it is that our Government recognises this state of affairs as much as anyone else, and to-day we have agents sent away to distant countries to try and open up trade. We have voted here year after year thousands of dollars to establish commercial agencies, and we are making expeditions out to Australia and different places in order to get an outlet for the excess that we are manufacturing in this country. But, Sir, just imagine for one moment sending agents thousands of miles away; sending agents away to Australia, to the Argentine republic and to other countries in order to open up a trade with their people and to extend our trade and our commerce, while here is a proposition made by a nation of 65,000,000 of the richest people on the face of the earth to open their markets to us, and yet we find men rising in their places and saying that it would be an injury to us to accept this invitation. It is something marvellous that that line of argument should be taken in a Canadian House of Representatives, by men who ought to be as intelligent as Canadian representatives are supposed to be. Sir, the Minister of Marine made a very true statement in reference to this subject when he was speaking of the prosperity of Canada and regretting that we had not a very large import trade. He said:

"After all it is the inter-provincial trade that is of more profit to us than our foreign trade and we ought to cultivate that."

I agree with him that this inter-provincial trade and this inter-provincial commerce is an enriching, and profitable, and paying thing, but the trouble is here as has been pointed out by many gentlemen, that deeply as we regret it there is but a very small inter-provincial trade and the facts are these. There are geographical difficulties in our way as a Dominion. The hon. Finance Minister was, I consider, the father of the National Policy, and in my mind I give him credit for an earnest desire to promote inter-provincial trade as one of the features of his National Policy, but it has been tried, it has been in operation for years, and we have failed to overcome the geographical difficulties that are in our way. We are forced to come to the conclusion that our inter-provincial trade has not been the success we would desire. I agree with the hon. Minister of Marine that if inter-provincial trade could be promoted, it would be a source of wealth to us, but there are great difficulties attending it. Carry out the proposition of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and give us commercial relations with the United States of America and what would happen? Why, Sir, we become entitled to participate and will participate in all the great inter-state commerce of that mighty republic, which has made it to-day one of the greatest nations of the earth. We become participants and sharers in the prosperity of that inter-state commerce which is many times greater than all their foreign commerce. We have access to the millions of people in the United States, and, Sir, if they have improved by this trade we cannot help sharing in that benefit, to improve also, as commercially we will be the one people in that respect. They will enter and trade with us, 5,000,000 of people, and we enter a trade with 63,000,000. Perhaps we may lose some inter-provincial trade, or part of it, that has been forced into unnatural channels, but we gain a vastly greater amount from that great intercontinental commerce which will sweep through this land, enriching it, I believe, as it has

enriched the people of the United States. Sir, if it be an undenied fact that their interest commercially has been the great means of making them a rich and prosperous people, does it not logically follow that the securing to us as free a right as they possess to participate in that intercontinental commerce must be a benefit for us? And, Sir, are we not justified when we contemplate this in offering this resolution? Would the Ministry not be justified in taking that proposition into consideration, and, if they agree in the arguments that have been advanced in its favor, seeking to give effect to it, as they have been invited by Mr. Bayard to do. It has been argued—and I will touch this point very briefly—that this proposition discriminates against Great Britain. Sir, that is one thing I do not just exactly like—not so much because Great Britain has done so much for us in that regard; but it looks as if when a nation takes your products free you should not leave a wall against it, while you take down the wall that separates you from another nation. But I regard the matter in this way: We have been given permission—nay, more, I believe it is our duty to our Queen and country, as British subjects, located in the Dominion of Canada—to see that the interests of the Empire are furthered, and we can only do that in this part of the Empire by being true to Canada and Canada's interests. In that way we show ourselves the most devoted and loyal subjects of Her Majesty. But even in the tariff we have enacted you find discrimination. You find us taxing Britain now, and yet Britain is receiving our products by the millions, and tens of millions year after year without taxing them; and what is the reason? Certainly not to benefit Canadians. She does it because it is to her interest to do it; and while she has received our products free, she has also received the products of other nations free. England has not treated us with greater favor than she has treated other nations.

Mr. HESSON. How about the cattle question?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman is right in that; but speaking in the main, England treats us as she treats other nations. The English people look after their interest and we must look after ours. But we find that the very import duties designed by the hon. Minister of Finance to operate more against the United States than against Great Britain have actually discriminated against Great Britain and in favor of the United States.

Mr. BOWELL. Quite the contrary.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman must not say that, because I have figured the matter out, and I give the result as I have obtained it from the Trade and Navigation Returns. The values of the dutiable and free goods entered for consumption in Canada from Great Britain and the United States respectively during the year 1887 were as follows:—

	Dutiable goods.	Free goods.	Total.	Duty Paid.
Great Britain... ..	\$35,766,273	\$ 9,195,960	\$44,962,233	\$9,318,920
United States.....	30,570,609	14,536,450	45,107,068	7,268,914

The value of the British goods imported was a little less than the value of the American goods, but we levied over \$2,000,000 more duty on the former than on the latter. The percentage of duty on the British goods, taking free and dutiable together, was 20½ per cent., and taking the dutiable alone, 26 per cent., while the percentage of duty on the American goods, free and dutiable together, was 16½ per cent., and on the dutiable alone 23½ per cent. The hon. Minister of Customs will also remember that these figures do not show as much discrimination against Great Britain as I believe will be shown by the figures for 1888, because the operation of the iron duties is not yet as manifest as it will be when we get the returns for this year. A loss of revenue is to be encountered, but we hope that retrench-

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

ment and economy, combined with greatly increased prosperity, will enable us to overcome that. I notice that the Government do not venture to ask us to vote down the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford on the ground of disloyalty to Britain, though speakers have greatly enlarged upon that; their resolution speaks of the interest of Canada, and of Canada alone, and that, I think, is as it should be. We have had great speeches on the subject of loyalty. I do not like to profess my loyalty in loud words, and very often I would rather act my loyalty than speak it. If I know myself, I am loyal to Great Britain; I believe I am loyal to Canada, and I think it is our first duty as Canadians—it will be regarded as our first duty by the people of England, by the Parliament of England, by the sovereign we are proud to have reigning over us—to attend to the interests of Canada, to build it up, and in building it up to bring added glory and dignity to the Empire. Now, Sir, I would say in conclusion, that one of the strongest reasons in my mind leading me to favor the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford, is that if I am anything, I am a Canadian; I believe in Canada; I love Canada; I want Canada to go on to prosper, to increase, to expand, to develop, to become a Canadian nationality, on this continent, happy at present in the tie that binds us with the mother country, but fitting ourselves, if at any time it should be thought in the interest of the Empire better for us, to become, as the hon. First Minister himself has spoken of us, a kingdom—an auxiliary kingdom—that we should go on, so that if that time should come, soon or late, we should be able to take our position among the nations of the earth, and reflect honor upon that nation of which we now form so important a part. Mr. Speaker, this is what I want to say, and I say it with feelings of regret: I have been through the Dominion, or have endeavored to go through it not with much time at my disposal, but I have at intervals of a few years endeavored to take time enough from my own affairs, if possible, to make myself acquainted with the different portions of this Dominion; and in doing that, while I was rejoiced at the hospitality and the kindness with which I was greeted in all parts of the Dominion, I could not fail to notice that there are commercial difficulties in our way, which produce a certain amount of friction, and prevent the cement that ought to bind us together from hardening as fast and as strong as I, as a Canadian, desire it should. I could not blame the people, when I found them in certain Provinces saying: It is reasonable that you should be more content with Confederation than we, because you have us for your customers, you send your goods down to us and you make us pay for them in hard cash. You take nothing in return from us, and we have to sell at reduced prices, at 20 or 30 per cent. less than the value of our goods to get the gold with which to pay you for yours. Sir, that is the difficulty under which these people labor; and we cannot wonder, under these circumstances, that that sentiment should be voiced in this House; for a man should be honest in his utterances, and if the Province from which he comes is dissatisfied, if there are grievances under which his people suffer, the way to heal them, the way to discover a remedy, is not to cry peace! peace! when there is no peace. Now, as I said, one of the strongest reasons that induced me to support the resolution of my hon. friend from South Oxford is this, that I know, although I do not like to contemplate the fact, that unless we can develop a larger inter-provincial trade, unless we can become cemented more closely and firmly together than we are, unless the present difficulties are removed—and I do not see very well how they are to be overcome, unless that friction is smoothened away and the feeling of dissatisfaction engendered by this state of things dispelled, there cannot be that strong bond which it is

desirable should bind the members of a new nationality. It is not because these men are discontented or dissatisfied with the Canadian flag. They are as proud of the Canadian flag, it may be, as we are, it is not that they have a dislike to Confederation politically, but it is because their material interests are not, they think, as well served by Confederation as they conceive the interests of the older Provinces are served. I believe if we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, we would open up natural markets for our productions; the people of Ontario would trade with the people with whom they desire to trade, and with whom it is natural they should trade, and the people of the other Provinces would do the same. We would lose perhaps some of the trade that we may have forced, by means of this high tariff, with the more distant Provinces, and some of the neighboring States might share part of that trade with us; but what could prevent our going in and taking our share of the immense trade that could be developed there and of participating with those people in its profits? Trading in our natural markets, the tariff barriers removed on this continent, there would then be peace and prosperity. All the Provinces of this Dominion, free commercially and prospering commercially, would politically become united and banded together as one, strong in upholding the Canadian flag, which I hope will ever be upheld in the hands of freemen worthy to dwell on the soil of Canada. I thank you, Sir, and the hon. members of this House, for having listened to me as patiently as you have, while I have gone over ground that has, no doubt, been gone over already. But I feel some interest in this subject. I feel that it is one of the most important subjects that has ever been before the country. I feel that its effects will be greatly in the interests of the country; and therefore I desired to say a few words in the hope that I might strengthen the arguments that have already been advanced.

Mr. RYKERT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1:15 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 26th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPRESENTATION OF PRINCE EDWARD.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of John M. Platt, Esq., to represent the Electoral District of the County of Prince Edward.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Buffalo, Chippawa and Niagara Falls Steamboat and Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

RAILWAY LEGISLATION.

Mr. SMALL moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee on Railways and Canals that they have power, if they think fit, to divide the Bill intitled: "An Act to confirm a certain agreement made between the Grand Trunk

Railway Company of Canada, the Canada Southern Railway Company and the London and Port Stanley Railway Company, and a certain agreement made between the London and South-Eastern Railway Company and the Canada Southern Railway Company, "into two Bills."

Mr. LAURIER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to explain what is contained in this motion?

Mr. SMALL. The Bill as originally introduced consolidated those several agreements. It has been proposed by the solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway that there should be two charters instead of one in confirmation of the agreements between those different lines of railway. The motion proposes two agreements and two charters, instead of one.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if notice has been given of this application? It is in the nature of a private Bill, and I think the practice is for a private Bill to be introduced and to be presented to this House, and not to originate in the Select Standing Committee on Railways and Canals.

Mr. SMALL. I was under the impression it ought to have been introduced in the Railway Committee. This motion has been made at the suggestion of the Clerk of the House.

Mr. MULOCK. Has notice been given for the application of this private bill?

Mr. SMALL. Oh, yes. The Bill is before the Committee and has been read a first time.

Mr. LAURIER. It is a mere matter of form, as I understand.

Mr. SMALL. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Government if they have come to any definite conclusion as to the adjournment of the House on Wednesday, and as to what time the adjournment would take place? It would be important to know this before getting through the present debate which we have now on hand.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is contemplated that the House should adjourn on Wednesday at six o'clock, and stand adjourned until the following Tuesday at eight o'clock. While I am up I would say that, from all I can learn, there is not much probability of finishing the debate on the question before the House to-morrow night, and if a vote is not taken to-morrow night I would ask the House to adjourn the debate until we meet again after Easter on Tuesday night. The debate would then go on on Wednesday and I hope it will invite the House soon to come to a vote, as the House, I am sure, feels inclined to do.

BILLS ON BANKING.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire of the First Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce speedily the Bill with respect to banking which has not, as I understand, been printed yet—the Bill as to banks and banking?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no Bill on that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I thought the hon. gentleman, or one of his colleagues, stated his intention to introduce a Bill with reference to banks and banking?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I asked the question as the impression had gone abroad, and a great many ques-

tions have been addressed to myself and my hon. friend about it. I take it for granted then, if the hon. gentleman will permit me, that there will, in all human probability, be no legislation on that subject by the Government this Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In all human probability there will be no legislation in this respect during the present Session. I think that what I did say with respect to the question relating to banking was, that probably the Committee on Banking and Commerce would, during the present Session, strike a sub-committee for the purpose of considering that question. The charters expire in 1890, and before that period I think the time and attention of those gentlemen who are accustomed to finance and fiscal matters should be directed especially to that subject, with a view to having legislation, if required or thought necessary, before the expiration of those charters.

GOVERNMENT MEASURES.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I would remind the First Minister that the Bills relating to the Franchise Act and the Contested Elections Act promised in the Speech from the Throne have not yet been laid before Parliament. It is of the highest importance that those measures should be in the hands of members before adjournment takes place. We certainly want to know, and the country wants to know, what legislation the Government proposes. It is a matter of the first consequence, because it relates to the constitution of this House. Unless those measures are in the hands of members before the adjournment takes place, there will be no adequate opportunity of consulting the country with regard to them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say to the hon. gentleman that not only those measures, but all the measures promised in the Speech from the Throne, and all the principal measures that the Government proposes to submit for the consideration of Parliament, will be laid before the House for immediate discussion and action on the reassembling of the House after Easter.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That will not suit.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I might point out to the First Minister that this would render it very difficult to get the views of the constituents, unless we sit for an unusually long time, which I do not suppose that he nor anybody desires.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sceptic enough to doubt whether the time of hon. gentlemen during the short recess will be materially occupied in explaining any of the public measures to their constituents. I think my hon. friends opposite, and on this side of the House as well, will find their time fully occupied in looking after their own domestic interests and religious duties during the short recess.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have now been a month in Session and have not had those measures yet.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take this opportunity of saying, for the comfort of the hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces who use the Intercolonial Railway, that free passes will be given going and returning during the Easter recess.

THE CAPTAIN OF THE *NORTHERN LIGHT*.

Mr. WELSH. I have been waiting for the last few days for the Minister of Marine to be in his place, to ask when those papers I have spoken of in connection with the captain of the *Northern Light* will be laid on the Table of the House?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will take the opportunity at six o'clock to put the question, I will see that my hon. friend is in his place.

Mr. WELSH. That is all right.

REPRESENTATION OF RUSSELL.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of this House the fact that the seat for the county of Russell is vacant, and has been vacant for some time. I notice that Mr. Speaker received the report of Judge Osler and the final report of the Supreme Court at the opening of the present Session. Looking at this report I find it is very much in the same line as the report of the same judge in the case of the county of Kent, and though the report has been before the House, and therefore, within the knowledge of the Government, for more than a month, the Government have not thought proper to take action, for reasons which I myself would agree justifies us in making the House consider as to the issuing of a Royal Commission to further investigate the matter. As the report is very much in the same line as the report made by the same judge in the case of the Kent election, that is to say, the question was whether further enquiry would be desirable, I think the House should not delay any further the issue of the writ. I, therefore, move:

That the Speaker do forthwith issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the Electoral District of the County of Russell in Ontario.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask my hon. friend to allow his motion to stand until to-morrow. The only objection I have to it is the rule which I think ought to be observed as much as possible, that in every case of this kind connected with the issue of a writ, we should act on a report from the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion allowed to stand.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending Trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. RYKERT. Mr. Speaker, I think the only deduction that can be drawn from the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, and from his speech in introducing that resolution, and the several speeches made by hon. gentle-

men opposite in support of it, is, that it is nothing but an insidious attempt to commit this House to the policy of free trade. Running through all their speeches from beginning to end is an evident disposition to advocate the policy of free trade. They seem desirous, as it were, by a snap verdict, to commit this House to a reversal of the National Policy which was adopted in 1878. It seems to me, Sir, that before this House can pass judgment in a proper manner upon a resolution such as that which is now before it, it ought to be satisfied that some opinion has been expressed by the people of Canada in favor of such a policy as hon. gentlemen opposite have now adopted. I cannot understand why this House should now, within twelve months after a general election, be called upon to reverse a policy which was then passed upon and approved of by the people. If the National Policy has been a failure in this country, that fact has not yet been established by hon. gentlemen opposite; but the country having adopted that policy on three different occasions—first in 1878, when they transferred hon. gentleman opposite from the Treasury benches to the Opposition side of the House, in 1882, after the matter had been fairly and fully discussed before the people and in Parliament, and in 1887, when every person in the country was fully alive to the importance of that question—it seems to me that there ought to be some strong and satisfactory reason why this House should now be called upon to reverse that policy. There is no doubt, in coming to the conclusion they did, in 1878 particularly, the people of this country were largely indebted to the speeches made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson). My hon. friend from South Brant has drawn the attention of the House to the year 1876, and I am glad he has, because I shall perhaps be able to refresh his memory as to some very important speeches made by him and by the hon. member for North Norfolk in this House and in the country. If there are any two persons in this country to whom we as Conservatives are indebted for the establishment of the National Policy, and the education of the people in favor of it, they are those two hon. gentlemen; and I have no doubt that when they expressed their opinions in Parliament, they expressed what they really felt. At any rate, whatever they did say met with a hearty response from the people. Now, Sir, it would perhaps be well, as a matter of history, that I should refer to some of those speeches, so that some of the younger members of this House who were not here at the time, may be informed to some extent as to what were then the sentiments of these hon. gentlemen. The hon. member for South Brant would have been a little fairer, I think, if he had gone back one year, and had referred to the report of the Committee on the Manufacturing Interests made in 1874. He has made copious extracts from the report of the Committee on Agricultural Depression appointed in 1876; but I would also like to refer to the very important report made by a Committee of this House in 1874 when the hon. member for East York had control of the Government. The whole question of the effect of the then fiscal policy, upon the manufacturing and agricultural interests of the country was then discussed, and a report was presented by the chairman of the committee, Mr. Wood, then a Reform member for the city of Hamilton, and that report, to my mind, has been vindicated by subsequent events. In that report I find this language:

"This disturbing element in the manufacturing industry of the Dominion, arising out of our geographical position and out of the trade policy of our neighbors, should induce even those who may regard free trade as a correct principle in the abstract, to recognize the necessity for a modification of that principle as a measure of self-protection, and your Committee respectfully recommend the enactment of such laws as will regulate, if it cannot altogether prevent, the evil complained of."

52

"2nd. The almost uniform testimony before your Committee was to the effect that an increased protection to manufactures will not necessarily increase the cost of the manufactured article to the consumer; and, in the opinion of your Committee, the witnesses have made out a very strong case in support of this view."

"It appears to be well established that the cost of manufacturing decreases as the quantity of goods manufactured increases. Thus a large manufacturing establishment can afford to sell its products at a lower rate than a smaller one. If therefore, Canadian industry is relieved from the pressure of such undue competition as that referred to in the first paragraph of this report, the effect will be that the manufacturing establishments will be worked to their full capacity, and the cost of production, and the consequent cost to the consumer will be proportionately reduced."

Subsequent events have shown the correctness of that report. Manufactures have increased in this country, everything has been reduced in cost to the consumer, and all over the country, instead of a slaughter market, we find a home market for the produce of our farmers. In 1876, when the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), then Minister of Interior, made a motion asking for the appointment of a committee, the hon. member for North Norfolk, who was a very strong protectionist, uttered sentiments with which I think every member on this side of the House and the vast majority of the people of this country will agree. This language has been repeated in this House on several occasions, but, like a good story, it will stand frequent repetition.

"It may be safely assumed that no nation has attained to greatness in commerce and manufactures without having, in the course of its history, imposed exactions and restrictions. I believe that the interests of the nation would be promoted by judicious protection; I believe that the agricultural interests of the Dominion would be promoted by protection, and that the manufactures being brought to the door of the farmer, would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were 3,000 miles away."

In that connection, to show that these sentiments were not only those of the hon. member but of leading gentlemen on the other side of the line, I would like to quote from a speech made by a gentleman in Congress in 1878 upon the Wood tariff, in which speech he seemed almost to have adopted the language of the hon. gentleman. The Hon. Mr. Tifton, on 3rd May, 1878, made these observations in Congress on the Wood tariff:

"Mr. Chairman, I want these gentlemen who favor this Bill to advise me where the operatives of all the manufacturing interests of this country are to find employment when the manufacturing interests are stricken down. I oppose this Bill because England is for it. I oppose this Bill because every English free trader in this country is in favor of it. I oppose this Bill because English manufacturers are for it. I oppose this Bill because I think it erring and inexpedient at this time. I oppose this Bill because it strikes down our home markets, by striking down labor, by striking down the consuming extent of the country—I mean the factories."

That speech made in the House of Congress is in entire accord with the speech made by the hon. gentleman. The speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk was endorsed by that of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), who, upon that occasion, seemed to grow somewhat wild in his endeavors to induce the hon. the Minister of Finance to adopt a fiscal policy for the protection of our manufactures. In his appeal to the House, he told them that he had pledged his electors, that when he came to Parliament he would ask for protection upon wheat. He was satisfied protection upon grain would be a grand thing for the farmers, and, moreover, he told the House that if they did not agree to his recommendation, he would bring down a petition signed by 100,000 grangers asking the Government to grant his demand. He was kind enough, however, to tell the House that the Government had yielded, to a certain extent, as regarded the fiscal policy, and he pointed out the benefits which would accrue from the adoption of that policy as far as he, a manufacturer, was concerned. This is the language he used in his strong appeal to the Minister of Finance:

"I trust that the wisdom which led him to yield that point will induce him to grant the same to other industries, and that no sectionalism

will tie his hands. I hope that other hon. gentlemen will speak on this subject, and whether the Committee is appointed or not, the interchange of views will lead the Finance Minister to bring in a tariff which will redound to the prosperity of the whole Dominion."

He pointed out that if one industry languished, all the others would. That was not the tone of the hon. gentleman's speech on Friday evening last. Then, on the contrary, he pointed out that if this resolution were adopted and the policy it proposed carried out, it might have the effect of destroying some industries. He thought, however, the larger industries would be able to hold their own although the smaller ones might collapse. He said:

"I have confidence that he will arrive at a conclusion on this point. I know the difficulty he will have in satisfying all parties, but we should keep in mind the fact that we are one people, and when one of our industries prospers all must benefit, while if one languishes all must suffer more or less."

That was the language then used by the hon. member for South Brant. In speaking of the pledges he had made to his electors, in showing what the people demanded at his hands, and in order to satisfy the electors when he went back to them that he had redeemed his pledges, he, on the floor of Parliament, said:

"At my last election when my opponents told them that they need not expect any protection from the Reform Government, I had to assure them that whenever this subject came up in the House I would raise my voice in their behalf, and I think it is hardly possible that the duty on wheat will give increased prices."

I wonder what the hon. gentleman says now? Then, as I said, he threatened the Government with bringing down his 100,000 grangers to compel the Government to grant what he thought should be granted:

"It is true some hon. gentlemen here think the United States pursue a commercial policy that is utterly nonsensical in some respects; but until the duties on agricultural products are removed, it is *prima facie* evidence that the farmers believe protection to be in their own interests."

We have often heard the hon. gentleman speak of immigration to this country. We have often heard him denounce the policy of the Government with reference to immigration, but in those days, when the question of immigration was in its infancy, when the policy of the Government of Ontario was strongly in favor of immigration, the hon. gentleman, in order to show what effect the adoption of the policy he recommended would have upon immigration, pointed out the advantage it would bring to some of our industries. He said:

"It is well known that we pay a cash bonus to the inhabitants of other countries to come into Canada and settle in our midst. It is a fact that some of those who have been thus induced to emigrate to Canada have been compelled, from want of employment to which they have been accustomed, to go to the United States. I believe by a defensive tariff you would not have to pay to bring those men here. Adopt it, and you will find the steam-whistle of our factories will be the call for them to come."

He also contended very strongly that the duty on wheat would not raise the price:

"I think it is hardly possible that the duty on wheat will give increased prices, because we raise a surplus and export it. Nevertheless, it will be a protection to our millers, and if any can be given to our agriculturists by a revision of the tariff they should get it. The party to which I belong, and which is led by the Premier, will make a mistake if they refuse to grant this Committee."

Then, in order to illustrate the beneficial effects of protection, the hon. gentleman points to his own industry. He said:

"The other year the Finance Minister, in revising the tariff, gave some encouragement to our industry which it never had before. The result was that a thousand men who were engaged in that industry in Germany were literally transported, by the change in the tariff, to Canada and set to work here. The cost of the article was not increased one iota, and Canada got all the benefit. The middlemen suffered a diminution of profits; but for them nobody seems to care much, the producer and consumer receiving all the sympathy. It is inevitable that a like result would flow to other manufacturers under the same policy. If the Finance Minister finds such is the case, I trust that the wisdom which led him to yield that point will induce him to grant the same to other industries, and that no sectionalism will tie his hands."

Mr. RYKERT.

Then the hon. gentleman was a little afraid that his friends from the Maritime Provinces might find some fault with the policy of protection, and he gave his opinion upon that question. He pointed out that if this policy were adopted, manufactures would spring up in the Maritime Provinces; and he thought, if they would look at the matter squarely, they would be satisfied, on a full investigation, that a protective policy was the best system for those Provinces. He said:

"I would remind the hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces that Ontario is not given up to manufacturing. That interest bears but a small proportion to others in this Province. It is the same in Quebec. That being the case, what is to prevent Halifax under a protective tariff from having its manufactories? What is to prevent the establishment of industries in St. John, Charlottetown, and the other towns of the Maritime Provinces? Protection does not mean Ontario's interests at the sacrifice of the interests of the Maritime Provinces. It is to stimulate the manufacturers of this Dominion irrespective of Provinces; but if any part of Canada could more successfully compete in our markets I think it is Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, from the fact that they have coal and iron lying side by side. They would be able to manufacture cheaply and compete with Ontario."

That, Sir, is another of the strong arguments which the hon. gentleman made, and I think that we, on this side of the House, are strongly indebted to them for those arguments, and the effect they had on the country. There is nothing which had so strong an effect on the country, there is nothing which so strongly endorsed the opinions expressed by the leader of the Government, as the speeches made by those two hon. gentlemen. They corroborated everything laid down by our party, and the result was a charge of Government, for which those hon. gentlemen have to thank themselves. Let me, for a minute, point out briefly what I consider the National Policy has done for Canada. I will not go into any elaborate statements, because this House thoroughly understands the question. It has been discussed over and over again, and it would insult the intelligence of this Legislature for me to go into the matter fully again, but the evidence is incontrovertible that we have got rid of the slaughter market of which we heard so much; we have got a home market; our manufactures have reached a much larger number, and a much larger amount of capital has been expended on them, and, instead of our farmers having to carry their produce 2,000 or 3,000 miles away, they have a market at their own doors. The hon. gentleman said that the prices have increased. Well, the other day, what I was going to call the Grit organ, but I do not know where to place it now, I do not think it is the Grit organ now, the *Globe*, made a statement in regard to certain prices. It was in regard to the price of hosiery, and one of the manufacturers of that article in Dundas was accused of making enormous charges. Mr. Lennard, of Bickford & Lennard, addressed a letter to the *Globe* saying that the prices in 1879, under the 17½ p.c. tariff, were for No. 1, \$1 a dozen; for No. 2, \$1.20 a dozen, and for No. 3, \$1 a dozen; that in 1887, under the 30 per cent. tariff, the prices were 85 cents for No. 1, \$1 for No. 2, and 77½ cents for No. 3; and that in 1888, under 10 cents a pound and 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, they were 82½ cents, 95 cents and 75 cents respectively. Then in regard to agricultural implements. There is a firm in the hon. gentleman's own constituency, the firm of Harris & Sons, of Brantford, who sold agricultural implements in 1878 for \$300 which they sold in 1887 for \$150. That shows that the farmer has not been very much injured by this policy. There are one or two more items which I will point out for the benefit of my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who I see is taking notes. In the years 1878 and 1887, we imported the following quantities of the grain and other articles named:

	1878.	1887.
Oats	2,162,292 bush.	19,797 bush.
Wheat	5,935,411 "	22,534 "
Indian corn	7,887,507 "	2,029,061 "
Flour	312,864 bbls.	168,124 bbls.

When you come to consider the report of Mr. Blue, you will find what has happened during this period. He points out that the following was the difference in the growth of grain from 1871 to 1881:—

	1871.	1881.
Corn.....	3,802,830 bush.	9,025,142 bush.
Wheat.....	6,367,961 "	20,247,452 "
Oats.....	42,459,153 "	70,493,131 "
Barley.....	11,496,038 "	16,844,968 "

You will see that since the National Policy came into force the production has very largely increased, and, following it down to the present time, you will find that it has enormously increased. Then, if you look at the exports, you will see where the farmers have got their markets. They exported to England the following articles in the years named:—

	1878.	1887.
Cheese.....	36,331,358 lbs.	73,185,517 lbs.
Sheep.....	11,985 "	68,147 "
Cattle.....	7,433 "	63,522 "
Wheat.....	3,402,625 bush.	5,048,084 bush.

So you will see who had the home market. I think that is strong evidence to show that the farmer has been somewhat benefited and that he has a market under the National Policy. I was somewhat surprised to read a letter which appeared in the *Mail* on Saturday, in reference to the farmers of Ontario, from Mr. Shaw, who is the recognised author of these pamphlets upon the subject of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. He says that Ontario is so much retrograding, that the production of the farms has fallen off:

"That the day is not far distant when we will have to import rather than export coarse grains from Ontario eastward. At least these are the indications, and this will apply to all kinds of coarse grain except barley."

The question at the polls last January was not a question of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, but a question between free trade and a protective tariff. We know what the platform was of the present Government, and that platform is fully laid down in the resolution passed by the Manufacturers' Association at a meeting which they held in Montreal in February, which says:

"Resolved, That the Conservative Government of Sir John A. Macdonald, with its clear, definite and emphatic policy of protection to Canadian industries, is alone worthy of support, and this meeting pledges itself to do all in its power to secure the return of candidates pledged to support the present Government, believing that the best interests of the country demand that there shall be no uncertainty in the tariff policy of the Dominion."

These gentlemen upon that occasion, as I understand, were compelled to accept the policy laid down in the Malvern speech of Mr. Blake, and the policy he laid down in Toronto was not a policy of free trade but a policy of revenue tariff. Upon that occasion in Toronto, Mr. Blake said:

"Our adversaries wish to present to you an issue as between the present tariff and absolute free trade. That is not the true issue. Free trade is, as I have repeatedly explained, for us, impossible, and the issue is whether the present tariff is perfect, 'or defective or unjust' . . . We have no longer a large surplus to dispose of, and a large deficit and a greatly increased scale of expenditure to meet. And it is clearer than ever that a very high scale of taxation must be retained, and that manufacturers have nothing to fear."

Then he was bidding for the manufacturing interest, and he stated there, as he did at Malvern, that there should not be any change. We remember that the Malvern speech came as a thunderbolt upon the people of the Province of Ontario, that it was the subject of discussion in *Grip*, and I recollect, Sir, seeing a *Grip* paper in that style (holding up the copy of *Grip*) called "The Sword Swallowed."

An hon. MEMBER. No, he is not swallowing it; he is showing how easy it can be swallowed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Send it across when you have done with it.

Mr. RYKERT. It says:

Manager Cartwright.—"It's a real, genuine swallow, ladies and gentlemen! No deception! Any manufacturer in the country can come up and examine for himself."

Then we find some gentleman in the rear called

"*Urgent Party in the Background.*—H'm! wonder why he can't swallow this sword!"—

that is, the Prohibition sword. At any rate, we had in this paper the idea that the people were staggered at the idea of the hon. member for West Durham bolting down all his former principles on the free trade policy, and he is represented as the clown, and Manager Cartwright the one who showed round the circus. Now, I say that the issue at the last election was plain and unmistakable, but it seems rather extraordinary that on this occasion we could find these hon. gentlemen adopting a different course. Taking advantage, I suppose, of their leader's absence, they come down here with a policy directly antagonistic to the principles laid down by him in his speech at Malvern and also his speeches in Toronto and Hamilton. They pretend that the farmers of Ontario are in favor of this new kind of policy. I deny it *in toto*. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) pointed out that a large majority of the Farmers' Institutes had passed resolutions in favor of commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity, or some thing of that kind. Now, I tell the hon. gentleman that the resolutions put to those meetings, with one or two exceptions, were not in favor of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. But hon. gentlemen opposite embody all these—commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity, or reciprocity. At all these meetings, what did they say? Why, Sir, they said to the farmers: "Look how you flourished from 1854 to 1866." They pointed to the past history of the country under the treaty, and said, "You flourished then." But they said not one word about discriminating against England; they dared not say one word about direct taxation; they dared not say one word about annexation; they dared not say one single word about the revenues of the country being deficient. Upon the contrary, they said: "Gentlemen, look how you have prospered; would you not like to prosper in the same way again?" Every resolution carried was carried under false pretences. I attended one of these meetings, and they tried to bolt that down the electors of Lincoln, and the electors saw plainly the other side of the story. They were told—exactly as the hon. member for South Oxford stated at Ingersoll—they were told that there was danger of annexation, there was danger of direct taxation, there was danger of discrimination against England. They would not point out these things, however, at the meetings held all over the country, and they tried to get a snap verdict. They moved a resolution at the close of the meetings, and at every one of these meetings the question was not what the effect of commercial union would be, but what would be gained by reciprocity. On Friday last the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) took occasion to have a little fun at the expense of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, and also the senior member for the city of Hamilton (Mr. Brown), and he read from speeches at the Dominion Board of Trade, and he also read a copy of the resolution. Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman had been desirous of being fair towards the member for Hamilton, he would have admitted that the language used by him, and which he read, was exactly similar to that which he used in this House. On the 20th of March, in this debate, the hon. member for Hamilton said:

"I am most sincere when I say that the Americans are a people with whom we should live in the greatest amity, with whom we should have the freest commercial relations so long as they do not affect the status of this country as a part and parcel of the British Empire. We propose now to have the closest relations with the people of the United States, and our Government have put in the Customs Act a standing offer to

interchange with the United States in natural products; but beyond that this country should not and will not go."

These are the sentiments expressed by that hon. gentleman the other night, and they are exactly in accordance with his speech before the Dominion Board of Trade. Now, what did the Minister of the Interior say? The hon. gentleman quoted a speech which the Minister of the Interior made before the Board of Trade, but he was not exactly fair. The hon. gentleman complained that I did not read the whole of his speech. Well, life is too short to read the whole of his long speeches; at the same time I think it but fair that in challenging the conduct of the Minister of the Interior and trying to show his inconsistency, the hon. gentleman should have read all that he said before the Dominion Board of Trade. I have it here on page 95, which the hon. gentleman could have found in the library if he had looked for it. The Minister of the Interior, then Mr. Thos. White, said:

"It is quite true that the extension of our markets will be a benefit to the country. But it is equally true that a home market is the best of all markets, and we can create that by the building up of our manufactures. It would be a great boon to the farmers, if they will then have a market at their own doors for their produce. Therefore, I hold that anything injurious to the manufacturing interest cannot be to the advantage of the farming community."

Now, why did not the hon. gentleman read that? He did not think that worth his while, but he thought he would make a point against the hon. gentleman by misconstruing what he said.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why did you not read the whole of it? You have not read the tenth part of his speech?

Mr. RYKERT. I have enough to do to attend to the hon. gentleman. I have taken up the somewhat lengthy task of replying particularly to the hon. gentleman, and I do not feel disposed to read the whole of that speech.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then why does the hon. gentleman blame me for not reading the whole?

Mr. RYKERT. I think the hon. gentleman's speech is like grasping at the substance and gaining the shadow. The hon. gentleman's speech seemed to me to point to the fact that he has some doubt about the policy now being enunciated. He has some doubts about the effect upon the country, he has some doubt about the effect upon his own industry, but he says, "I am a patriot, and I will sacrifice my own industry for the benefit of my country." That is the substance of the hon. gentleman's speech. Now, let me take the hon. gentleman again into my confidence for a few minutes. It is just as well that I should deal with him now. The hon. gentleman took up the Depression Committee Report in 1876, and he says, "Why, Mr. Gurney is against the National Policy—he is in favor of unrestricted free trade," and all that sort of thing. He took Mr. Massey, Mr. Goldie, Mr. Rosamond, and all those gentlemen. Now, let me tell the hon. gentleman that I took the trouble of telegraphing to all these gentlemen to know if what was said of them was correct. I have all their answers, and they are in the negative.

An hon. MEMBER. Read them.

Mr. RYKERT. I intend to read them. The hon. gentleman said, in reading a letter that the member for East York handed to him, that he did not mention names. Well, he did drop a name. Mr. Speight, manager. I happened to catch that name, so I took the liberty of telegraphing to that gentleman, and here is his answer, addressed to Frank Madill, M.P.:

"Unrestricted reciprocity would destroy our manufacturing industries and not benefit the farmer. Prices are low for all kinds of implements; farther competition would destroy us."

That is from Mr. Speight, manager of the establishment to which the hon. gentleman referred.

Mr. RYKERT.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He does not want to state what is not true. I did not say that Mr. Speight had testified. The Minister of Customs knows that. I give it an emphatic contradiction.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman misunderstands me.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, I do not.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes, you do.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I know what you are trying to do.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman read the letter and referred to the name of Mr. Speight as the manager, and that is the way we found who the letter came from.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I did not.

Mr. RYKERT. I said the hon. gentleman read the name Speight.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I mentioned the name of Speight.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Allow me to explain. If the hon. gentleman was a gentleman, and if he was carrying out—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the hon. gentleman was carrying out what was the understanding at that time with the First Minister and the members present, when the name slipped out inadvertently, he would not have mentioned it. I did not complain that it was mentioned. I did not say Mr. Speight; indeed the letter in which the connection with Mr. Speight came in was in respect to the manager, and Mr. Speight differed from the manager, the manager holding that unrestricted reciprocity would not injure their business, Mr. Speight holding the opposite.

Mr. RYKERT. We have the letter. The hon. gentleman is very strong in his language, yet he has never shown that he himself possessed any of the characteristics of a gentleman in this House. From the very commencement of his career in Parliament till now he seems to have fallen a little from grace.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have caught you.

Mr. RYKERT. I sent a telegram to Mr. Speight, the manager of that concern, to know what he thought of it—and we have the answer and you have the answer now. I also telegraphed Mr. Massey of Toronto. The reply I got was:

"I certainly do not favor unrestricted reciprocity to National Policy."

Mr. Goldie was also put down as one in favor of free trade. He telegraphed me:

"I am not in favor of commercial union. I consider the country is prosperous under the present policy."

"JAMES GOLDIE."

I have a letter also from him, which arrived this morning, and which I will also give to the hon. gentleman. Those are the names he quoted. I knew very well they did not hold those views—perhaps they have changed, like hon. gentlemen opposite. We are now discussing what is best for the country at the present time. The letter says:

"GUELPH, 24th March, 1888.

"J. O. RYKERT, Esq., M.P.,
"Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR.—I am in receipt of your telegram, informing me that Mr. Paterson had stated last night that I was in favor of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, and asking me if this statement was correct.

"I am opposed to commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity, as it is called. I am opposed to our people begging reciprocity from the United States or toadying to them whatever. I believe we can build up a country of our own, the future of which will surpass the

imagination of the most sanguine now. The present policy of our Government has done great good to this country, and I am as strongly in favor of it now as in 1878. I am bitterly opposed to the degrading spectacle of a number of our legislators—"

Mr. RYKERT, The hon. member for South Brant among the number, I suppose.

"begging reciprocity from the United States."

I have also a telegram from Mr. Rosamond of Almonte, another gentleman quoted by the hon. member :

"Paterson's statement altogether incorrect. Am as much in favor of National Policy as I ever was. Totally opposed to any agreement with the United States that would interfere with Canada's right to regulate her own tariff."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Might I ask the hon. member how Mr. Rosamond knew the statement I made?

Mr. RYKERT. I telegraphed the gentleman.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then I say the hon. gentleman telegraphed something I never said. What I read was what those gentlemen said in 1876. Did he telegraph them that?

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish the hon. gentleman would not interrupt. It always leads to very unpleasant incidents and we had better proceed with the debate.

Mr. RYKERT. I do not object to it. The hon. gentleman does not know any better.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I always nail things when said.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hold that if an hon. member conceives that a misstatement has been made he has the right to nail it then, and that is the best time to set it at rest.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not understand that the member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) said there was a misrepresentation. He was only putting the question as to how the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) communicated with Mr. Rosamond. That is what I understood. If there had been any question of deliberate misrepresentation I would certainly have allowed it with pleasure, as I have done already. What I meant to say was this: that it is better for the House, in a debate like this, that hon. members should not interrupt a speech, unless a question of order or of privilege is raised.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I will avail myself of your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I distinctly claim that the hon. gentleman has made a misstatement. The hon. gentleman led off by saying that I had made certain statements with regard to those gentlemen, and he said he had an emphatic contradiction in regard to them, and he read certain replies. I asked how the gentleman knew the statement I made. He said: "I telegraphed him." The statements I read were read, as I said at the time, from the report of the Committee on Trade Depression in 1876. I read the questions, I read the answers published and submitted to this House. That was what I read. The hon. gentleman now rises and reads a telegram, having sent a telegram that Paterson said so-and-so—what I never said—that the gentleman is not in favor of commercial union. If you think that is an honorable course, Mr. Speaker, I will leave it in the judgment of the House.

Mr. RYKERT. It is quite evident what the hon. gentleman stated on Friday night—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a point of order, Mr. Speaker. After that has been raised, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) should, in courtesy and in justice to my hon. friend, read the telegram which he sent.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) induced this House to believe on Friday night that these gentlemen were in favor of this resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not at all.

Mr. RYKERT. That was his sole object in reading it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Read the telegram.

Mr. RYKERT. His sole object in reading the extracts—

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Produce your telegram.

Mr. RYKERT—was to satisfy the House and the country that they were in favor of it. I asked: Are you in favor of it or not?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I certainly think the hon. gentleman should read the telegram he sent. Here is a question of veracity raised between the two hon. gentlemen.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman does not seem to grasp the question altogether. They had better wait till I get through with them and perhaps they will be satisfied.

Some hon. MEMBERS. The telegram.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman knew that the whole question before the House that night was reciprocity or free trade.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The House knows what I said; it is here in *Hansard*.

Mr. RYKERT. I took the opportunity of reading the evidence that was taken. If the hon. gentleman wants more reading I can give it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Yes; but there is a question of veracity.

Mr. RYKERT. There is no question of veracity. My word will go as far as that of the hon. gentleman, and I have a record of 500 majority to prove it. The hon. gentleman came to my city during the last election, and the result of the election was to increase my majority to near 500. It was never more than 100 before that time. The people were so thoroughly satisfied that the hon. gentleman was talking nonsense, that they increased my majority very largely. If hon. gentlemen opposite hope to disconcert me by this kind of interruption they are very much mistaken. I rather like it. I want to give the hon. member for South Brant the evidence of a person nearer home, that is, J. K. Osborne, one of the leading members of Harris & Co., of Brantford. This gentleman addressed a letter the other day to the *Empire*, in which he gives his opinion on this question. He says:

"The avowed object of Commercial Unionists, from a commercial standpoint, is to secure for Canada the cheapest markets in which to buy, the largest markets in which to sell, and the development of her natural resources, which it is claimed would immediately follow. That such would be the result of unrestricted trade with the United States I very much doubt; but, granting that these expectations would, in some measure, be realised, would not far greater benefits accrue to Canada by making Great Britain, instead of the United States, the objective point for closer commercial relations."

He goes on to say:

"It may be true that Canadian agriculturists might derive some benefit from free intercourse with the United States, and it is on this large mass of the electorate that the strongest guns of the Commercial Unionists are brought to bear. I believe that the vast majority of the Canadian farmers are as well, if not better off, than those of the United States, and until something more tangible than a bare statement to the contrary is presented, will stick to my belief. I believe this to be true of all Canadian farmers from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and if a comparison is instituted let it be a fair one, say Ontario farmers against those of New York, Ohio or Michigan, and Manitobans against those in Minnesota and Dakota.

"Unrestricted trade with our southern neighbors would certainly not enhance the price of wheat, cheese, butter or fruit, for the market for these great staples is Great Britain, and the farmers of the United States are our competitors in these markets. Our cattle also find largest sale in Great Britain, and if care was taken in the breeding of horses the market in Great Britain would be a limitless and a paying one. Even in smaller items, such as poultry and eggs, England will be our best customer as soon as the proper way of shipping is known and adopted.

"It is a mistaken idea, too, to imagine that were all the restrictions of trade removed, the Canadian article would be enhanced by the present American duty placed upon it. Such a result could not be expected by the most sanguine. The American buyer takes our horses and our barley because he needs them, not because they are cheaper, but they are better adapted for his purpose than any other. Were the tariff barrier removed there might be more trade, but it would not be at greatly enhanced prices to the Canadian seller. The American consumer would largely reap the benefit of the reduction of duties, otherwise the whole argument of free trade falls to the ground."

This is an important letter coming from one's own town. I have here a letter from Mr. Gurney, of Hamilton, who has sent it to me unsolicited. It reads as follows:—

"I am informed this morning that I have been quoted as a manufacturer in favor of reciprocity with the United States. To this I would give a most unequivocal denial. Were I called upon to say whether my individual business could compete with United States manufacturers, I should probably declare my belief that it could, but that is not the question, but would it be wise to readjust my whole business, involving the sacrifice of two-thirds of my plant, on the basis of a treaty with such neighbors as we have on our southern border, to which I reply it would be the greatest blunder ever advocated by a business man, and what applies to the individual is equally applicable to the whole manufacturing and mercantile community. I write this with some haste, as I leave immediately."

That is the letter sent to me by Mr. Gurney, of Hamilton, without his being solicited for it or even spoken to. The only inference to be drawn from the hon. gentleman's remarks is just as I indicate, that the hon. gentleman quoted those gentlemen as being in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, otherwise what would be the use of quoting them at all. It seems somewhat singular, Mr. Speaker, that those hon. gentlemen should have so suddenly changed their front in this House. In the early part of the Session a resolution was given notice of by the member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), to this effect:

"That in the opinion of this House, commercial union with the United States would be mutually advantageous to both countries, and it is therefore the duty of the Government to use all proper means to secure such union."

Sir, after that resolution had been on the notice paper for a few days, we find it suddenly withdrawn and a new motion introduced which is now the subject-matter of discussion in this House. My purpose in alluding to that is simply this, that those gentlemen do not seem to understand what they really want as regards this question. It is necessary for the members of this House to know exactly how they do stand when we come to discuss and express an opinion on this resolution, and I think I will be able to show the House what the position of hon. gentlemen opposite is. If they want union upon this question, I think, Sir, that I can show them that they themselves possess different opinions on the same question. I look upon this matter as simply a question of triumph for the *Globe* newspaper. That newspaper has come out in favor of direct taxation and free trade, and after it came out with this policy the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the member for South Wellington (Mr. Innes) opposed it, but now they seem to favor it. I think I can show to the House and to the country that those gentlemen have no views of this question at all. First, we find commercial union thoroughly discussed by them, and we find it discussed by every newspaper in the country, then we find unrestricted reciprocity, then we find continental free trade discussed by the *Globe* newspaper and all the papers throughout the country, and then, at last, when the Opposition have been for a couple of months without a policy, the *Globe* comes out in favor of direct taxation and continental free trade, or something like that, and the Opposition members follow suit. I think I can show satisfactorily that this was not always the opinion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I think he was not in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. He will not answer that. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is in favor of unrestricted reciprocity? Yes. The hon. gentleman nods his head. I shall recollect that, because when I come to it by-and-bye I think I can show

Mr. RYKERT.

that he is entirely opposed to it, and I think it is our duty in discussing this question to know whether its advocates are sincere or not, whether they have thoroughly discussed it and considered it, and whether they thoroughly understand it and are sufficiently in favor of it to propound such a policy for acceptance by the country. We are told in the plainest possible language by the mover of this resolution that he voiced the sentiment of the country. I would like to ask just here, why is it if this policy which is to be inscribed on the banner next election and which the member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has told us he "has nailed his colors to the mast and will go to the polls," I should like to know, Sir, why the leader of the Opposition is not the mover of this resolution? Why, if this is going to be the policy of the Reform party, is the leader of the Opposition not the mover and propounder of this policy? I will tell you why, Sir. It is because he is not in favor of it; it is because he has not made up his mind on it, he has never made up his mind on it and as far as the records outside of the House show he has not pronounced an opinion on it. When I heard the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) state that he voiced the sentiments of the people of this country, I felt inclined to take exception to it, because I knew from what I had read that even his own party were not united on it. I read the *Advertiser*

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell) I have nothing to do with the *Advertiser*.

Mr. RYKERT. Oh, no. I read the *Guelph Mercury*, the *Brantford Expositor*, the *Canadian Post*, the *Galt Reformer*, or whatever you call the Liberal paper up there, I have read all those papers published in the Reform interest and I find they are opposed to the *Globe* on this question. I find that they are all at sixes and sevens whether they shall have unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, but they are opposed to free trade and direct taxation. I find all those different opinions expressed and I have the right to ask myself how is it those gentlemen can come here now and boldly assert that the policy expressed in this resolution before the House is one in the best interests of this country? The member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said he expressed the opinion of the country. I take issue on that point. I say he does not, and I am prepared to show it before I sit down. He used these words:

"It is true that I am fortified and encouraged in bringing forward this motion by the knowledge that in so doing I only voice the opinions of the representatives of the Liberal party in this Parliament; and, furthermore, that I have every reason a man can have for believing that when I give utterance to their opinions I also give utterance to the opinions of the vast majority of those who support us and of a very important section, to say the least of it, of those who, on other questions, have differed from us very widely."

That is what the hon. gentleman said. Well, let us see what his leader said. The hon. leader of the Opposition made a speech on 3rd October, 1887, in which he said:

"I am not quite certain that those who have constituted themselves the champions and promoters of commercial union can now present it as a certain or definite principle. It is yet vague, but the substratum in an aspiration towards reciprocity. The idea is still uncertain, it may be unhappily expressed, but the substance of it is that the most advantageous thing that, commercially, the people of Canada could look to, would be some form of reciprocity with the United States."

Then, the organ of the hon. member for South Brant, the *Brantford Expositor*, on 28th January last, had something to say on this subject; and I want to see whether the views of hon. gentlemen opposite and their organs are in accord, because there is no use of our voting for the resolution unless we know that hon. gentlemen opposite are in favor of it themselves. That paper, referring to the *Globe* said:

"We regret that such a powerful exponent of public opinion should seek to disseminate the idea that it is only by a free trade propaganda or something of that sort, that the Dominion can be redeemed from its unsatisfactory régime. We do not believe it, and we would ask to em-

phases the fact, that the *Globe* in its new departure does not voice in any sense the views of the political party of which it is a leading advocate."

We also find that, the *Sentinel Review*, of Woodstock, which has been fighting the *Globe* on this question for some time and discussing it very intelligently, on 20th February, discussed the policy advocated by the *Globe* in the following terms:—

"The Liberal party needs a platform more stable than the shifting sands of evasion and inconstancy, and so long as the leader could be held responsible for the utterances of their hitherto recognised organ, it was absolutely necessary to repudiate the free trade dogma. It is not a grateful task, but until it is done throughout the whole country the Liberal party in Dominion politics will be a ghastly case of suspended animation.

There does not seem to be much unity among leading Liberals of the country on this subject, although the hon. member for South Oxford, says he leads them. Then we find the *Lindsay Post* denouncing free trade and direct taxation as follows:—

"The *Globe* in a month or two is like the little boy with the potatoes—will be digging up the hills to see if the free trade direct tax potatoes or principles it has been planting have really been making any growth. When the *Globe* essays to lay down a new line of policy for the Reform party it is time to pound a little common sense into our contemporary."

The hon. member for Halifax spoke in very strong terms the other night on this question, and in the city of Halifax on 8th December, 1887, he made use of this language:

"I know there is a strong feeling in the United States against admitting wheat free from Canada in competition with their own, and I believe there is equally a strong objection taken by the coal interest against placing coal on the free list. Cannot then these articles be eliminated from the contract?"

Then, we find a gentleman in this House distinguished for the cordial support he gives to the Opposition, speaking of the "unfortunate differences" in the party. I see him smile; no doubt he recognises the phrase. The *Guelph Mercury* came to the relief of the party as it thought it was going to pieces too rapidly, and that it was time for it to settle its differences. On 11th February, just before Parliament met, it said:

"The *Globe* has had pretty good proof by this time that his advocacy of the absolute free trade and direct tax finds no sympathy, and has had no support from the Liberal party of Canada, with two exceptions, that we know of, nor have its views been endorsed by any member of the party as far as we are aware. Of course the *Globe* is only responsible for its own utterances, but it is regretted that a paper which had for many years voiced the sentiments of the Liberal party, should now with a singular want of judgment go off at a tangent and take up a platform which in its sober senses it must know is utterly impracticable in the present condition of the country, and which were the Liberals, as a party, to adopt, would lead to its disintegration and ruin."

The hon. gentleman I suppose will not repudiate the *Guelph Mercury*; and we find him on 11th February opposing this very resolution.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. RYKERT. He opposed the principle laid down by the *Globe* newspaper.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes; and the resolution brought before the House to-day is entirely in accord with what has been laid down by the *Globe* newspaper. And we find articles in that paper day after day calling upon this House to vote for that resolution; but hon. gentlemen opposite, finding that commercial union has been pronounced to be a political humbug, come here and go for something else. The *Brantford Expositor* is also very strong on this subject. In an article of 10th February, 1887, headed "Putting on the brakes," it says:

"It is pretty tough for those who differ from the *Globe* in its free trade direct tax platform to be dubbed the protectionist tail of the Liberal party. In fact, we may say it is cheeky for it to spring a new departure on the country, and coolly appropriate the whole Liberal party, always excepting the tail, as thoroughly imbued with its new

found belief. And we would like to know where the protectionist tail of the Liberal party is? If it ever had one, those whom the *Globe* designates the rats of 1879 constituted it, and the leading organ's attitude towards them afforded little expectation of their ever returning to the fold."

Now, Sir, I give these extracts to show that when the hon. member for South Oxford stated that he was in accord with the Liberal party and with the great majority of the people who, though not belonging to the Liberal party are in favor of reciprocity, he does not voice their sentiments at all. On the contrary, I think I have shown that the different organs of the party are opposed to the resolution. What I object to in hon. gentlemen opposite is the course they have been pursuing on this question. I would like to know how we stand to-day as a Parliament. We stand as a Parliament with a resolution on our Statute-book pledged that as soon as the United States shall agree to reduce their tariff on certain articles, we shall pass an Order in Council admitting the same articles into Canada on the same terms. The Act of 1879 enacts as follows:—

"Any or all of the following articles, that is to say, animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees, shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat and all other grain, flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted or smoked) and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation by the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada."

That is the position we occupy here to-day as a Legislature.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman approve of that resolution? That is contrary to the National Policy.

Mr. RYKERT. I will state what my own views are on that matter in a very few minutes; and, perhaps, they will not be in accord with those of the hon. gentleman, or those of hon. members on this side altogether. Now, that is our proposition, and that has been on our Statute-book since 1879. We, a short time ago, through the mouth of our representative in Washington, made overtures of which this House is well aware. Sir Charles Tupper, then acting as one of the commissioners on the treaty question, made a proposition with which all the hon. gentlemen here are familiar, but this proposition was not accepted by the commissioners on the other side. This was the proposition Sir Charles Tupper made:

"That with a view of removing all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of a mutual arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada and Newfoundland."

Then we find the answer. Now, if the American commissioners were disposed to treat on the terms laid down in our Statutes, there would be no difficulty whatever in at once arriving at a conclusion. But they were not prepared to accept that, and they would make no counter proposition. They refused, on the contrary, to discuss the question at all, their answer being:

"While continuing their proposal heretofore submitted—on the 20th ultimo—and fully sharing the desire of Her Britannic Majesty's plenipotentiaries to remove all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, the American plenipotentiaries are constrained, after careful consideration, to decline to ask from the President authority requisite to consider the proposal conveyed to them on the 3rd instant as a means to the desired end, because the greater freedom of commercial intercourse so proposed would necessitate an adjustment of the present tariff of the United States by Congressional action, which adjustment the American plenipotentiaries consider to be manifestly impracticable of accomplishment, through the medium of a treaty under the circumstances now existing."

That shows, that so far as the present condition of affairs is concerned, we are willing to adhere to our offer of 1879, or

even go further, as expressed by our plenipotentiary. The hon. gentleman asked what my view of the matter is? I will tell the hon. gentleman that I retain the same views on the question which I expressed in 1865, when addressing the Agricultural Society of Ontario, as their President, in the city of London. It was the year before the abrogation of the treaty, and I then publicly declared that I did not care whether the treaty was abrogated or not, because I believed that the Province of Ontario, and the Dominion at large, could flourish without it. I still am of the same opinion. I still believe that we can go on and prosper without a reciprocity treaty. I still believe that we can go on side by side with our neighbors in generous rivalry and prosper, as we have shown we can in the last fifteen years. But while I am of that opinion, I stand pledged, as a member of the Parliament which adopted that resolution, to support it as far as it goes and no further. I am not prepared to go further. That is my position in the matter. I am somewhat surprised—though perhaps I ought not to be—that hon. gentlemen opposite should persist in crying out that this Dominion is in a dilapidated state. It seems to be a matter for rejoicing to them that this country should not be in a prosperous condition. We all recollect that, some years ago, when speaking about the Budget, the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) was called upon to reply to the Finance Minister. That hon. gentleman then expressed the opinion and the hope that before very long Canada would come to that position when she would be in a state of almost degradation. He hoped to see the day when we would not be prosperous, and looked forward to the time, which, he said, has now arrived, when we would be in a state of decay. In response to the speech of Sir Leonard Tilley, then Finance Minister, he said:

"This country will, as I have said, pass through a period of stringency and trade depression as well as of prosperity, and I venture to prophecy that in two years from now, the hon. Minister, if he still retains his position as hon. Minister of Finance, will find that he will be compelled to offer apologies; he will explain how this factory and that factory was closed; how wages in this department were lowered, and how it occurs that the exports have declined. I believe this, and I am confirmed in my views by writers in commercial journals, equally well informed with the hon. Finance Minister. And then we, on this side of the House, will have the satisfaction of knowing that though we have had to wait for it a few years, till a period of trial came round, yet it was bound to come at last."

I hope the hon. gentleman is quite satisfied, now that he says we are in a state of decay, that there is no prosperity whatever in the country, and that we are rapidly going to the dogs. That cry has been raised throughout the whole country by hon. gentlemen opposite. The sentiment of every right thinking man must at once condemn their line of action. As was stated the other night, you may go to the other side of the line, and you will not find an American in his place in the Legislature or out of it, crying out against his country. Americans may be driven from the cities to the country, they may be driven from the East to the West, they may fail in their efforts to secure a competency, but you will never find them going back on their country. In this respect, they offer a striking contrast to hon. gentlemen opposite, to the hon. member for Bothwell and the others who seem to rejoice in declaring that our country is in a state of despondency.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What did you say in 1877?

Mr. RYKERT. Nothing that I am aware of.

Mr. MILLS. (Bothwell.) Read the resolution of your leader.

Mr. RYKERT. I said nothing in 1877 about it. I am answerable for my own statements. The hon. gentleman has referred to that resolution, but he will find nothing of despondency in it. The right hon. gentleman who moved it speaks hopefully of the future, but he said that the policy then pursued, if it were continued, would be disastrous to

Mr. RYKERT.

the country, and that the only remedy was the adoption of a new policy.

Mr. MILLS. (Bothwell). And we say that is disastrous. We say the same thing of your policy as you did of ours.

Mr. RYKERT. But the hon. gentlemen opposite have been shown to be false prophets. These hon. gentlemen talk a great deal about their organ. I want them to listen to what I am going to read from their own organ on this question. The measure of these gentlemen is accurately taken by their own mouthpiece; their organ seems to fully understand what they were at; it seems fully to understand that they are determined to smash Confederation and destroy the whole country. No later than 8th September, 1887, I found this article in the *Globe*:

"One of the standing misfortunes of Canadians consists in the existence within our borders of many pessimistic individuals, often active and able, who have no desire to perpetuate our Confederation, and who further movements, good or bad indifferently, with a single aim to create general despair. For years past these men have been telling the people, who live together harmoniously enough, that it is obviously impossible for them to continue to jog along in agreement to disagree about creeds. Instead of trying to calm race disputes, they have seized every occasion to exacerbate these, that Ontario and Quebec, Canada and *Canadien*, might join in declaring any political fate more endurable than the continuance of the effort to build up a Canadian nation. They are the wailers over Canadian geography,"—

There they are—

"the whettors of every prejudice"—

There they are—

"the moaners over the wrongs of great majorities, the foes of tolerance"—

There they are—

"the enemies of all who counsel the people to make the best and not the worst of one another"—

There they are—

"the magnifiers of business troubles, the spreaders of panic, the groaners over every difficulty in Canada's development"—

There they are—

"When they join in demand for reform they cry that life is not worth living without it; when the reform is wrought they weep that the situation is as bad as ever."

The *Globe* took accurate stock of these gentlemen. Now, I entirely dissent from their statement that the Province of Ontario in particular and the Dominion in general is retrograding, and I am prepared to show from their own organ that to-day Canada is more prosperous than ever it was. There is an old saying that chickens come home to roost. In 1886—and I commend this to the attention of the leader of the Opposition, though I am sure he does not join in the crusade of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but I observe that up to the present time we have not had any indication of his views upon this question. In 1886, a discussion was raised in the Ontario Legislature in reference to the terrible expenses of the Ontario Government. Of course, that was enough to make anyone cry out, because the leader of the Opposition knows very well what a terrible expensive Government that has been. When they are charged with the increased expense of which they were guilty, we find the organ of the hon. gentleman—I beg his pardon—we do not know which is his organ, but it used to be the organ of the party—I find this language in the *Globe*, and I commend it to the attention of the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House because they will find in it the absurdity of their continuing to decry the country from day to day:

"The critics of the Budget in the Legislative Assembly have undertaken to show that the Government is extravagant because the expenditure is greater now than it was fifteen years ago. Do those persons believe that Ontario has been standing still for fifteen years? If they do not—if they admit that there has been growth and expansion—are they able to show that the country has not got value for the money paid out, or that payment has been in any degree disproportionate to

the service? Let us have a knowledge of the facts before we condemn any party.

"In 1871 the Dominion had a population of 3,577,176, and an area of land occupied of 37,041,073 acres, while Ontario had a population of 1,618,245 and an area occupied of 16,128,399 acres. In 1881 the population of the Dominion—inclusive of the new Provinces and Territories—was 4,321,919, and the area occupied was 45,322,694 acres; while the population of Ontario was 1,920,337, and the area occupied was 19,224,362 acres. This shows that in the former the increase of population was 20·8 per cent., and of area occupied 22½ per cent.; while in the latter the increase of population was 18¾ per cent., and of area occupied 19 per cent.

"No Province or State of America, we make bold to say, has such a record as this Ontario of ours; and if our representatives in the Legislative Assembly have the courage to act as true sons of Ontario, regardless of party ties in another place, and to insist upon a policy of 'hands off' when its rights and interests are threatened, the men of this generation will live to see it become the wealthiest and most populous commonwealth of the continent, as it is now the best governed."

There is the evidence of their own organ that Ontario is more prosperous than almost any country in the world, and is prospering and increasing in every respect. Let us go a little further. We have the report of Mr. Blue who has charge of the Bureau of Statistics in the Province of Ontario, and his words are very significant as to the growth of fall wheat, spring wheat, barley and oats in the Province of Ontario, showing that it is ahead of any ten States of the American Union. Let us take them in their order. The following is the average production of cereals in Ontario and the principal grain growing States of the Union in bushels for five years:—

<i>Fall Wheat.</i>	
Ontario	21
New York	14
Pennsylvania	12
Ohio	13
Michigan	16
Indiana	13
Illinois	12
Mississippi	10
California	12
Kansas	15
<i>Spring Wheat.</i>	
Ontario	16
Wisconsin	12
Minnesota	13
Iowa	11
Nebraska	12
Dakota	10
<i>Barley.</i>	
Ontario	26
New York	23
Wisconsin	24
Minnesota	23
Iowa	22
Nebraska	22
California	19
<i>Oats.</i>	
Ontario	37
New York	29
Pennsylvania	22
Ohio	32
Michigan	34
Indiana	34
Missouri	31
Minnesota	34
Iowa	34
Mississippi	26
Kansas	31
Nebraska	32

Let us see what he says in his report, and I commend this to the attention of the croakers against Ontario:

"Take the Province of Ontario, in the Dominion of Canada, as a sample. There, substantial wealth or a reasonable competency is within the reach of every industrious man whose efforts are intelligently directed. The penniless pioneer of a few years ago is the substantial, independent farmer of to-day. The uplifting of the people in social and material comfort is a process as visibly going on from year to year as the revolution of the seasons. Its progress is recorded in the annual advance in the value of their accumulated property, in the increase of their trade both in imports and exports, in the establishment and development both of religious, educational and benevolent institutions, in the spread of social refinement in the cultivation of the sciences, in the appliance of every art that ministers to the happiness of human life. Nor are these conditions the result of long and painful evolution taking generations for their development."

That is the opinion of Mr. Blue. He also speaks in his report of 27th February as follows:—

"The farmlands in Ontario having increased in value from \$632,242,500 in 1882 to \$348,009,828 in 1886, farm buildings from \$132,712,575 to \$183,748,212, farm implement from \$37,029,851 to \$50,530,538, and live stock from \$90,540,720 to \$107,208,935, or a total of \$999,497,911 as against \$882,625,610—a gain of \$106,872,301 in four years instead of 'a loss of 30 per cent.'"

We also find in that valuable report that the different counties in the Province have increased in a great ratio for the last year.

"In the group comprising Essex, Kent, Elgin, Norfolk, Haldimand and Welland, the value of land had risen in 1886 by about \$1,000,000 over 1885. In the group comprising Lambton, Huron and Bruce the increased value was over \$1,000,000. In Grey and Simcoe the increased value was \$900,000. In the group comprising Middlesex, Oxford, Brant, Perth, Wellington, Waterloo and Dufferin the increase in value in the short period of one year was \$1,750,000. In the group composed of Lincoln, Wentworth, Halton, Peel, York, Ontario, Durham, Northumberland and Prince Edward the increased value in a year was \$3,600,000. In the group comprising Lennox and Addington, Frontenac, Leeds and Grenville, Dundas, Stormont, Glengarry, Prescott, Russell, Carleton, Renfrew and Lanark, the increase in value was for the year \$7,500,000. In the group comprising Victoria, Peterboro', Haliburton and Hastings the farm lands increased in value in twelve months by \$1,100,000; and in the group composed of Muskoka, Parry sound and Algoma the increase was \$420,000. The total increase in value of farm lands in the whole Province in 1886 over the preceding year was nearly \$23,000,000."

So you will see from that report from Ontario, that the Province is not going backward, but, on the contrary, that everything is in a good condition. The hon. gentleman also, in order to show that he is still in the same despairing mood, refers to the great debt under which we are laboring. I might ask him to go back as far as 1875, when he declared that the debt which existed had been incurred for works of general utility. He went home to England, and there publicly declared over his own signature that all this debt was created in erecting works of public utility, and he went on to show what they were; therefore I say that it does not lie in his mouth to go beyond 1875 for the purpose of decrying this country, and showing what the existing financial affairs are. Now, I will quote from the organ of the party. As late as November, 1881, the *Globe* newspaper, in referring to an article of Goldwin Smith, which ran in the same direction as the speech of hon. gentlemen opposite, denounced this statement as improper and incorrect, and said the debt was not created in the manner which Mr. Smith described. It says:

"Who does not see that Mr. Smith wants the same thing for Canada, and is ready to decry this country if so he may injure its credit, and thus prevent development of its incalculable resources and induce the people to look to Washington or despair; it is true that the debt of the Dominion is large, but nineteen-twentieths of it have been incurred for productive purposes, and the interest has always been promptly paid. With no debt and without works, in which the money have been expended, the country would be infinitely poorer than it would be were the debt doubled without adding to the works."

Now, Sir, there is an article showing that the debt was created for works of public utility; but in the face of that public declaration these hon. gentlemen talk quite differently now. The hon. gentleman again said:

"In these twenty years they have trebled our debt, in these twenty years they have trebled our taxes, and when the Budget comes to be brought down I think the House will find that the liabilities of the people of this county are very far indeed from being fully discharged or measured, even, by our present enormous debt."

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see for one moment about this debt. In the year 1875, when the hon. gentleman gave the people of England to understand that the debt was created for works of public utility, we had a debt of \$116,008,378. In 1886 the debt was \$223,159,107, or an increase during that time of \$107,150,729. Now, during that period, while the debt increased that amount, we paid for public works and the debts of the Provinces, \$118,865,802, so that we actually expended, without increasing our debt, \$11,815,073. That does not look very bad after all. Then we have the

evidence of a gentleman whom they will not doubt. In a speech made by Mr. Blake, the member for West Durham, in Russell, he says:

"The expenditure had increased since 1878 by about eleven and a-half millions. Part of that increase was justifiable, although the Conservatives in opposition were not wise enough to know, or not honest enough to state, that an increase was necessary in a young and growing country like Canada."

In answer to all that we have the public declaration of the hon. member for South Oxford that the whole of this debt has been incurred for legitimate purposes. Now, Sir, the hon. gentlemen followed in that bemoaning style of his, which characterises the speeches from the other side of the House, and he spoke about the exodus from this country. In view of what has taken place in the records of this Parliament, I think he ought to have hesitated before speaking of the exodus in the manner he has done. Of course, the hon. gentleman has always been anxious, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) likewise, to make the people believe that the country was going to the dogs, and that people were leaving it as rapidly as they could. They take the evidence furnished by the collector at Port Huron. The hon. member for South Oxford, in speaking about this exodus said:

"But I will point to this merely, that if you are to accept the customary standard laid down in the United States, if you can venture to hold that every able-bodied man who comes to North America is worth, when he lands on the dock, \$1,000 to the State, then, Sir, whatever may be the cause, the result of all this is, that in losing these 2,000,000 of people we have lost 500,000 able-bodied men, or thereabouts, and we have lost an equivalent, according to that calculation, to \$500,000,000."

It was well said by an hon. gentleman a few nights ago that a country that could lose \$500,000,000 must be a rich country indeed. He goes on:

"What shall I say of the folly of supposing that it is anything but a great misfortune, a great calamity, a great injury to the people of the country that so huge a portion not only of those who come to settle in Canada, but of those who belong to us, of those who are our own flesh and blood, our own kinsman, have been obliged for lack of opportunity to leave Canada and seek a home elsewhere? I say that this is proof positive that we are in a state of retrogression."

Then he goes on and points out about the two millions. He repeats no less than four times in his speech that two million people have left the country. He says:

"These men have not hesitated to carry out a policy which has been responsible, in my judgment, for driving two millions of Her Majesty's North American subjects into exile, and which had risked the loss of all British North America to the Empire. It is time that we should clear our minds of cant on this subject. It is idle for any human being to rise up and tell this House that, when we have lost a number equal to half the whole population that now remains, things are satisfactory with us. There is not another country, except perhaps Ireland, that has sustained so heavy a bleeding as we have done during the last few years."

Now, Sir, this House well knows that some time ago, when the charge was made that a great exodus of young men was going on from this country, an investigation was made by Mr. Lowe, and his report was laid before the House. It was charged upon that occasion that no less than 71,424 persons, settlers, had entered at Port Huron and gone to the United States. Upon examination Mr. Lowe found that instead of that number there were only 2,422 who had left our country for the purpose of settling in the United States, and that the total number of passengers passing out of Canada, of all kinds, was 64,168, including 13,804 who went to Manitoba via the United States. I find, Sir, in the report of the Committee on Immigration and Colonisation, of 1884, the following:—

"The immigrant settlers during the year included 34,987 who entered from the United States, making entries of settlers' effects at the Custom-houses, the names of the settlers, the numbers of persons in the family, and the nationality being registered in all these entries; these figures being thus obtained by an exact registration, are absolute and show a very considerable movement from the United States to Canada, owing, doubtless, to two causes, one being ready employment in manufactories and on railway works, and the other the attraction of our lands in the North-West."

Mr. RYKERT.

I commend that to the attention of the hon. gentlemen opposite. We had no less than 34,987 people who came back from the United States during that year, while it was actually found that the total going out was only 2,422. Now, let me read something else on that point. I know hon. gentlemen opposite will believe the *Globe*, and here is what it said on the 14th April, 1882:

"The Dominion Government should now take means to represent forcibly to the Government of the United States the extreme and seemingly wilful inaccuracies of the figures published at Washington as truthful. If the American Government refuses or neglects to furnish evidence upon which statistics rest, no more need be done than to publish the fact in Europe where American figures already enjoy none too sweet a reputation."

That is what the *Globe* said, and the *Globe* thought the report made was entirely correct. We found among the list of immigrants actors, clergymen, dentists, druggists, lawyers, bakers, barbers, blacksmiths, laborers, milliners, tailors, servants, speculators, and people without any occupation, the total number being 45,393. A declaration was made by the American officer who reported the number of immigrants who passed into the States, before the United States collector. This declaration contains the statement that:

"Charles Irwin and myself got up those returns entirely by guess work, and copying off the old returns, and before my time he helped Crawford and others of my predecessors to get them up. The idea was to make the immigration look as big as we could. I know myself of large crowds of men going to the lumber woods in the fall being taken as immigrants, although we knew perfectly well they would all go back to Canada in the spring."

And further this declaration says:

"In getting up the returns, the way we got at the occupation of the immigration was this: We took so many thousand persons, called so many carpenters, so many blacksmiths, so many painters, &c., so many doctors, so many lawyers, so many preachers, &c., and the balance we called farmers; in fact, the whole thing from beginning to end was nothing but guesswork."

He was also examined before a Committee of this House, as follows:—

"By the Chairman:

"Q. Did you assist in obtaining the immigration returns? A. I did not; I made out the returns, but there was no obtaining of them at all. I made out the returns, but did not obtain them in any way, shape or form, except by simply—you may call it guesswork, or estimating them."

"By Mr. Trow:

"Q. Were those returns made under oath? A. No, Sir; not by me."

"By the Chairman:

"Q. How long were you employed in performing those duties? A. I was employed for some time previous to my connection with the Customs. When I was baggage master for the Grand Trunk, the Deputy Collector in charge at Fort Gratiot asked me to make up those returns for him, as he knew nothing about them, so I did that work for about two years previous to my connection with the Customs, when I was baggage master there."

"Q. Do I understand you to say that in making up these immigration returns, you did not take any means of verifying the correctness of the returns made to the Government, and that the statements or returns sent to the Washington Government, and published by them as authentic, were, in point of fact, not authentic? A. Yes; you can clearly understand me to say that there was no attempt made to get at the actual registration of these immigrants whatever."

So when hon. gentlemen opposite cite the returns obtained at Port Huron and other American ports as authentic they must be aware that they are entirely incorrect. And no one knows this better than the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Trow). So satisfied were the American authorities on this point, that the returns were fraudulent, that a letter was sent by Mr. Secretary Manning on 20th February, 1886, to the collectors in the different ports in which he says:

"WASHINGTON, D. O., 20th February, 1886."

"To Collectors and other officers of the Customs:

"Since it appears to be impracticable to procure under existing laws, accurate statistics of immigrants arriving in the United States from British North American possessions and Mexico, you are hereby directed to discontinue the collection of statistics of such immigration until otherwise directed."

"DANIEL MANNING,

"Secretary."

So satisfied were the Americans as to the inaccuracy of their reports that Mr. Secretary Manning put an end to their collection, and they have not since been made, yet hon. gentlemen opposite rise and state that the number of immigrants is something enormous, and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has the cool affrontery to say that over 2,000,000 of people have left this country and gone to the United States since the present Government assumed power. Is that an honest and an upright statement, a fair representation for the hon. gentleman to make? He knows right well what the records proved, and yet he has the coolness to say that the exodus is still going on. Let me make a comparison in order to see how we stand, and that perhaps may be satisfactory to some hon. gentleman while unsatisfactory to others. I hope it will satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite that we are increasing at a greater ratio than our neighbors across the line. I have taken for purposes of comparison the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario on the one side, and on the other the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York and Ohio. The following is the result:—

INCREASE OF POPULATION IN PROVINCES AND STATES.

	1871.	1881.	Increase.	Per cent.
Nova Scotia.....	387,000	440,572	53,572	13·84
New Brunswick.....	285,594	321,233	35,639	12·68
	672,594	761,805	89,211	13·56
Quebec.....	1,191,516	1,359,027	167,511	14·00
Ontario.....	1,620,851	1,923,228	302,377	18·65
	2,812,367	3,282,255	469,888	16·74
P. E. Island.....				15·87
Nova Scotia.....	3,484,961	4,044,060	559,190	16·04
New Brunswick.....				
Ontario.....				
Quebec.....				
Maine.....	1870.	1880.		
New Hampshire.....	626,915	648,986	11,071	1·76
Vermont.....	318,300	346,991	28,690	9·01
	330,557	332,286	1,729	0·52
New York.....	1,275,766	1,328,263	41,490	3·25
Ohio.....				
	4,322,759	5,082,871	700,112	15·97
	2,865,260	3,198,062	532,802	19·96
	8,323,785	9,609,196	1,274,411	15·31
Nova Scotia.....				16·04
New Brunswick.....				
Ontario.....				
Quebec.....				
New York.....				
Ohio.....				15·31
Maine.....				
New Hampshire.....				
Vermont.....				

Have we reason to complain of this result? I hold we have not. This statement distinctly shows that, instead of decreasing in population, Canada is increasing at a greater ratio than those States across the line. Take the great cities of New York, Buffalo and Cleveland, and we find them increasing rapidly, but no more rapidly proportionately than is our own country. Yet in the face of these facts hon. gentlemen opposite despair and hold up their hands, and say we are going to the dogs. That, however, is simply a repetition of what they declared in 1878. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at that time bewailed the fate of Canada, he declared he was perfectly helpless and could not do any more for the country; yet hon. gentlemen opposite have seen the country prosperous during the last six, seven or ten years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. RYKERT. "No," says the hon. gentleman. There is the best evidence of it. I have shown the prosperity of the country in the figures I have submitted, and I have shown that the increase of population in the United States is less than in Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite may take the Yankee almanac and prove an exodus to their hearts' content, but their figures are not correct. Secretary Manning says that the immigration statistics are inaccurate, and cannot be relied on. We have the sworn statement that instead of the immigration of Canadians at Port Huron being 45,393 in 1873 it was only 7,222. Yet the hon. gentleman opposite says we are going to the dogs, and, in fact, we find all of those hon. gentlemen making similar declarations. We have another and a very good authority. There is an agricultural college in Ontario, and in connection with it there is a distinguished authority by the name of Professor Brown who certainly does not belong to the Conservative persuasion, but who is a gentleman holding high rank in the Reform-Liberal party, and that gentleman, in a letter to the *Globe*, on 15th December 1887, gave his opinion in regard to the condition of Canadian farmers, as follows:—

"I have no hesitation, therefore, in again repeating that you are not only doing well and making money—whether placed in the bank, in improvement or on mortgage—but you are actually wealthy. When any farmer can pay 6 per cent. on what he gave for land and working appliances, give his family \$500 to help keep the house, and then have one-fourth of the whole left to lay past or speculate with in future crops, he is second to no profession I know."

Now, Sir, there is a gentleman whose opinion on all those questions is well known. It does seem to me remarkably singular, in the face of the publicly declared utterance of men who ought to know and in face of the report of the Ontario Bureau of Industry and other documents that those gentlemen should in face of all that keep crying against and bemoaning the fate of Canada. The whole record points to the conclusion and shows that Canada is second in prosperity to no country in the world, and it proves too that no country has made such rapid progress. Let us take and compare with the State of New York. That is a great State and one of the richest and most prosperous of the States of the Union, and yet we find that official documents declare that the ratio of prosperity in the Province of Ontario is greater than in the State of New York. Yet, Sir, those gentlemen are now inviting us to go away from our home, they want us to go and leave this terrible and god-forsaken country, they say we are handicapped with debt and that the people are leaving the country by scores and thousands—two millions, I think they state left the country in the course of eight or nine years. Those gentlemen opposite complain about the institutions of this country and the reckless expenditure of the Government and everything of that kind. Where do they ask us to go to—to that blessed land on the other side of the line pictured by them in the most beautiful and glowing terms. But what did the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) think of the Yankee land in 1878? What did he think of this land we ought to rush to, this land into whose arms we ought to fly, this land under which we ought to submit ourselves to be taxed just as the American please, and to which we are to humble ourselves just as they wish to humble us. Speaking in the lower Provinces in 1878 he drew a far different picture of the United States and held up to us the progress of Canada. He said:

"We, Sir, have studied the example of the people of the United States and we see in the condition of that country almost everything which ought to warn you, not to allow yourselves under any plea or pretense to be deluded into imitating the system which has wrought so much mischief there. We see in the United States according to the testimony of their wisest writers, of their own most experienced statesmen that the result of their foolish system, is that capital to the extent of several thousand millions has been worse than wasted, that labor has been diverted from its proper channels, that the foreign commerce has been almost annihilated, that almost every evil has been brought upon the country—evils far exceeding, so far as regards the effect in their material

prosperity, those which resulted from civil wars, and we have no desire to assist in bringing those evils upon the people whose welfare, for the moment, we are responsible. Have made up our minds, be it for weal or for woe, they will adhere to these principles that they believe are the only ones capable of extricating you from your difficulties, and that most assuredly they will not allow themselves to be cajoled into adopting a system from which as proved by the example of the United States we can expect nothing but ruin and decay."

Yet, Sir, after this the same gentleman now invites this House and this country to join this very same people. Sir, we have other evidence of the kind of a country to which these hon. gentlemen wish us to go. The *New York Times*, of February, 1888, speaks about the enormous debt upon different States. It says the States are heavily mortgaged and continues :

"The amount represented by the face of the farm mortgages in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas and Missouri, is \$3,422,000,000. The actual value of the farms in these 10 States is to-day about \$13,931,000,000. All talk relative to this vast sum of money being paid is utter folly. No agricultural people can pay such sums. Profits derived now from American agriculture are so small as to be unworthy of the slightest consideration.

The paper goes on to show that the farmer will not average \$294 for each farmer, and of this small sum they will have to pay for labor, seed, rents, supplies, and they and their families live besides. It is not possible for these farmers to lift these mortgages. Yet those gentlemen say "go to that country," that country which is flowing with milk and honey, leave your own benighted Canada and see where you land. But let us think of what a beautiful time our farmer would have with \$294, and what luxury he could enjoy. Why, after paying the rent and taxes he would have very little left to speak of. Let us see what this is I have here. It is an official paper from Minnesota. Here, Sir, is an eight-page advertisement of the tax sales of land in Polk county. There are 4,890 residents going to be sold out for taxes, and 2,875 non-residents advertised to be sold out for the same cause. There is where some of the hon. gentlemen want us to go, Polk County, Minnesota, there is the beautiful and blessed Yankee land for us to go to and be happy,—the beautiful land in which we find there are 7,765 lots to be sold for non-payment of taxes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was going to ask the hon. member whether he was not one of the parties who held up that country and its prosperity to us as a reason for adopting the National Policy?

Mr. RYKERT. Never.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Your leader did.

Mr. RYKERT. I never, Sir, never said one word on behalf of that country, and, I hope, I never shall, Sir. Well, Sir, let us go on a little further. We find what the *Scientific American* says of Dakota, that blessed land of the blizzard, to which we are asked to go,—the land which a short time ago was described as the land of the wild cat and hyena. The *Scientific American*, speaking of Dakota, says:—

"Good beef steers were sold for 2c. per lb. live weight, and farmers kick at the low price; hogs are worth 4c. per lb.—"

Hope the hon. gentleman knows what that means,

"which is thought an excellent price. Corn 21c. per bushel, or say \$5.75 per ton, allowing 70 lbs. to the bushel—very cheap. Some farmers talk of burning it for fuel, as it is considered as cheap as Pennsylvania hard coal at \$11.80. Corn in the ear is said to be first class fuel by those who have used it."

And that again, Sir, is the blessed country, the beautiful paradise to which we are all invited to go. I, Sir, as a Canadian cannot feel justified in asking and advising my countrymen to go there; I cannot, Sir, as a Canadian feel myself justified in running down my country as hon. gentlemen opposite do. If our country is burdened with debt there is a way to overcome that, for if hon. gentlemen can satisfy the country that the ruin which they speak of has been brought about by gentlemen on the Treasury

Mr. RYKERT.

benches they and the country have a remedy. But they have proclaimed all this before the people on three different occasions and the people said that they had no confidence in what they stated. The people found them wanting and they rejected their professions. In the same way the gentlemen opposite are now crying down and belittling their country and asking us to go to that beautiful Yankee land of paradise such as Polk County. There never was a more inopportune time to discuss this question than at the present, because we find that the people on the other side of the line are discussing the question of altering their tariff. We see day after day reports of bills being introduced into Congress, in which the question is being discussed about altering or reducing the tariff in the United States. If, Sir, those ideas are carried out, if they meet with any response at the hands of the American people the tariff will be largely reduced and if the tariff were reduced what is to become of the revenue those gentlemen say we are going to have when we get unrestricted reciprocity? When our business has been built up by the National Policy, when our industries have been established and when we have a home market for our farmers it is unwise for us to discuss this question. It is crying down our country and impairing our credit in England and elsewhere. We ought to be the last people in the world to do this, but the whole stock in trade and the whole capital of hon. gentlemen opposite seems to be to cry down their country. There is too much anxiety on the part of those gentlemen for unrestricted reciprocity under which they can join the people of the United States. I can quote no higher authority than the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) on this subject. Some time ago he thought it humiliating in a large degree for Canada to have reciprocity at the hands of the Americans. Speaking on 6th August, 1873, at Halifax, the hon. gentleman said:

"It was alleged that England herself was turning towards protection. In that case, she could undoubtedly discriminate against us, and what then would become of our surplus products, for which we now find a market in the mother country. It was unpatriotic to make Canada's existence dependent upon the United States granting reciprocity, and he repudiated the notion that reciprocity was as necessary to us as some have tried to make us believe: We are already in a fair position to compete with the United States on the markets of the world."

That is the opinion the hon. gentleman expressed on that occasion. He thought that it was humiliating for us to go to the United States and demand reciprocity. Then, the hon. member for Bothwell, in a speech made at Mount Elgin, in 1878, quoted with approval the following language of Sir Alexander Galt:—

"It is, therefore, thought desirable, and indeed our manifest duty to show them, not in a spirit of hostility, but certainly in that of independence, that while we value their friendship, and value their trade, we will not conform to unreasonable terms, and would not have either our commercial policy or our political allegiance dictated to us by a foreign country."

At Charlottetown in the same year the hon. member for South Oxford delivered himself in strong language, and surely what he said then has equal force to day. The circumstances of Canada have not much changed, except that the country has gone on and prospered more than any other country in the world, and how can he possibly say to-day that we ought to knuckle down at the foot of Brother Jonathan any more than then? The hon. gentleman said on that occasion:

"They say we must have reciprocity and we cannot live without it. For the Dominion of Canada I take exception to that statement. While reciprocity is desirable, we are not in such a state of subjection to the United States that we cannot live without it. We have men and ships, and 'will carry the war into Africa.' We will find new markets for ourselves, and cut them out. There is nothing better calculated to prevent the bringing about of reciprocity than to tell the Americans we cannot live without them. It would induce them to believe that they had the power to drive us to their own terms."

Can any person dissent from the argument of the hon. gentleman? No, we are entirely in accord with that, and

what was applicable then is all the more applicable now in our present state of prosperity. Then, I will quote again from the organ of the hon. member for West Ontario; at least I assume that it is his organ. Between the *Mail* and the *Globe* I am not sure which is his organ. I believe in a long race the *Mail* is the better paper; it is better written, and gives better literature. But the *Globe*, referring I have no doubt to the hon. member for South Oxford, the hon. member for Bothwell and several others who at that time were barking at his heels, on 28th December, 1887, said:

"Now it happens that these people see in the natural wish of Canadians to extend their trade with their neighbors, occasion for preaching that the extension must be had instantly and at any price lest Canadians shall surely die. Though it is not easy to exaggerate the advantages of unrestricted reciprocity, they do manage to exaggerate them by taking that attitude. Not only so, but they compromise the prospects of success for the movement they profess to have at heart. To proclaim that we cannot exist without commercial union, to argue that we should sacrifice even our political status to get the boon, is the very method by which our republican neighbors will be induced to withhold it, if they have a desire to annex Canada. Does any reasonable man doubt that the pessimists understand that? They are too able not to be well aware that they actually obstruct unrestricted reciprocity by declaring, in effect, that the Canadian Provinces should even separate to obtain it. And why should they thus obstruct? The answer is surely plain. Have they not avowed their wish to smash the Confederation into its original fragments."

Now, Sir, in corroboration of what the hon. member for South Oxford said in 1878, we find the *Globe* following it up with the following strong language:—

"Is it a wise policy on the part of Sir John and his organs to show to the Americans such great anxiety to secure free trade with them? Is not that the way to prevent a reciprocity treaty? Is not the American answer under such circumstances certain to be that of the *New York Sun*: 'Reciprocity with Canada? Why, yes, certainly; we are ready for it, only it would be convenient for the several Provinces of the Dominion to be admitted among the United States as a conditional precedent.' The true attitude in reference to the United States is that which the Reform party has always taken: 'We can live without your trade; we are flourishing under our present tariff arrangements; we are not willing to annex ourselves, and are not anxious for any change but we are willing to make a fair reciprocity treaty which will benefit both countries.' Which is the more statesmanlike, this position or that adopted by Sir John and his organs?"

Thus you will see that the sentiment then pervading the Reform party and those who were then leading the party, was that it would be unwise and impolitic on their part to place on the Statute-book any declaration admitting that we were prepared to have reciprocity; and it does seem to me, in view of the opinions I have given you, expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite, that it is utterly unwise and impolitic for us at the present time to seek to get reciprocity on any terms except on the fair and reasonable terms proposed by Sir Charles Tupper. We have already had an opportunity of ascertaining how the American people feel on the question. If the hon. member for South Oxford is prepared to define what his resolution means, what kind of a treaty he wants, then we shall be able to judge exactly what his proposition is. We are asked to pass a vague and meaningless resolution; but we want to know what kind of a treaty hon. gentlemen opposite propose. Do they ask for a treaty more extensive than that of 1874? If they do, I say they have no chance of getting it. The question has been discussed over and over again in Congress and almost every place in the United States, and the unanimous testimony of the American people was that even the Reciprocity Treaty of 1874 went too far. If there is any meaning at all in the resolution of the hon. gentleman, you would have manufactures of every kind passing across the line without paying customs duty.

It being six o'clock, the House adjourned.

After Recess.

Mr. RYKERT. When you left the Chair, Sir, I was about to discuss the terms of the Treaty of 1874, and to show that it was not acceptable to the people of the United

States, although it was far more extensive in its provisions than the old Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, which existed down to 1866. I may here remark that his new found scheme of Mr. Wiman and Mr. Butterworth is nothing but the resurrection of an old scheme which was propounded some years ago in the House of Representatives. I find that, in a debate which took place in that body, this whole question of commercial union was discussed, and although a very strong and a very plaintive appeal was made to that representative body on behalf of the scheme, yet they paid no attention whatever to it, but thought it unwise and impolitic. I find that the whole matter was discussed in a speech made by the hon. Elijah Ward in the House of Representatives, on 18th, May 1876. In that speech, he pointed out all the propositions which Mr. Wiman has laid before this country, and comparing the speech made by Mr. Ward on that occasion to several made by Mr. Wiman since, I have come to the conclusion that Mr. Wiman has simply resurrected the scheme which was propounded years ago in the House of Representatives. Mr. Ward, in the course of his remarks, made these observations:

"As many manufactures in both countries are made of material imported from various parts of the world, it would manifestly be impossible to establish a completely free system of commercial intercourse with Canada, except under duties not only corresponding but also equitably divided on the productions of the countries. This is the chief obstacle to any fair mutual advantages and complete arrangement of reciprocity between us."

And he goes on to discuss the scheme from the same standpoint as Mr. Wiman does. I merely mention this to show that the scheme is not a new one, and to show that it is not one which is at all likely to be acceptable to the United States; and I maintain there is no use in our proposing an arrangement to which the people of the United States have shown they are decidedly adverse. I take the ground as a Canadian, that we ought not to humble ourselves at the feet of the United States. We should rather see what our country can do by itself in the march of progress; we should rather see if we cannot compete with the United States, and I would like to see our country pursue the course we have hitherto pursued of working and advancing in a spirit of generous rivalry with our neighbors, and resisting every attempt to merge ourselves in the institutions of the United States, either politically or otherwise, as such a policy must inevitably end in annexation. The Treaty of 1874, which was framed by the Hon. George Brown, was one of a more comprehensive character than that of 1854. It provided for the introduction in Canada of the manufactures of the United States and *vice versa*, and was in fact much more extensive in its provisions than we would be prepared to go at present. It went much further than I, as a representative of the people, would consent to go, as long as I hold a seat in this Legislature. But even that treaty met with the universal condemnation of the people of the United States comprehensive and extensive as it was, embracing as it did manufactures of every description, as any hon. gentleman will see by looking at the treaty itself, it did not meet with favor on the other side; and if I refer to it now, one of my reasons for doing so is to give the opinion pronounced on it by a very prominent Reformer, then member for Toronto, Mr. John McDonald, now Senator McDonald, who was considered as level headed a man as we have in the whole Dominion. Mr. McDonald denounced that treaty in the most unmeasured terms, and consequently came under the censure of the organ of his party, as must inevitably any person who has the hardihood to differ from its opinions. That, however, is a compliment which most men like to have paid them, and I have no doubt the censure of the *Globe* had no effect on Mr. John McDonald. Speaking of reciprocity, he said:

"Upon no clause of the Reciprocity Treaty but those relating to our own trade, do we desire to express an opinion. It needs but little rea-

soning to prove what the results will be when the American goods referred to are admitted into our country duty free. To the Canadian manufacturer—ruin. To the Canadian dealer—loss. To the projected manufacturing interests—stoppage. To the Canadian consumer—direct taxation. To the entire trade of this country—disturbance, uneasiness and uncertainty."

That is the opinion of Senator McDonald, then member for the city of Toronto, and I have no doubt his opinion would have great weight. But, in the same connection, allow me, Sir, to show you the opinions of gentlemen of the United States, who thoroughly understand the question. We have the opinion of Mr. Blain, who was at that time candidate for re-election to the State of Maine, and this treaty was then being discussed on every platform in the United States. Mr. Blain said:

"The treaty of that name which was terminated in 1866 was cruelly oppressive to the people of Maine and inflicted upon the people of that State, the 11 years of its existence, a loss of \$50,000,000. It presented the singular anomaly of giving to the Canadians the control of our markets of certain leading articles on terms far more favorable than our own people had ever enjoyed. Let us simply place Canada on the same basis with other foreign countries, taxing her for duties or admitting them free, according to our own judgment of the interest of our revenue and the needs of the people, always bearing in mind that in governmental as well as friendly matters 'charity begins at home.'"

So you will see that he had no respect whatever for that treaty proposed by the Hon. George Brown. He looked upon it as something which the United States people could not accept, because it was not at all in their interest. To show the opinions of the American people on this question, we have had a certain amount of literature placed before us by the American papers during the last two months, and I propose to lay before the House some evidence of the terms on which the Americans would be willing to admit us into commercial union, and what a beautiful position we would occupy if we should put ourselves at their mercy. The *Chicago Times*, speaking of an unconditional surrender on our part said:

"Unless, therefore, the Dominion is prepared to make a complete and unconditional surrender of all control over its own tariff and accept whatever tariff our Congress may choose to enact from time to time, the scheme of commercial union, in the sense in which the phrase is used, is entirely out of the question."

The *Chicago Times* says further:

"It must not be forgotten, that this proposition (commercial union) implies a complete surrender by the Dominion Parliament to the American Congress of all control over the principle of the Dominion's revenue—the tariff. Whatever it may please the American Congress to do regarding the tariff, that the Dominion Government must forthwith accept. Our Congress would have even more power over the Dominion under this arrangement than it would in the event of political union, because the people of the Dominion would have neither vote nor voice in Washington under the proposed commercial union, while they would have both under political union. Not only would our Congress prescribe and change at pleasure all the tariff taxes exacted from the people of Canada, but our executive officers and our courts would make all the rulings and decisions affecting rates for the Dominion as well as for the United States."

That is the position we would occupy in the opinion of one of the best writers in the United States, and he further expresses his opinion by saying:

"The fact seems to be that very many Canadians who are talking about this project imagine that they are talking about something like the old Treaty of Reciprocity, and it is probable that if the real wish of the Canadians could be ascertained, it would be found to be for reciprocity and not for a surrender by their Government of all control over their own tariff—a thing almost necessarily involved in the customs union scheme."

Then we have the *Philadelphia Record*, which says:

"No scheme which would give to Canada an equal voice in the determination of federal taxation could be considered. She would have to accept the position of a State in the Union, with only such power in the determination of the tax rate as her comparative population would entitle her to. How this could be effected without representation in Congress is a matter hard to determine."

So, as far as we are concerned, they do not propose that we should have anything to say in regard to taxation or revenue, but we must be contented to take whatever they

Mr. RYKERT.

choose to give us, and for the balance we must resort to direct taxation.

Mr. TROW. You are speaking of commercial union now, not of unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Siamese twins.

Mr. RYKERT. I think I shall be able to show the hon. gentleman in a short time that commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity and continental free trade are all the same thing, but he had better consult the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in regard to that matter, because at Jarvis he made a speech in which he said that commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity were both the means to arrive at the same end. This paper goes on and says:

"If Canada wants free trade with this great country, she can get it once and for all by casting in her lot with us. Nobody who has any sense should strike a blow to annex her territory to ours, but when the Canadian people, kindred to us in blood and language, and living in a land which nature has made a part of ours, wish to become incorporated with this great Republic, they will be cordially welcomed; and we may confidently affirm that they will never secure permanent free trade with us until this movement occurs."

Now, what does the hon. gentleman say to that? He is a free trader, and according to the doctrine laid down there, even a free trader cannot expect to have access to the markets of the United States unless he joins hand in hand with the people. A few days ago, we had a speech made by a young offshoot of Mr. Blaine, young Mr. Blaine, in which he indulges in the flowing and beautiful language which we sometimes hear on the other side of the House and which we often hear on the other side of the line. He says:

"American fishermen will never rest content, and this vexed and vexatious problem will never find abiding solution save under some such agreement as that of the Treaty of 1783 or 1854, honorably enforced and maintained in spirit and in letter. * * * There are many ways doubtless by which such an end may be gained, but if this be the best treaty which Great Britain and Canada will grant negotiation is not to be numbered among them. Two measures at once suggest themselves, punition and persuasion. The means for the first are furnished in the resolution of Congress authorising the President to inflict retaliatory measures; for the second, in the lately much-discussed commercial union. Deprive Canada of all business relations with the country or grant to her, not a treaty framed on the lines of the ridiculous, one-sided reciprocity of Lord Elgin, but on the basis of unrestricted interchange of products, with the enactment and enforcement of our tariff laws."

So none of these gentlemen will accept us unless upon their own terms, that is, that we should accept their tariff laws and allow them to change them as they please, no matter how it may affect us or how it may affect our revenue. They do not appear to want any such makeshift policy as hon. gentlemen advocate. The *Rochester Democrat* says: "This country does not want any such makeshift policy," but it says it "is willing to unite the interests of the two countries in a bond which will be effective as against the competition of the mother country." Then we find also that the *American Manufacturer* says:

"We are not anxious to annex 'hopeless and helpless' people, but we assume will be obliged to take a few of this kind along with the rest. Under the inspiration of American citizenship they may become hopeful and helpful. Possibly after all Canada becomes thoroughly ripe for annexation, the Goddess of Liberty will hold out her apron and catch her as she involuntarily falls from the parent limb."

That is a fine position for the hon. gentleman to place us in. Here is a paper, the *Minneapolis Tribune*, which has always shown a great deal of sympathy for the people of Canada, and no doubt has strong feelings in our favor. That paper says:

"The followers of the present Conservative Government oppose commercial union as destructive of their policy of national development. A Government which has had the courage and spirit to build the Canadian Pacific Railway in furtherance of its idea of a great northern confederation, knit together by common interests and strong national feeling, is not going to surrender its policy tamely. That policy contemplates the building up of Canadian industries by a protective

tariff against the United States, England and the other manufacturing countries. The Canadian who does not shrink from the idea of political union with the United States as the ultimate destiny of his country, may well favor commercial union as advantageous. The Canadian whose ambition for his country is an independent position as a member of the family of nations, may well pause before committing himself to the plan of free trade across the line."

So you see, from the quotations which I have made from the American newspapers, that they have no sympathy with the policy initiated by hon. gentlemen opposite. Whether you call it commercial union, unrestricted reciprocity, continental free trade, or direct free trade, they are one and the same thing, and I think I can show that from the hon. gentleman's own utterances. I will quote again from my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who has been showing himself very conspicuous in advocating free trade and in educating the young Liberal idea in that direction. At Waterford, he said :

"The two plans are different modes proposed of arriving at substantially the same result."

At Jarvis, on 4th November, he said :

"It is simply a customs union between two or more independent states, where a common tariff and excise laws are adopted and the revenue collected, and after deducting expenses of collection so divided among the participants in the basis of population or any other basis that might be agreed upon, while all trade restrictions between them were removed."

So you will see that commercial union, as far as the hon. member for North Norfolk is concerned, means the abandonment of the customs line between the two countries, the pooling of receipts, and the dividing of the pool according to population or according to some other means which may be suggested; and the result of that must be a deficiency in our revenue which must be made up by direct taxation. No hon. gentleman on that side who has spoken, either in this House or in the country, has intimated that we could receive more than \$25,000,000 from the pooling arrangement, which would show a deficiency according to our present expenditure of over \$10,000,000, which would have to be made up by direct taxation, and the consequence would be that, no matter what we had this year, we could not know what we would receive the next year. We must be dependent upon the amount received from the United States for the amount required for our expenditures, and we must find out whether we would receive enough to carry on future improvements before we could settle our own taxation. The result would be that all future improvements must be abolished, that no more railways must be built, that no railway subsidies must be granted, and that we must resort to direct taxation. We all know well, and I will be able to show before I sit down, how direct taxation will work. Now, as regards commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity, and I think they are one and the same thing, according to the definitions made by the hon. gentleman. A few days ago Mr. Cluxton, of Peterborough, made a speech in which he said :

"That commercial union meant unrestricted reciprocity, unrestricted commercial intercourse between Canada and the United States, or in other words the obliteration of the customs line between the two countries, in fact the abolition of all tariff and customs duties."

Now, we find what it really means. We find that this celebrated Mr. Hitt, who is now making himself conspicuous in the Congress of the United States upon this question, at a banquet in the city of Boston, pointed out what are really meant by reciprocity and commercial union :

"We in the West would like you, manufacturers of New England, to have access to that great market of Canada. With a reciprocity treaty, or, better still, commercial union, you will have the preference over English, French and German goods; and in two years' time after it is adopted goods from Yankee manufacturers will be in every retail store from Montreal to Victoria."

That is a beautiful prospect for the manufacturers of Canada. Hon. gentlemen will find that, if their policy is

carried out, the result will be that every retail store between Vancouver and Halifax will be filled by American manufactures. More than that, he goes on to let the cat out of the bag, and I suppose our friends from the Maritime Provinces will like to hear this. He says :

"In a commercial union, with a common tariff and the border free, probably a larger part of the imports of Canada than at present would enter by way of New York and New England ports—and the receipts of Canadian ports would, of course, correspondingly fall off."

We will be entirely at their mercy; they will so arrange matters that our cities upon the shores of the Atlantic will be completely deprived of that volume of trade which has done so much to build them up during the last few years. Then there is Mr. Shaw, who seems to be an authority upon this commercial union question, who takes the same view. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) seems to have the same view of the matter. Then we find that the *Farmer's Advocate* says that they don't know what they are talking about, they don't know what it really means. Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that a definition of unrestricted reciprocity ought to have been given by the hon. gentlemen in moving this resolution. They ought to tell us what they mean by this proposition; they have failed so to do, and they leave us in a state of obscurity. Now, I do not feel disposed, and this House will not feel disposed, to accept any proposition which is surrounded with so many difficulties, and so many uncertainties as this proposition made by the hon. gentleman. We find that the hon. member who moved this resolution spoke some time ago in the town of Ingersoll, prior to the meeting of the House, and he there discussed the question of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. He says they are one and the same subject, one and the same thing. He says it is so surrounded with difficulties that it is utterly impossible to tell exactly what will be the result, but of one thing he is certain—that unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, will lead to discrimination against England. He is certain also that it will depreciate and reduce our revenue; he is certain that our political system must sooner or later be abolished and that in consequence we shall be absorbed into the American Union. Now, Sir, these are matters, it seems to me, of very serious import. In the speech made a few nights ago, the hon. gentleman points out all these difficulties; he points out the difficulty with regard to our revenue, and the difficulty with regard to discrimination against England; but in his speech at Ingersoll he said of the two alternatives, we should choose that of annexation in preference to refusing to accept the benefits of commercial union. The hon. gentleman, as reported in the *Globe* newspaper, seems to have made up his mind on that point. He seems to have made up his mind that direct taxation must come, and the sooner it comes the better :

"I speak strongly and I feel strongly on this matter; the more so because it is quite manifest that the very men whose corrupt and extravagant mismanagement have mainly contributed to bring about this shameful state of things are now impudently declaring that the very consequences of their misconduct form an insuperable barrier to obtaining this great boon for the people of Canada!

"The argument is worthy of the men.

"Nevertheless it is quite true, and it would be folly to deny it, that we do enter into any negotiation with the United States at a serious disadvantage by reason of our own folly."

Again he says :

"Now you will see that I have put the case against us as strongly as even the fiercest opponents of the scheme can desire, and therefore you may feel assured that the difficulty is not insuperable. I am not speaking at random when I say that even so I decline to admit that this forms any insuperable difficulty

"In the first place I have given you the worst aspect of the case. In the next I am very clear that the great mass of the people will profit largely, and be, therefore, better able to bear additional taxes.

"In the third place, it is likely that our remaining taxes will produce more, and finally, what is of most importance, it is a mere shifting of taxation, and you will not have to pay one cent more on the whole.

"We have to raise \$30,000,000 anyway. It is simply a question of the mode in which you will raise it.

"It will not cost the people of Canada one cent more, but rather the reverse, if they elect to raise a portion of this money by direct instead of indirect taxation."

So you see that the hon. gentleman has surrounded this question with a great many difficulties, and therefore I say it is one that this country ought not to accept. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, as I said before, stated that he voiced the sentiments of the country, he voiced the sentiments of the Liberal party in the House and outside, and of a very large majority of the hon. members who are not in political accord with the Reform party. But I would like to point out that while these gentlemen are in favor of this policy, the leader is entirely opposed to it. Mr. Blake, in his Hamilton speech, was entirely opposed to it. He said it was utterly impossible that we could adopt a free trade policy at the present time—entirely out of the question. The hon. member for Bothwell shakes his head. What does he mean by free trade? I shall show from his own organ what he means by free trade, before I get through. Mr. Blake, then, declared positively that the Government should not change our fiscal system, that it would be detrimental to the best interests of this country. Now, Sir, it is rather strange, when we look at the history of the past few months, to see the wonderful changes that have come over different members of that party. It seems to me they have no right to ask this House, or to ask the country, to adopt a policy upon which they are divided, upon which they cannot form one concerted opinion. On the contrary, I say, they are as diverse as the poles. The *Globe* newspaper, which is now the organ of that party—it seems to have triumphed now in this little race; this resolution is according to the principles of the *Globe*, but in opposition to the London *Advertiser*, the organ of the hon. member for Bothwell, and other papers which profess to represent that party in Ontario. The hon. member himself was in favor of commercial union pure and simple against unrestricted reciprocity. A little while ago, I think he shook his head when I said that, but I think I shall be able to refresh his memory in a few minutes. But this we do know, that the Liberal organ discussed commercial union and then unrestricted reciprocity, and when the East Northumberland election came on, the whole question discussed then was commercial union, and a strong protest was made immediately after that election to the Reform party because they had not carried commercial union. Now, I find in the organ of the hon. member for Bothwell, this language. The article is headed "Commercial Union versus Unrestricted Reciprocity":—

"The *Toronto Globe* is devoting itself to the advocacy of unrestricted reciprocity in opposition to a plan of commercial union. We wonder whether our contemporary has been encouraged in this line by the success of Mr. Cochrane against Dr. Mallory. Commercial union lies within the range of practical politics. In our opinion unrestricted reciprocity does not. Reciprocity in natural products is practicable because the natural products of no other country are likely to find their way across the American border from Canada."

I think the hon. gentleman was in accord with my individual opinion, and he seems to favor the proposition laid down in the Statute of 1879 in favor of reciprocity in natural products. He says:

"The wheat, the barley, the oats, and whatever else we may produce that we might send in to the market of the United States under a reciprocity treaty are not likely to be interfered with at the border, but this would not apply to manufactured goods. Unrestricted reciprocity would necessitate the continuance of all the custom house officers upon the frontier that are now found there, and the right to make a different tariff would be of no value to us, the more especially as free trade with a neighboring Republic would imply a higher rate of customs duties as against others, and as we are in greater need for purposes of revenue, than the United States of high taxes, we have nothing to gain and much to lose by isolated action upon the tariff. They can afford to do with a lower rate of taxation than we, and everything at the present time points to the possibility of the American side of the border falling below the rate of taxation here."

Mr. RYKERT.

I have now established beyond all controversy that the hon. gentleman who shook his head this afternoon is not in favor of unrestricted reciprocity but commercial union. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) evidently somewhat disconcerted at the position of the Reform party at the late elections, and finding they were demoralised and without a policy, desired to secure a policy. The hon. gentleman said, at the Farmers' Union at Waterford, that it would be a good idea to adopt commercial union as the Liberal platform. The hon. gentleman then thought that commercial union would be a grand plank in the platform of the party, and he evidently seized it with some degree of pleasure. He thus started the question upon its journey, and now we find it introduced in this House as the platform of the Reform party. I should like to know what difference there is between the two terms—commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. I say there is no difference; and, in fact, the hon. member for North Norfolk says they are one and the same thing. He said:

"This Farmers' Union will naturally and legitimately look into the question of our trade relations, our natural markets, &c., and it will at once be confronted with the question of commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. This is not yet a political issue. It is receiving the favorable consideration of men of all parties. Perhaps it may yet answer the despairing demand for a policy made by that portion of the great Liberal party of Canada who were not satisfied with a mere policy of negation, but at the present moment the issue is not a part of the political creed of either of the great parties. Perhaps it may lead to a recast of Canadian political parties, but it now appeals upon its own merits alone for favorable consideration."

Again I am constrained to direct the attention of the House to the fact that the Liberal leader has not yet opened his mouth here on this question. What has that hon. gentleman to say in regard to the opinion of his party friends in Lower Canada? He appears to be afraid of the issue, for he has allowed his deputy leader to assume all responsibility and thrust upon this House and the country a policy which cannot be acceptable, because he himself says it is not a feasible policy. What did the hon. member for Quebec East, the leader of the Opposition in this House, say? He said at Somerset:

"I am not ready to declare that commercial union is an acceptable idea; I am not ready on my part to declare that commercial union is a principle which ought to be adopted. There are a great many considerations and there is a great deal of preliminary study to be gone through before a stand can be taken one side or the other. Commercial union may be possible, perhaps, but it may be surrounded with insurmountable difficulties, but the time has come when the policy of reprisals must be left out, and Canadians must show the American people that they like fair play."

The hon. member for Bothwell again took up this question and discussed it in answer to the *Montreal Gazette*, and I will show what the views of that hon. gentleman were upon it. He said on the 19th December, 1887:

"The *Montreal Gazette* says that commercial union is objectionable because it would take from Parliament that control over the revenue which has ever been held as the main source of strength in the Commons in their struggle for supremacy in the state. A more absurd proposition could not well be put into a single sentence. Commercial union no more takes from Parliament control of the revenue than does any ordinary treaty of reciprocity. The *Gazette* says that commercial union would take from the Parliament of Canada the right to make a tariff. It would do nothing of the kind. It would take from Parliament the right to impose taxes upon articles produced in the United States."

We find the leader of the Opposition is called upon to take part in the election contest in Haldimand. The first time he appeared in Ontario as leader of the Liberal Party he was called upon to express an opinion upon this question of commercial union, at the time he was endeavoring to run out Mr. Mostague. He said:

"Tory politicians call me a rebel, but, rebel as I am, the great difficulty to my mind—a difficulty which I have not solved—is the one that I am not quite sure commercial union would be consistent with the duty we owe to the mother country."

That is what I like to hear, but pass this resolution and see how far you can keep in line with the mother country. The

very moment this proposition is adopted, that very moment you knock down the barriers between this country and the United States, and you erect a barrier against Great Britain.

"I feel that the time has not yet come for me to discuss this question and to give the solution which I shall some day be called upon to give."

I said a few moments ago that the policy was a shifting one, the party being for commercial union, then for unrestricted reciprocity, and then back to commercial union. The organ of the hon. member for West Ontario, the *Toronto Globe*, was terribly annoyed at the result of the election in East Northumberland, and it expressed its opinion upon this question in the following terms on 23rd December, 1887:—

"We suppose every Tory organ from Cape Breton to Vancouver will this morning overflow with joy on account of the glorious defeat of a commercial union candidate yesterday. . . . What the election proves—and to this we would like to direct the attention of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain—is that in the past election in which commercial union was made an issue, the anti-commercial union candidate, backed by the entire strength of a victorious Government came within a hair-breadth of being defeated."

Again the *Globe* pins its faith to commercial union and looks hopefully to the future. On 24th December, 1887, it said:

"Though the Opposition must regret that the unrestrictedists have won a seat in East Northumberland, the commercial unionists have reason to congratulate themselves on the very good run made by their candidate. Mr. Cochrane beat the commercial union candidate by nearly twenty votes, that is, we say, very strong evidence that unrestricted reciprocity will sweep the country whenever taken up by a regular party organisation and presented to the people as the sole issue in a general contest. We can remember no scheme of so short a presentation before the electors of any country gained so large a proportion of votes as commercial union has polled in East Northumberland. All political experience suggests early success by the party which flings aside all other questions and stands on this only."

So even at that time the *Globe* kept prominently before the people commercial union. We have also the opinion, and no less an authority of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) that the scheme is entirely impracticable, and under any circumstances it is utterly impossible for the Reform party as a whole to adopt it. That hon. member, who is given somewhat to literature, describes the difficulty in this way, in one of his celebrated letters he sent to Mr. Wiman:

"We are often told that unrestricted reciprocity would 'sweep away all the custom houses upon the frontier.' If that were to be done it seems clear, for several reasons, that we would have to agree upon a uniform customs tariff with the United States against the rest of the world. In other words, the entire tariff legislation of both countries would be brought to a standstill during the duration of the treaty, and it is scarcely conceivable that either Canada or the United States could arrive at a satisfactory uniform tariff to last for that period."

And yet in the face of that declaration the hon. gentleman is going to vote for the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. He points out the utter unsatisfactory condition of the whole scheme, and that we could not possibly carry on the affairs of this country with a tariff which is likely to be shifted about from one end to the other.

"Mr. Chamberlain, at his interview with the press in Washington on the 18th inst., is reported to have stated that 'the most important reason why the project of commercial union could not be successfully inaugurated was the fact that the Tariff Acts of the two countries do not agree, and that it would be difficult to devise a plan which could meet this objection.'

"It is useless to deny that there are both practical and sentimental difficulties in the way of establishing a uniform tariff for the two countries against the rest of the world, and of maintaining this uniformity during the life of a reciprocity treaty. I suppose these difficulties are not insuperable."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) again wants reciprocity pure and simple. I find that on the 12th December, 1887, in his organ he says:

"We shall be pleased to obtain reciprocity in natural products with the United States; we shall be pleased, failing this, to get unrestricted reciprocity; we believe that it must be greatly to the advantage of this country, and that it would affect the revenues much less than unrestricted reciprocity with the mother country."

You see, hon. gentlemen, that he wants reciprocity pure and simple, and failing that, he wants unrestricted reciprocity. He goes on to point out, in an article of the 19th November, the difficulties of having a common tariff, and the difficulties in the way of importations from both countries. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, the member for Bothwell, (Mr. Mills) who, as I said before, was strongly in favor of commercial union as against unrestricted reciprocity, got quite annoyed at the unrestricted reciprocity advocates, and gave them a bit of his mind and opinion in his organ some time afterwards. On the 19th November, 1887, he says this is a very "serious mistake," and continues:

"We observe that some of our contemporaries are declared in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, as they call it, rather than commercial union. They say that in case of unrestricted reciprocity we would be left free to make our own tariff, while the United States might make theirs, and so we would have absolute free trade with the United States, with reference to the products and manufactures of the two countries, without been bound with them in a common tariff. In our opinion those who take this position are making a most serious mistake, as it is certainly not a proposition which will be entertained by our neighbors, and which would have all the burdens and inconveniences attending it which belong to the present system."

The hon. gentleman thinks if they cannot accept commercial union it was better to abandon all idea of unrestricted trade with the United States. He goes on to say:

"If our people are not prepared to accept commercial union they had better abandon all idea of unrestricted trade with the neighboring republic, we must have a common tariff, we must, if we have unrestricted trade, get rid of the customs houses along the entire frontier, and that we could not do except by agreement with our neighbor upon a common tariff."

He points out the objections:

"How are the people of the United States to know that the cottons which we propose to send in are Canadian bleached cotton? How are they to know whether the tweeds and flannels are manufactured in this country or in Scotland?"

So from this evidence we see that the hon. gentleman was first in favor of commercial union as against unrestricted reciprocity. Then we find that although the organs of the party were in favor of unrestricted reciprocity he suddenly changed front in the month of January, 1888, and he turns around in favor of commercial free trade. Then, Sir, we find that all the organs of the party, headed by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) the member for Wellington (Mr. Innes), and the member for South Brant (Mr. Somerville), at once raised a cry against the new policy of the Reform party and against the *Globe* newspaper. Let hon. gentlemen bear in mind this which I take from the *Globe* of 20th January:

"But unrestricted reciprocity would not greatly reduce anything except agricultural implements. Woollens, for instance, are dearer now in Dakota than in Manitoba. On the whole, the Manitoba farmers' supplies, barring machines and tools, are as cheap as in Dakota. Under free trade with the world the Manitoba farmer would obtain untaxed implements and untaxed British goods as well. He would gain nearly all that unrestricted reciprocity can give him. In addition his entire list of necessities would be reduced fully 30 per cent. Freedom of railway building, important as it is, will never be worth as much as free trade to the North-West farmer, grazer or merchant."

You see that the *Globe* was in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. Unrestricted reciprocity would do as much for him as annexation, his position would be nothing like as good under annexation as under free trade for the whole world. Now, Mr. Speaker, again I find that this unrestricted reciprocity on which you are now called to pass judgment in this House, is also condemned in the very strongest terms and the results that would follow from it are pointed out by the *Globe* newspaper again:

"It is not useless, as the pessimists declare, to keep before the country that unrestricted reciprocity, though the most desirable of changes, is not the only alternative, nor even the most profitable policy for Canada. If we wished to produce public despair we might preach that commercial union is the one salvation from the present bad position, and that that salvation should be sought at all costs. But we are content to leave that false and abominable teaching to our good neighbors the pessimists, the gentlemen, not Canadian in any respect, who have set out to smash the Confederation."

This was referring to the member for Bothwell's organ, which had been attacking the *Globe* :

"It is their business to profess despair and create it."

Which they are doing in the House all the time.

"The lengths that they will go may be understood from two particulars. Professor Goldwin Smith's favorite journal recently suggested that the Canadian fisheries should be surrendered for nothing but to placate our neighbors so that they might perhaps incline their hearts to give us reciprocity! And the distinguished writer himself said: 'One touch of the Retaliation Act would bring the policy of separation and restriction down with a run.'"

You will see, Mr. Speaker, that so far I have established beyond all question, that unrestricted reciprocity, commercial union, continental free trade and free trade are one and the same thing so far as those gentlemen on the opposite side of the House are concerned; and that we had at one time or the other the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) in favor of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity or in favor of free trade. What, sir, will be the result of this measure so far as Canada is concerned? We have been told by hon. gentlemen who have spoken that the result of this proposition if adopted or crystallised into legislation must end in direct taxation, and that the revenues of our country will not be able to meet the extraordinary and growing expenses required for carrying on government; so that we must have direct taxation. This, Sir, has been fully pointed out. I have a letter here written by Mr. James Young, the former member for one of the Waterloos, who lives in Galt and whose opinion on this question is well worthy of consideration. That gentleman has given the matter a great deal of study, and some of the most interesting literature contributed to this question during the recess has been contributed by Mr. Young. Mr. Young in one of his pamphlets shows that the result must be direct taxation, and I venture to say that quoting such a high authority as that hon. members on the opposite side of the House will not be inclined to question it. Mr. Young says:

"One of the first results of commercial union would be the loss of nearly \$7,000,000 of revenue annually collected by us from American imports. The total customs revenue of the Dominion for 1886 was \$19,373,551, and notwithstanding our high taxation, there was a deficit of \$5,834,000. How could we pay our public creditors and prevent financial embarrassment if we gave up our control over the tariff, and at the same time threw away \$3,769,000, or over one-third of our total customs receipts, which was the amount collected from the United States goods last year?"

"It will not do to 'pooh-pooh' this question instead of answering it. It is a matter of the most vital consequence. The solvency or bankruptcy of the Dominion may depend upon it. The seven millions of revenue would have to be raised, and how could we do it? We could not raise it by higher duties on imports, for we would be under the continental tariff which we wouldn't control, and if we even trebled our inland revenue taxes it is extremely doubtful if the amount would be forthcoming, for the rates would be, in many cases, prohibitory, inducing smuggling and other evasions of the revenue. But even if we could easily raise the \$7,000,000, what class of Canadian tax-payers, least of all our farmers, who have the brunt of the burden to bear now, would ever dream of taxing themselves for commercial union to such an extent."

That, Sir, is the opinion of a gentleman well informed on all those questions. I think that evidence proves beyond doubt that the result of this policy must be direct taxation. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in his speech a few nights ago refers also to the same question and speaks as regards direct taxation. He admits there would be some difficulty in meeting the revenues, and he shows the only way it could be done would be by direct taxation. He does not look upon that as a very objectionable feature, but Sir, we know that if the leader of the Liberal party were here he would oppose this very scheme. The hon. member for West Durham, in appealing to the electors last February, at Hamilton, said:

"Fiscal system of Canada for many years. What is that system? It is the system of raising revenue by indirect taxation. Direct taxation for the Dominion is, in my judgment, a practical impossibility. Indirect taxation must be the source of our revenue."

Mr. RYKERT.

The hon. member for South Oxford is also at issue with the hon. member for Bothwell. In moving his resolution the other night, he said:

"Sir, I desire to say that, in my judgment, we ought not, I do not think that Government would dare, I do not think any other Government would wish, to add by direct taxation one farthing or one penny to the taxes that now press most heavily on the agricultural classes, on the fishermen, on the miners, on the lumbermen, on all the great producing classes in this community. I shall be prepared to prove in some detail, at the proper place and time, that among the many faults with which our system abounds, perhaps the greatest is this: that under it the hard-working, industrious, thrifty man is taxed enormously out of proportion to his earnings; and I say that with a system of direct taxation, if you must have recourse to it, although I doubt greatly whether you need, with proper economy, have recourse to it, that crying injustice must be redressed, and the respectable, well-to-do, moneyed classes must be made to pay their fair proportion—no more should be asked—to the burdens of the country. This proportion they most assuredly do not contribute to-day, and never will under a system of purely indirect taxation."

Does the hon. member for Bothwell agree with that proposition? He will not answer; I will give the answer for him.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I expressed no opinion upon it. I said that it was a suggestion for an income tax.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman's memory is a little defective. I noticed that he applauded the hon. member for South Oxford when he made that speech, and being such a high authority on political economy the hon. gentleman I know entirely approved of it—that customs duties should be done away with and the taxes should be levied by direct taxation.

M. MILLS (Bothwell). He never said so.

Mr. RYKERT. I read it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. RYKERT. Well, I will read it again:

"I shall be prepared to prove in some detail, at the proper time and place, that among the many faults with which our system abounds—"

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The protective system.

Mr. RYKERT. No, he does not say that at all.

"—perhaps the greatest is this: that under it the hardworking, industrious, thrifty man is taxed enormously out of proportion to his earnings; and I say that a system of direct taxation, if you must have recourse to it, &c."

What did the hon. member for Bothwell say a short time ago? He said it would be absurd to have direct taxation. It is really hard to catch him; now you have him, and now you have not. On 23rd December, 1887, the *London Advertiser*, his organ, says:

"Mr. Mills in his celebrated work on political economy pointed out the reasons why a fairly imposed customs tax is preferable to direct taxation and the reason he assigns are of general application. Direct tax must be paid at some stated time, whether it is convenient for the tax-payer or not, and it never can be imposed upon the community, in such a way as to impose upon each individual burden in proportion to his ability to pay. A customs tax, if the principles of free trade are kept in view, and if levied for the sole purpose of revenue, is really an income tax in the expenditure of each family, in the purchase of imports, bears a much closer proportion to the income of each person, than if an attempt were specially made to tax income."

Now, if the hon. gentleman is logical and consistent, he will oppose this resolution, because its effect must be as stated by himself and others—direct taxation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes, the hon. gentleman said so himself, and the hon. member for South Oxford said so in his speech.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, he does not, nor does he in the extract you read.

Mr. RYKERT. He said:

"We will suppose, for argument's sake—"

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentlemen do not disconcert me in the least. I can stay here until to-morrow morning if necessary,—

"We will suppose, for argument's sake, that we have to face this bugbear of direct taxation—direct taxation, be it remembered, not for all our revenue, but a trifling portion of it alone. Now, Sir, I have to call the attention of the House in that connection to certain important facts. First of all, no man who has paid any attention to this subject will, I think, dare to deny the fact, which, I think, is recognised by every political economist, that direct taxation properly levied takes a great deal less out of the pocket of the people than direct taxation; most of all, indirect taxation, levied as our system of indirect taxation is levied now."

That is what the hon. gentleman says. He says that we require a revenue of \$35,000,000, that in pooling the most we can have is \$25,000,000, and that the rest will have to be raised by direct taxation. He said that distinctly at Ingersoll. I believe the hon. member for Bothwell is opposed to direct taxation, and he says the whole Reform party is opposed to it; and yet the organ of the party is in favor of direct taxation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. RYKERT. Well, we will see before I get through. The *Globe* on 22nd September, 1887, said:

"The only objection to its adoption is that some part of the Dominion revenue might have to be raised by direct taxation. To our mind that is another recommendation. To pay a considerable share of taxes directly would induce the people to be very careful as to whom they committed the administration. Still it appears to be true that direct taxation is much of a bugaboo to politicians, especially to French Canadians."

So you see the *Globe* is in favor of direct taxation, and says it is only a bugaboo raised by the French Canadians. Then we find that the *Globe* says commercial union would result in direct taxation:

"If the advantages are what he states, is the objection that free trade involves direct taxation a powerful one? Certainly not from unmitigated commercial unionists. That reduction of the United States tariff which is certainly imminent, will reduce the American revenue so much that, if Canadians paid to it according to consumption, and shared in it according to population, they would have to resort to direct taxation in order to provide the Federal Government with the necessary revenue."

The *Globe*, on January 23rd, says further:

"If it be objected that continental free trade cannot be had on terms leaving Canadians free to making more fiscal progress, our answer is that the *Globe* has never favored commercial union on any terms."

There the *Globe* denies having been in favor of commercial union; yet I pointed out that it was in favor of commercial union at the time of the East Northumberland election, when, urged on by the hon. member for West Ontario, it called on the party to gather its forces together and show the country that the Reform party was not quite dead. Now, we have again, on 28th December, 1887, the *Globe's* opinion, as follows:—

"It is said that Canadians cannot be educated up to direct taxation. Bah! The very pessimists who affect to believe so much in public stupidity admit that a considerable revenue would have to be raised by direct taxation under commercial union. If the Americans reduce their tariff, as President Cleveland proposes, the revenue to Canada from the projected customs union would be quite inadequate to her needs, and her Government would have to raise, by direct taxation, an amount no easier to collect in that way than the total sum needed for governmental purposes. That is nothing against commercial union. Sir Richard Cartwright faced the prospect boldly and honestly. He pointed out that direct taxation must come of continental free trade. So much the better, say we. Direct taxation is a good thing of itself. The people can be convinced of this without any more trouble than is necessary to carry any great wholesome reform. What pusillanimity is that which shrinks from the advocacy because the good cause would be defeated 'if submitted at the polls to-morrow.' And what dishonesty that the very persons who allege 'direct taxation' to bar 'abolition of custom houses' should make nothing of 'direct taxation' as a bar to the scheme which they propose to favor!"

So you will see that they are in favor of direct taxation. The *Globe* is in favor of continental free trade as opposed to unrestricted reciprocity and also as opposed to commercial union, and then, as I have shown, the *Globe* is entirely

in favor of direct taxation. What I find fault with also, and what the hon. gentleman has pointed out himself in moving the resolution, is that it must result in discrimination against the mother country. That, I think is a very important matter. So important was this question of discrimination considered in 1879, when the National Policy was under discussion in this Parliament, that the then hon. member for West Middlesex, the Hon. Mr. Ross, now Minister of Education in Ontario, made a very strong appeal against it, based on the fact that it would discriminate against England. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) also took the same ground, and gave instances to show, by selections from different portions of the tariff that it meant discrimination against the mother country. Now, these hon. gentlemen, however, are willing to abandon all that, they are willing to withdraw their former statements, and are prepared to accept a resolution which certainly means discrimination against England. Although they hold that the Government were wrong in the policy they adopted in 1879, they are yet prepared to adopt a policy which, as regards discrimination, must have the same effect as they contended the Government policy of 1879 had. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was then very much annoyed at the idea of discriminating against England, and he animadverted a good deal on what he called the "lip loyalty" of this side of the House. At page 451 of the *Hansard*, he is reported to have said:

"But a few weeks have passed, and both sides of the House were uniting and expressing the gratitude to Her Majesty for having confided her child to our care. If that illustrious lady were to return to England, I am afraid she will be obliged to tell her Royal Mother that the practical outcome of all this lip loyalty was a policy directly antagonistic to the interests of Great Britain, a policy which whatever may be the intentions of the Finance Minister and his colleagues, seems on its practical results especially designed to injure British interest and hamper British trade."

But the hon. member for South Oxford, in speaking at Ingersoll, did not think discrimination against England any objection whatever to his new policy. He there said:

"Anyway, let us have no cant on this subject. We are not called on to be more British than the British themselves."

"Our total trade is not of much consequence to Great Britain, and the loss of a small fraction of it, if they do lose it, will do them very little harm."

Now, it has been said over and over again that the Treaty of 1874 forced the Hon. George Brown to discriminate against England. In delivering his speech in Parliament upon that treaty, he pointed out that it would not discriminate against England, in the following language:—

"I come now to the objections which have been urged against the treaty from such a quarter as entitle them to a formal answer. The first of these is the allegation that the treaty discriminated against Great Britain in favor of the United States. Nothing could be more unfounded than this. It was perfectly understood from the opening of the negotiations that no article could be free from duty in regard to the United States that was not also free with regard to Great Britain, and nothing else was ever contemplated for a moment."

You see now that while these gentlemen, in 1879, were opposed to discrimination against England, they are prepared to vote to-day for a resolution involving such discrimination, and the hon. gentleman who moved it does not care about that. The trade of England, he says, is very small, and England can look after herself. Another objection which, in my judgment, is a very strong one against this proposed arrangement, and which the hon. the mover of the resolution admitted to exist, is that it will inflict serious injury on our home manufactures. Even the hon. member for South Brant, on Friday evening, was obliged to admit that it would affect some manufactures, and he thought it might affect his own; but he was so patriotic as not to care about that, so long as the best interests of the country were served. This afternoon that hon. gentleman found considerable fault with me because I had telegraphed to several manufacturers with reference to what he said on Friday evening. If the hon.

gentleman had no object in showing to the country that these gentlemen were in favor of the resolution, why did he mention their names? He found fault with me when I telegraphed to know whether what the hon. gentleman had said in their regard was true or not. I read a letter from Mr. Gurney, of Hamilton, a gentleman whom I have never met, but who, having listened to the hon. member for South Brant in this House, for he had occupied a seat in the gallery during a part of the hon. gentleman's speech, voluntarily wrote me this letter in which he says that the statement of the hon. member for South Brant with reference to him was not correct.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did he say that in his letter?

Mr. RYKERT. You heard the letter read.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did he say that I made a statement that was not correct.

Mr. RYKERT. He said he understood you had said so, and it was not correct. I simply read the letter, and I am not going to be baffled and thrown off my balance by the hon. gentleman's interruptions, which are most unseemly. Since my observations, this afternoon, I caused a telegram to be sent to Mr. Rosamond, to which the hon. gentleman will probably not take any exception. Why did the hon. gentleman quote Mr. Rosamond and Mr. Gurney and all those manufacturers, if not to show that they were in favor of the resolution; if not to show that they were opposed to ordinary reciprocity, but were in favor of this resolution. This telegram was sent to Mr. Rosamond:

"When you stated, in 1878, before the Depression Committee that reciprocity would be of benefit to everybody, did you mean unrestricted reciprocity or a renewal of the old Reciprocity Treaty?"

The answer is:

"The old Reciprocity Treaty, certainly."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman quoted from the evidence given before that Depression Committee, to show that Mr. Rosamond was in favor of the resolution. Mr. Rosamond has replied that he was in favor of the old Reciprocity Treaty, but is not in favor of unrestricted reciprocity. The ground we take is that we are in favor of the old Reciprocity Treaty; we are in favor of—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to call his attention to what the hon. member did say.

Mr. RYKERT. Let the hon. gentleman take his seat. He will be able to speak by-and-bye. We have had constant interruptions, and they have led to unpleasant remarks being made across the House which do not tend to improve the proper conduct of business in this House. Whenever the hon. gentleman is cornered, he gets nettled, but I propose to take my own line in this matter. I have heard what the hon. gentleman has stated, and I have asked the manufacturers if they were in favor of the resolution before the House, and they state distinctly that they are not. Now we come to other evidence which I propose to place before the House. At a manufacturers' meeting at Toronto on 10th February last, at which both Mr. Massey and Mr. Goldie were present, whose names have been mentioned by hon. gentlemen opposite, the following resolution was passed unanimously:—

"Whereas strong and constant efforts are being made to bring about commercial union between Canada and the United States; and

"Whereas the inevitable result of such a move would be the sundering of the political ties which bind us to the mother country, and annex us to the United States;

"Be it therefore resolved: That the Canadian Manufacturers' Association is entirely opposed to commercial union with the United States and to any other political proposition that might imperil our existing

Mr. RYKERT.

relations with Great Britain, or prejudice the political status of the Dominion or the welfare of the Canadian manufacturing industries."

I assume that that resolution, passed by a representative body, will have more weight than a dozen speeches, and distorted speeches at that, of the hon. gentleman. I pointed out, this afternoon, that a leading member in his own city (Mr. Osborne) had written to the *Empire* as to his views on the subject, and boards all over the Dominion have expressed their opinions in the same way. We have also the evidence of many manufacturers to the same effect. Mr. John Hallam, of Toronto, who is, I believe, a celebrated Reformer of that city, says:

"I am in favor of commercial union in the fullest acceptance of the term, providing that England and Canada could have free trade on a reasonable revenue tariff with the United States. I am not in favor of commercial union between Canada and the United States as against England and the British colonies throughout the world.

"I believe that we can buy everything we need in England and the British colonies at lower prices and of better quality than we can in the United States, with the exception of a very few special articles.

"Commercial union between Canada and the United States to the exclusion of Great Britain would not, in my opinion, be of general benefit to the whole of Canada. I think the Maritime Provinces are so situated geographically as that they would be benefited by commercial union. The same, in my opinion, will apply to Manitoba.

"For these and other reasons I am opposed to the scheme of commercial union as advocated by Goldwin Smith and Erastus Wiman. I want more light on the subject.

"However much Canada might favor commercial union or a more liberal trade policy with the United States, I am of opinion that the United States will not grant it, and I think it extremely foolish for us to agitate such a question until we are reasonably sure that such a policy would be entertained by the Government of that country."

So you see that these gentlemen are opposed to commercial union and in favor of ordinary reciprocity. Then we have also Mr. John Dobson, who gives the same opinion. He says:

"I am decidedly opposed to commercial union. Canada is yet a young manufacturing country, hence the principle to preserve a close balance between consumers and producers at home has not been applicable hitherto.

"A nation should encourage trade with one not producing the same products as itself. Canada and the United States have similar products.

"Great Britain has different; therefore Canada should encourage trade with the latter.

"Canadian manufacturers would be for a time undersold by the longer established firms in the United States, and would be finally forced to shut down. Then prices would be increased to the loss of Canadian farmers.

"It would undoubtedly mean annexation, and both countries are safer and better apart. Britain has been the true friend of Canada in sunshine and in shadow. It would be base ingratitude to grant favors to a stranger that would be denied a friend.

"I am, therefore, opposed to commercial union, which is only annexation in disguise."

As I pointed out, if you have this commercial union, every retail store would be filled with goods from the United States. I have also a very high authority on this subject—at least I know he thinks himself a high authority—I refer to the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar)—and he points out this difficulty in a letter to Mr. Wiman, that it is going to affect the manufactures and disarrange the trade of this country for a long time to come. He says:

"I wish now to refer to an objection, which is raised in Canada, against a proposal to place manufactured goods, as well as natural products, upon the free lists of the two countries. It is contended, with much force, that the early, sudden and complete removal of these duties would have a serious effect upon the trade of the country. It is true that stocks in the hands of importers, upon which duties had been paid, would be ruinously depreciated by suddenly throwing open the door to the admission of the same goods, free. The stocks and raw material of manufacturers, upon which duties have been paid, would also depreciate, and much of their plant might be useless until adapted to the new requirements of their business. The striking off so many customs duties at a blow would also reduce the Canadian revenue to an extent that could not be borne by our finances at the moment, for time would be required to re-arrange the public income and expenditure. For all these reasons it must be conceded that extensive remissions of duties upon manufactured goods should not be made suddenly, but only after ample notice; and, even when the reduction begins, it must be gradual. In this way alone would importers have an opportunity to work off their old stocks, and to regulate their new importations to suit the new openings for trade."

So high an authority as the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is not in favor of this resolution being adopted by the country at the present time.

Mr. EDGAR. I am, certainly, that letter is in favor of it.

Mr. RYKERT. The first letter says that it is impracticable.

Mr. EDGAR. Will not my hon. friend finish reading the letter which he read a part of?

Mr. RYKERT. I have read all his letters, though I have not read them all here.

Mr. EDGAR. But you have not finished reading that letter.

Mr. RYKERT. I do not propose to place that kind of light literature on the pages of *Hansard* at this time. I do not think that would be conducive to the welfare of the country.

Mr. EDGAR. That is exceedingly fair.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman shows that it is impossible to carry out this scheme, that it will seriously affect our manufacturers and will disarrange our trade. That is why I point it out. It is going also, in my judgment, to be very injurious to the farmers, and I will support my judgment by reading an article from the *Globe* on that point, and particularly in reference to the North-West farmers. I know, hon. gentlemen opposite, like to hear that authority quoted, but I must confess that I have not much confidence in my witness on general questions, though occasionally it tells the truth. It says:

"Now the selling price of North-West wheat would not be appreciably increased by unrestricted reciprocity. It will fetch almost as much sent over the Canadian Pacific Railway to England as sent to Minneapolis. To increase the profits of its growers they require cheap supplies. But unrestricted reciprocity would not greatly reduce anything except agricultural implements. Woollens, for instance, are dearer now in Dakota than in Manitoba. On the whole, the Manitoba farmers' supplies, barring machines and tools, are as cheap as in Dakota. Under free trade with the world the Manitoba farmer would obtain untaxed American implements and untaxed British goods as well. He would gain nearly all that unrestricted reciprocity can give him."

So, as far as the farmer is concerned, unrestricted reciprocity would not be of much benefit to him, and Mr. Wiman pointed out a few days ago, when speaking in Winnipeg, that it might even hurt the Manitoba farmers. No doubt, therefore, the farmers would be hurt by it to a considerable extent. The question was raised a few nights ago by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) as to who pays the duty, and he then stated that his opinion was that the exporter of barley from this country paid the duty. His language was:

"Take the case of barley. As has been stated to-night already, we exported last year 9,437,717 bushels, the value of which was \$5,245,000; but I ask hon. gentlemen, did the farmers get that \$5,250,000? They did not, because they had to pay in duty, \$943,000."

Now, Sir, if the hon. gentleman were present, I would like to refer him to a high authority on that question. I will give him the answer from one of his own leaders, a gentleman whose opinion, no doubt, he will take, that is the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). He seems to have solved that question as to who pays the duty. He has expressed a decided opinion that so far as barley is concerned, the exporter does not pay the duty but the consumer does. I was surprised at the hon. gentleman making those remarks in presence of the hon. member for Bothwell. The hon. member for Bothwell some time ago, in addressing the electors in the campaign of 1878, made a speech which is reported in a campaign document, called "Reform Government in the Dominion." The hon. member for Bothwell was then Minister of the Interior, and he, in a speech he then made, answered the question of the hon. member for North Victoria.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You don't agree with that.

Mr. RYKERT. I do not agree with much the hon. gentleman says, but I do not suppose the hon. gentleman will wilfully mistake what the facts are. I give the answer for the benefit of the hon. member for North Victoria. This is what the hon. member for Bothwell said relating to barley:

"He says in regard to the taxes put on Canadian barley, that the Canadian farmer undergoes that much loss, and so pays a large amount of money into the treasury of the United States. If that be true, why all this row about the imposition of one cent on the pound of tea? Why, according to the doctor, that comes out of the Chinaman. My view is the consumer pays it. But if the doctor is right, the Chinaman pays it. If the doctor is right, the tax on broadcloth is paid by the English manufacturer, and that on cottons by the manufacturer of New England. Why then this complaint of the burdens of taxation. We are, according to Dr. Orton's views, simply taxing the foreigners to trade with us. Our opponents are wrong upon one point or the other. Well, if we pay the tax that is imposed upon the produce of other countries, we certainly do not pay the tax upon the product of Canada going into the United States."

He goes on further to say, page 96:

"It is said the Americans have been injuring us by sending into Canada wheat, flour and Indian corn, and I wish to call attention to this question. Before doing so, perhaps I had better give you some evidence of the fact that duties imposed by the American Government on the various products of the agriculturists of Canada have in no wise affected the prices of various articles which have been sent into the American market from Canada."

And he goes on to give the prices of the various farm products for the twenty-two years from 1854 to 1876; and then he adds:

"I might go over the prices of barley, rye and other cereals with much the same result, thus establishing the uncontrovertible fact that the duties imposed by the American Congress upon the produce of Canada do not fall upon the people of Canada, but are paid by the consumers of these articles in the United States."

Now, Sir, that is the answer I give to the hon. member. The hon. member seemed to find considerable fault when I asked him a question the other night. Now, I give him the answer from one of his own leaders. Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored, in these observations, to show that the scheme is an impracticable one. I have shown from their own mouths that the scheme is surrounded by great difficulties that it would be utterly impossible to get rid of, if we adopted the resolution of the hon. gentleman. In my opinion it is impracticable to discuss this proposed treaty at the present time, because a discussion is going on the other side of the line in reference to a proposed change of tariff. Under any circumstances I feel it would be unwise; and I do not think the Americans will concede that treaty at the present time. I am not in favor of humiliating Canada at the feet of the United States. I am in favor, as I said a few minutes ago, of remaining as we are. We have made material progress and great advancement during the past 15 or 20 years. Unmistakable evidence surrounds us that Canada has prospered in a greater degree than almost any other country in the world. I have shown by statistics that Ontario and Quebec have increased in a greater ratio than the neighboring States of New York and Ohio, notwithstanding that they had the large cities of New York, Buffalo, Cleveland and Cincinnati to contribute to their prosperity. I have shown that the progress of the Maritime Provinces has been greater than that of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York and Ohio. I have shown further that the ratio of increase, even in Prince Edward Island, of which hon. gentlemen complain so bitterly, is greater than that of New York State—15.47 as against 15.40. I say that having confidence in the future of my country, I am not prepared to advocate any scheme which will have the effect of humiliating us, as is proposed by this resolution. Reciprocity may be very well in natural products, but the time has not come when we should ask the Americans to give us reciprocity upon any other terms than those we have already offered. They have shown they were not favorable to the Treaty of 1874, which was a

liberal and a wide treaty, and was as far as our party is prepared to go, and yet that proposition was treated with disdain. So long as I have been in Parliament I have not been in favor of any treaty that would place us in a humiliating position. So long as we continue our present rate of progress, I am not disposed to alter our system. I believe that Canada is destined, in the future as she has done in the past, to make rapid and gigantic strides. We have within ourselves all the elements of greatness, we have everything to make a great country; we ought to take advantage of our position, and if we do so I believe that we will make Canada one of the best countries in the world

Mr. TAYLOR. Representing, as I do, one of the largest and one of the wealthiest agricultural constituencies in the Province of Ontario, I feel it my duty, both to myself and my constituents, not to allow this motion to be put without giving a few reasons why I think it would be injurious to the best interests of this country to adopt the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). My first objection to the resolution is that it has been moved purely in the interest of the Reform party in this country. It is a well known fact that that party has had no policy for sometime past. As a proof of that I will read from one of the organs of that party, and I am sure that it will be accepted as an authority, for it is the only religious daily published in Canada. Here is what the *Montreal Witness* says of that party:

"The Liberal party has no policy on any subject, for the simple reason that it accepts as members all who oppose the Conservative Government of the day, whether they oppose it from principle or merely from personal prejudice. Thus there are protectionists and free traders, monopolists and anti-monopolists, railway promoters and anti-railway promoters, prohibitionists and anti-prohibitionists, men of all stripes in its ranks, and it, therefore, cannot formulate a policy on any subject. What is the party for anyway? 'The business of the Opposition is to oppose,' said Lord Randolph Churchill, but the Canadian Opposition does not even fulfil that conservative function effectively."

That is what the *Montreal Witness* says of the Reform party. It is true that before they met here during the present Session, they were without a policy. One of the members of the Opposition, an honest farmer, who thought commercial union was the platform of the Reform party, put a notice on the paper declaring in favor of commercial union. Then a hurried caucus was called, and the party formulated the policy laid down in the resolution now before the House. But I oppose the resolution for other considerations than mere party. I believe that if it were adopted and carried into effect it would prove disastrous to the agriculturists, to the manufacturers, to the laboring classes, as well as the mercantile interests of the country. I say it would prove injurious to the farmers, from the fact that we here produce similar articles of produce to those produced in larger quantities in the United States, and as the produce of the United States comes into direct competition with the produce of the farmers of this country, and as their seasons are much earlier than ours, the effect is that they are able to export produce to this country to take the place of Canadian produce, and consequently a certain amount of our produce has to be exported. An hon. member speaking the other night made reference to the fact that our exports under the National Policy were less than previous to the adoption of the National Policy. He was answered by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House that as our manufactures had increased there was more labor employed in the country and more of our produce was consumed here. But I will give a better reason than that. I take the imports of grain from the United States in 1877 and compare them with the returns for 1887, on grain entered for home consumption, as the statistics appear in the Trade and Navigation Returns. The following is the result:—

Mr. BYRNES.

GRAIN Imported from the U. S. and entered for home consumption:—

	1877.		1887.	
	Bush.	Value.	Bush.	Value.
Oats.....	1,697,968	\$ 610,632	19,797	\$ 7,741
Corn	8,260,079	4,269,543	2,029,081	884,125
Wheat	4,689,051	4,848,824	22,540	18,313
	14,547,098	\$9,717,059	2,071,398	\$910,179
	2,071,398	910,179		
Decrease in 1887..	12,475,700	\$8,806,880		
Wheat flour.....	Brls. 549,083	\$2,964,273	Brls. 169,629	638,618
Eye flour	1,969	9,616	135	503
Corn meal.....	294,342	678,477	136,137	310,864
	845,374	\$4,852,366	305,901	\$950,085
	305,901	950,085		
Decrease in 1887..	539,473	\$2,902,281		

More in 1877 on grain \$ 8,206,880
More in 1877 on flour. 2,902,287

\$11,709,161

What do these statistics mean? They simply mean that those grains, ripening sooner than the Dominion product, were forced into this market and displaced \$11,000,000 worth of the produce of Canada, which had to be exported to make room for the American product. Those are the true facts of the case, and it would continue if we had commercial union to-morrow. The same may be said of fruit, vegetables, and all other farm products. I take the returns for apples, and I find the following:—

1877.		1887.	
Brls.	Value.	Brls.	Value.
173,968	\$203,067	26,835	\$56,484
26,835	56,484		
157,133	\$146,583		Decrease in 1887.

I say, therefore, that in regard to those items, our trade would suffer very materially, to say nothing about our cattle trade. Had we unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, our cattle would be scheduled the same as American cattle on entering the United Kingdom. What would that mean? It would mean a loss of from \$4 to \$6 on every animal exported from this country to the British market. A similar result would follow in regard to our dairy industry. We saw by the newspapers a few days ago that the Colonial Office had given instructions to enquire if Canadian cheese was adulterated by the products of animal fat. Why was this done? Simply because the Americans wanted to put their bogus cheese on the English market as Canadian cheese. We have noticed that large quantities of American cheese are sent to Montreal over the Grand Trunk railway, and there shipped to the English market. A similar result would also follow in regard to our butter industry. American bogus butter is at present shut out by legislation, yet if unrestricted reciprocity were brought into force that bogus butter would come in here and inflict great injury on our dairy industry, as was the case before that legislation was enacted. My hon. friend the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) read the other day the statement of one of the presidents of the Agricultural Institute of New York, stating that the value of their land had depreciated 25 per cent. during the last ten years, owing to the fact of bogus butter being allowed to be made in the United States; yet hon. gentlemen opposite who take the farmers to their breasts and desire to do everything beneficial to them want to have the same state of things brought about that was in existence a couple of years before the legislation prohibiting the importation into Canada of bogus butter was passed. We have also requests made for legislation to protect the farmers against bogus lard, and I fancy before this Session closes

legislation similar to that respecting butter will be passed. So much for the farmers of the country. Then I referred to the fact that I believed the adoption of the resolution would injure manufacturers. I know this that there is hardly any article of manufacture in the United States without a combination of all the manufacturers engaged in the same line of industry. If we had unrestricted reciprocity our manufacturers would either have to join the combination or they would be crushed out; if they joined the combination they would simply have the trade they have now worked up to a certain extent, but the result would be that nine out of ten of them would be killed. I also realise the fact that our laboring classes would be injured. I believe so from this fact: that there are nearly as many men in the prisons of the United States engaged in manufacturing goods as there are free laborers in Canada; and if we had unrestricted reciprocity the free labor of Canada would come into direct competition with the prison-made goods of the United States. I need say but very little to show the effect it would have on the merchants of the country. I have already said enough to convince the House and the country that, with unrestricted reciprocity our farmers, manufacturers and workingmen would suffer, and these all suffering our merchants would also suffer likewise. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) said the other night that the National Policy had done little or nothing to develop our inter-provincial trade. When I was home on Saturday I was in one of our manufacturing concerns in Gananoque, when the manager handed to me a letter, which, he said, contained a pretty decent order. It was dated Summerside, P.E.I.; perhaps the hon. member for Queen's knows where that is. West & McLeod, P. E. I., perhaps he knows those gentlemen. The order was for about \$20,000. It was not for wheat or pork or beans or something of that sort to feed the starving farmers. That \$20,000 was for luxuries, it was for top buggies to drive those poor farmers around the country in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Too poor to walk.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, too poor to walk.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What is the name of the firm?

Mr. TAYLOR. West & McLeod, of Summerside, P.E.I. You know them probably. He also showed me another order from Fredericton signed by a man named Johnson, for \$30,000 or \$40,000 for similar articles. Here now we have \$60,000 of an order to a Canadian manufacturer, and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman where those orders would have gone only for the National Policy? Would they not have been transferred to Boston, and would not the manufacturers and mechanics of Boston have had the pleasure and profit of making those goods while the American farmers would have had the pleasure of feeding them, in place of the farmers of my own county selling their produce to Canadian mechanics and manufacturers. For these reasons I think the National Policy has developed an inter-provincial trade. Those orders were from gentlemen living down in the Maritime Provinces, and they represent the benefits to one factory in Ontario. But the same thing is being repeated all over the Dominion. When the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was making that blue ruin speech of his which we have often heard in this House before, and was telling us that we lost one out of every four of our native-born population and three out of every four of our immigrants, there was a remark made by the hon. gentleman who sits beside, which did not get into the *Hansard* or into the newspapers, but which is too good to lose, and I think I will repeat it. When the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was dwelling on the great exodus, my hon. friend remarked: "My goodness, it makes one feel lonely to think we are losing our friends at that rate." I do not blame the hon. member for making

the remark. If the exodus was going on at the rate it was pictured we would feel very lonely indeed. The hon. gentlemen opposite have told us in their speeches that the farmers of this country are being ruined by this National Policy, that they are being taxed to death, and the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), stated that the annual tax on the average family was \$35 a year. I heard that figure mentioned before from a gentleman in my county, and I fancy they both must have got their information from the same source. Those speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite are made, I believe, for a purpose, and that purpose is to try to prejudice the farmer, and to raise a feeling of discontent among the farmers of this country, and try to make them believe that the manufacturers and merchants are ruining them, and that they are being taxed to death to support the manufacturers principally. I have made the statement before and I make it here in my place again, that it is possible for a farmer, a workingman or for a gentleman, and many of them do live in this country, to enjoy all the necessaries and even some of the luxuries of life without contributing one dollar a year to the taxes of this Dominion. I made that statement and an intelligent, respectable, well-to-do Grit farmer in my county contradicted me, and said: "My taxes amounted to \$35 last year." I asked him who he paid that to and who collected it? He said "The tax collector collected \$35." I said: "Where did the tax collector put it, where did it go?" and I told him I would resign my seat in Parliament if he would prove that one cent of the \$35 that tax collector got from him found its way into the Dominion Treasury. I said that was spent by your own council that you elected in the spring, it went for maintaining bridges and roads and paying the school rate, except what went to the county council and was probably expended in maintaining the court house, the jail and the registry office, and your reeve looks after that. Not one cent of it went to the Government." He said: "The *Globe* says we pay \$35 a year, and I believe it. It says we must pay it on everything we eat and wear," and I replied: "The *Globe* does not tell the truth and I will prove it to you." I said: "Here is a statement of the *Globe* made for the benefit of you farmers, and we will work it out and see how far it is true. The *Globe* says the gross debt is \$281,000,000 and the net debt \$220,000,000; and then it goes on to tell about how much that represents for every man, woman and child. It says the debt has increased \$75 a minute under Tory rule, and the annual interest \$21 a minute. Now let us take the debt at what the *Globe* says, \$220,000,000. The average interest is three and a-half per cent, and that represents \$7,700,000. Now what will the interest be at \$21 a minute? There are sixty minutes in the hour and twenty-four hours in the day and 365 days in the year, and multiplying those figures together we find that it would amount to eleven millions some hundred thousand dollars, that is just about \$4,000,000 of a mistake, which is not very much for the *Globe* after all. Now let us take the other calculation of \$75 a minute as the gross debt. There are sixty minutes in the hour; let us multiply 75 by 60; there are 24 hours in the day; multiply that result by 24, and there are 365 days in the year and we multiply that again by 365. We have had Tory rule for fifteen years, and say we started out at Confederation without a dollar of debt, and the Mackenzie Administration did not increase the debt; let us multiply our former result by 15 (the number of years of Tory rule out of the twenty years since Confederation) and this would make our debt \$591,000,000 if the *Globe's* calculation was right. That is only a little over \$300,000,000 of a false statement for the *Globe*."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is nothing of a mistake.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is about on a par with the mistakes they make on the other side of the House. I told the far-

mer: "There are the figures the *Globe* has given to you, and it is trying to make you believe that you pay \$35 a year taxes." He said: "But we pay it on what we eat." I said: "Well, I will go to your house, and I will sit down at the table while you are eating your dinner and we will see what you pay. Do not you raise on your farm every bit of meat and flour, and butter and eggs that goes on your table. Is there any tax on them?" He could not say that there was. I said: "Unless you drink whiskey or smoke tobacco or cigars, which you are better off without, you do not contribute anything to the taxes of the country, except a few cents on the pepper and spices, and other little items that go to make up a tasty dish of hash. There is nothing else you pay on among the necessities of life. When the Mackenzie Administration were in power they taxed your tea. There is no tax on your tea now." Now, take what you wear. I had a suit of wool cloth on at the time, and I told the farmer if it was good enough for me it was good enough for him. I pointed out: "You grow the wool yourself; you take it down to your own mill and it is made there, and you pay no tax. It is the same way with your cotton. The raw material comes in free. It is made here, and you as a farmer feed the hands that make it, so you see there is no duty on your cotton, but if you wish to go and buy in the United States and bring it here then you pay the duty. I said to him: "I will give you a practical illustration of who pays the duty." Here are two men keeping house; each keeps a cow. They each want to lay in a couple of barrels of flour for their family during winter. They say instead of buying the flour we will go out and buy the wheat. One man goes out and buys ten bushels of wheat at 80 cents a bushel. He says to the miller: "How much a bushel will you charge me for grinding it, giving me the offal required for my cow." This man gets his wheat ground and has his flour and the offal for his cow at \$9. The other farmer does not believe in befriending the Canadian farmer or miller, and he says he will go to the American farmer and buy 10 bushels of wheat for 80 cents a bushel. He takes it to the American miller and gets it ground, with the result that suppose he gets it at the same price of \$9 as the Canadian farmer; but then when he tries to bring it across the line, the custom house officer says he has to pay \$1 duty on his two barrels of flour. This raises the price to \$10, because the man had to pay the duty, which he would not have to pay if it were manufactured in Canada.

Mr. BOWELL. And he has to pay duty on the offal besides.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was just giving this as an illustration. That man paid the duty, and so does every man who brings anything across the line—the consumer pays the duty. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we pay the duty on what goes out, and we also pay it on what comes in. The hon. member for South Oxford stated that we produce many articles in Canada that are not produced in the United States, and *vice versa*. I dispute that statement. I ask the hon. gentleman to name an article, the produce of the farm or the factory, that is made in Canada and that is not made in the United States. On the other hand, there are a large number of articles made or grown there that are not made or grown in Canada. Now, I purpose dealing for a few moments with an article that I am very conversant with, that is barley, and I will try to satisfy my hon. friends opposite as to who pays the duty on barley. My hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) made the statement, the other night, that the farmers pay the duty, and he gave the right hon. leader of the Government as his authority for the statement, and asked me if I agreed with him. He quoted from a newspaper report of the right hon.

Mr. TAYLOR.

gentleman's speech, and I read his quotation in *Hansard*, which was a misquotation, for I have heard the speech of the right hon. gentleman on two or three occasions. That speech was made previous to the National Policy in 1878. At that time American grains were allowed to come into Canada free, while our grains going into the United States had to pay a duty. The right hon. gentleman, in advocating a policy of protection, described a farm on the boundary line of Maine, where the line is an imaginary one, and he said a farmer having a farm on each side of the line grows barley, and he had a hundred bushels on one side and a hundred bushels on the other side. He takes his American barley to the American buyer, and sells it for \$1 a bushel and gets \$100. He also takes his Canadian barley over and has to pay 15 cents a bushel, and there sells it for \$1 a bushel, and therefore he has only \$35 for his Canadian barley. That statement is correct, and if the farmer did that, he paid the duty on the 100 bushels. But I want hon. gentlemen to understand that when he took his Canadian barley across the line it lost its identity, and simply sold at the price State barley was worth. But if he had taken that barley to the Canadian buyer on this side of the line, he would have sold it for \$1 a bushel as well as in the United States, and the buyer would have taken it to the States and paid the duty upon it himself, from the fact that Canadian barley in the United States was quoted at 15 cents a bushel more than State barley. I have been buying barley for twenty-five years on the shore of the River St. Lawrence, and right opposite me on the American shore is an American buyer, and during those twenty-five years that buyer has not paid for American barley one cent more than I have paid for Canadian barley on this side. I will show you how the Canadian barley loses its identity when it crosses the line. Previous to the adoption of the National Policy American barley came into Canada free of duty. I was buying on the Canadian shore, and American farmers used to put barley on their boats and bring it to me. I paid them for it in Canada money; as Canada money was worth a premium at that time, it was an inducement to the American farmers to bring their barley to this side. No man will tell me that barley grown here is better than barley grown six or ten miles further south. No maltster can tell the difference between Ontario barley and that grown in the State of New York; but the maltsters control the price and they buy their barley at an export price. They want all the bright barley grown in the United States and Canada, and rather than let ours be exported to England, they pay the duty on ours. The barley that I bought from American farmers previous to the National Policy was consigned by me to commission merchants at Oswego or New York, and was bought by the American maltsters at 15 cents a bushel higher than the American barley, and I made profit on it. Will hon. gentlemen opposite tell me who paid the duty on that barley? Here are the quotations of barley in the *Mail* newspaper of 8th November, 1881, when the duty on our barley going into the United States was 15 cents a bushel. No. 1 bright Canada, \$1.15; six-rowed State, \$1.00, just 15 cents difference between American bright No. 1 and Canada No. 1, the amount of the duty. What happened? The maltsters of the United States, knowing that they paid the duty, went to Washington in 1883, where it is reported they spent \$150,000 in lobbying the Government to get the duty on barley reduced. They did get it reduced from 15 cents to 10 cents a bushel. Did the Canadian farmer get the benefit of that reduction in the duty? If he did not, would he get the benefit of the removal of the entire 10 cents? Here are the quotations from the same paper just after the reduction in the duty: Canada No. 1, 75 cents; choice State, 65 cents, just 10 cents difference, the exact amount of the duty. Now, who paid the duty? If the maltsters went down to Washington and

got the duty lowered from 15 cents to 10 cents, did they do it in the interest of the Canadian farmers, or in their own interest? They simply changed the price, and ever since the reduction of the duty to 10 cents, the difference between the price of Canadian barley and State barley is just 10 cents a bushel. If we had unrestricted reciprocity, our barley would simply lose its identity. The maltsters would buy the crop of Canada as they do the crop of the United States to-day. They would buy on an export basis, and pay for it just what it is worth to send to England. That is the way they buy their own crop, and if we had unrestricted reciprocity, they would simply do the same with ours, so that if we could not make any more money out of it by exporting it than by selling it to them, we would sell it to them. The Americans have three quotations for barley to-day; The Western, State, and Canadian. Had we unrestricted reciprocity, there would simply be two lines, the western and eastern barley. Now these are the facts with regard to barley; and there is no gentleman in this House or out of it who can prove otherwise than that the maltsters of the United States pay the duty on Canadian barley; and after an experience of 25 years in shipping barley to the United States market, and on buying barley on the American side, especially State barley, I am satisfied that had we unrestricted reciprocity the farmers of Canada would not get one cent more for their barley than they do to-day, and they would suffer very materially in having the surplus produce of the United States, which ripens earlier than ours, displace so much of their produce. Our farmers would also have to compete with the bogus butter, bogus lard, bogus cheese of the Americans, and would lose by having their cattle scheduled; nine out of ten of our manufactories will be closed, and our laboring classes would be reduced to poverty. I have no hesitation in saying that in the interests of my county, I will vote against the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford and support the amendment moved by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is with some feelings of diffidence that I arise to address the House on this very important question. We have had a very long and undoubtedly important debate on the resolution before the House. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) has treated us to-day to a very long speech, and proved himself once more to be the champion reader of quotations in this House. Backed by his scrap-book, which always supplies him the necessary fuel, he is enabled on every occasion of this kind to keep on speaking for hours; and I would suggest to the Government that, in the interests of economising our valuable time, it would be a prudent act on their part to place a small sum in the Supplementary Estimates with the view of buying out that scrap-book and committing it to the flames. If they would do so, they would effect a considerable saving to the country, and do an act which would be a decided advantage to this House. The hon. gentleman's speech reminds me of the verse in the Good Book with regard to the impure fountain which casts forth mire and dirt, a good deal of which we have had this afternoon and to-night from the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman treated us to a very long speech before recess, and after dinner he evidently turned over his manuscript and went back over the same ground again. Some of his quotations he gave us as often as four times, showing himself to be very anxious to talk for a considerable time, and, no doubt, he served a useful purpose to the Government in that respect. We have had a perfect showerbath of quotations from the hon. gentleman. I do not know that I can remember an occasion in which the hon. gentleman, though he is always liberal in that respect, gave us such a liberal supply of extracts as he did this afternoon. In many of his quotations he was not correct. I had the honor, on a previous occasion, of following the hon. gentleman in a speech

he delivered some years ago, and I found out in one case, when I came to examine the source of a quotation which he gave, that he had given the quotation in so garbled a manner as to convey a meaning directly the opposite of its intent; and when I gave the quotation over again, with the portions he had left out, it proved to be the very opposite in meaning to what the hon. gentleman said it was. As regards the telegrams which the hon. gentleman read to us to-day, it is quite clear he sent telegrams of a peculiar kind, so as to obtain answers that would suit the occasion and his own purpose. The best evidence of this is that he refused to read the telegrams that he sent, although challenged to do so. He would give the answers but would not give the messages he had sent. That is the hon. gentleman's forte. We have heard some rumours that the hon. gentleman, in this lengthy speech, has been making his *depart*; we have heard rumours that he is to be sent to the Upper Chamber; and in this connection, I may say that an hon. gentleman whose decease we all regret, who once had a seat in this House and afterwards was sent to the Senate, in a discussion on some important question, made a speech, which an hon. gentleman on this side characterised as being a diarrhoea of words, with a constipation of ideas. I do not think the Government could cast the mantle of the deceased gentleman upon a more appropriate member of this House than the hon. member for Lincoln. Now, we have heard a great deal said about the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite are evidently afraid that their pet policy is in danger, and are doing everything they possibly can to prevent the farmers from getting the impression that the National Policy is not an advantage to them. They evidently fear that if the farmers should wake up and discover the true secret of the National Policy, in operating against their interests and in favor of the interests of the manufacturers, they would record their votes against this policy. They also evidently dread that our fishermen and all our laboring classes will record their votes in opposition to the National Policy. I admit that the Government have been exceedingly fortunate in misleading and blinding the eyes of the farming community, the laboring classes, the lumbermen, and the fishermen during the last three elections. In the first place, the right hon. the First Minister said that what he intended was merely a readjustment. He did not intend, he said, to increase the burdens of the people. When the second contest was fought, in 1882, he was not willing to appeal to the country on the same terms as in 1878, because he was a little scared that the farmers might possibly see the hollowness of the National Policy from their standpoint; so before appealing to the people, he made up his mind that it would be prudent to readjust and gerrymander the constituencies; and he went to work. He felt afraid that when the question came to be discussed before the people, a sufficient percentage in each constituency would become convinced of the hollowness of the National Policy from their standpoint to defeat his policy. In 1887, again we had the Franchise Act. We know the grounds upon which that election was carried, we know perfectly well that the Riel question was made to do duty as far as it possibly could, and in the next place we know that grants to railways in all directions, promises of post offices, promises of piers, promises to make public improvements in all parts of this Dominion, were held out in order to secure the people's votes for the Government on that occasion. And they were undoubtedly successful. These inducements, with the money which was spent and the promises of improvements which were made, carried them into power for the third time. The hon. gentleman who has addressed the House stated the advantages that the National Policy had produced to the people of this country, and went on to show something in connection with the statements which Mr. Blake made in his Malvern speech in regard to the manufacturers. He did not quote Mr. Blake

any more correctly in that case than he did in others, and I will come to that part later on; but the National Policy of 1879 is not the National Policy of the present time. The First Minister declared that it would be a readjustment, but, in place of that, they have added to the taxation until now it is very much higher on every article that is imported which we manufacture here than it was at that time. We have never objected to grant certain protection to our manufacturing institutions. We have always held that a revenue tariff should be the basis of taxation, and that permitting our manufacturers to bring in the raw material for purposes of their manufacture, within the limits of that revenue tariff, was all that they could reasonably expect. But hon. gentlemen departed from that principle and adopted a protective tariff, and they have left themselves entirely in the hands of the manufacturers. The result is that from year to year the manufacturers come to the Government, imploring them to grant them increases from time to time in the duties, and to-day we have the unfortunate exhibition of rings being formed for the purposes of raising prices on articles that are manufactured in the country, and are manufactured, by a few people. To-day we have a committee of this House appointed to investigate these matters, and the evidence is that these people have got more advantages than were necessary for them, and it is clear that, if the Government had adhered to a revenue tariff instead of adopting a protective tariff, that would not have occurred, because they could have replied to the applications made to them, that the necessities of the Dominion Treasury did not require that they should increase the taxation. The result would have been that there would not have been the opportunity to form these rings. In 1877, Mr. McCarthy found a great deal of fault with the Government of that day for having increased the expenditure. At that time it ran up to something like twenty-three millions and a half, and he introduced a resolution condemning the Government for going beyond twenty-two millions. He declared that the Government should not exceed that amount. We find that, although on that occasion hon. gentlemen were anxious to keep down expenditure, they have departed from that view, and now we are expending something like thirty-nine millions annually. There is another question that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) referred to, and that was the question of importing wheat and other products from the United States. He gave some quotations in regard to imports which he said were entered for home consumption in 1878. Well, since that time, when they import, they do not enter for home consumption. There is a privilege under the National Policy by which, if a miller wants to import a certain quantity of wheat for the purpose of manufacturing, if in six months he manufactures a certain amount of flour and ships it out of the country, he is allowed to draw back the amount of duty he would pay on his importation. The result is that, when they do import, they import for the purpose of exportation, and get their wheat in free of duty. They import corn and they import wheat. The last hon. gentleman who spoke said that, if we had the system in force which we had in 1877, the crops of the United States, coming in so much earlier than ours in Canada, would result in our being able to bring in wheat and oats and corn at an earlier period than they become ripe in this country, and that, in that way, it would interfere with the Canadian farmer. Well, they have all these powers under the National Policy. They import wheat to grind into flour, and they can ship it out or turn it into the Canadian market and sell it, and, if within six months they can get Canadian wheat and grind it into flour and ship it out, they can draw back the duty paid on the imported wheat. It is the same in regard to corn. The distiller brings in corn and manufactures it into whiskey and he exports that whiskey, and he is allowed a rebate on the amount he paid for the importation. That

Mr. McMULLEN.

is the case of the distiller and the miller. It is the same in regard to the oatmeal miller. If he wants to import American oats before the Canadian oats are ripe, he can bring them in and sell the oatmeal on the Canadian market, and, if within six months he can get Canadian oats and manufacture them and send the oatmeal out in a sufficient quantity to meet the quantity of American oats that he imported, he can draw back his duty? Can a farmer do that? He cannot. Take a farmer who has a large amount of feeding. Can he go to the United States, and buy corn when it is cheap, and feed his cattle, and ship the cattle to England, and get a rebate for what he paid for the corn? Not a bit of it. The man who manufactures the corn into whiskey and sends the whiskey across the Atlantic can get a rebate on what he pays for the corn, but the farmer who imports the corn and turns it into beef cannot get any rebate. The whiskey man gets his rebate, but the farmer gets no rebate. It is said that reciprocity would destroy our manufactures. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) dwelt upon that question, that reciprocity would destroy our manufacturing institutions, and would not benefit the farmer. It is a most amusing thing that, at all the meetings that have been held of manufacturers throughout the country, and particularly the one in Toronto, they declared that, after carefully and deliberately considering the question with regard to commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, they believed it would be a great injury to the manufacturers and would not benefit the farmer. It is a wonder that they give so much attention to the farmer. Why do they not allow the farmer to decide the matter for himself? Why do they not allow the farmers' institutes to decide the matter? No, the manufacturers, in their wisdom and sagacity, feel that, unless they take charge of the poor unfortunate farmer, he would be left at sea and would not be able intelligently to decide the matter for himself. The manufacturers have not had a single meeting at which they have not passed resolutions declaring that it would be an injury to the farmer as well as to themselves if we had commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity. Now, the hon. gentleman was boasting to-night with regard to his majority. He was telling us that he had 500 majority. Permit me to say that I was rather surprised at the hon. member taking such a bold and determined stand in opposition to unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. If there is any man in the House that should be prepared to endorse closer commercial relations with the United States, that man is the hon. member for Lincoln. Why, Sir, it is said that if we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, they are such sharp, cute fellows that we could not hold our own. Now, there is one hon. member who is in this House, and we have evidence that he was able to hold his own, and that was the hon. member for Lincoln. That hon. member possessed a timber limit some time ago; he sold that timber limit to an American, and he made a nice sum of money out of it, and yet he made that money when we did not have commercial union. Now, if we had commercial union, those who hold timber limits—and I am sure some of his friends, if we could consult the records, are yet possessors of timber limits, they could get better prices for their timber limits than he got.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Oh no, they could not get more.

Mr. McMULLEN. I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks that he got about all he wanted out of the Americans, and he does not want any more connection with them. I can easily understand why the gentleman who bought the timber limit might be commercial union. I dare say that if any person went to him, and asked him: "Mr. Sands, are you disposed to favor commercial union with Canada?" He

would say "No, I am not." "Why are you not?" "Because I had one transaction with those fellows over there, and they are the worst lot I ever met, and I don't want anything more to do with them." I have no doubt that would be his reply with regard to commercial union. The hon. gentleman says that he had 500 of a majority in Lincoln this last election. Well, I question very much, if the hon. gentleman had not sold his timber limits, whether he would have had that majority; I think that largely explains the fact; and I dare say that if there had not been a technicality in the court proceedings, we would have the best evidence that such was the fact, evidence that would show my statement to be correct; but he got out of that position just the same as he has crawled out of a great many other difficulties he has been in during his parliamentary life. Now, he went into a comparison of the farmers in the United States and in Canada. He pointed out some cases, and he exhibited a sheet that he held up in his hand with regard to a large tax sale that took place somewhere in the United States. I have no doubt that in some parts of the United States they have their drawbacks, sections of the country that are not worth very much, the same as are to be found in all countries. They have, I dare say, towns that have been surveyed and located, and that have been found afterwards not to be desirable sites to settle upon, and the result is that in all probability some of these lands were sold out to pay taxes. We have in our own country examples of that kind. Now, the principle bugbear that they keep continually exhibiting before the eyes of the farmers of the country, and that the hon. member for Lincoln has held up to-night, is the bugbear of direct taxation. They say it is impossible to conduct the affairs of this country if we are going to have reciprocity with the United States, without direct taxation. Well, I believe, from their standpoint, it is impossible; I believe that according to Tory rule, it is quite impossible. I believe that these men have become so accustomed in the past to a continuous increase of expenditure that they have become so completely ignorant of the true methods of economy that they would not be able to conduct the affairs of the country unless they had an enormous amount of money beyond what was really necessary. Year after year, they have added to the expenditure. I believe one Minister of the Crown has said that he would rather undertake at any time to defend a thousand dollar increase, than to justify a hundred dollar reduction. I believe they act upon that principle all the time, and the result is that ever since they have taken office, they have run up the debt of this country and have increased the annual expenditure to an enormous amount. I do not think it is wise. I believe when you take into consideration the enormous number of hangers on they have got, the barnacles of state that we see around this Chamber, and that are scattered all over this country, it will be evident that there is going on an enormous drain of our public resources. It is impossible for them to conduct the affairs of this country and reduce the sum down to what would be necessary if we had unrestricted reciprocity, even supposing we had to lose some 5 or 6 or 7 million dollars. Now, I believe that if we had unrestricted reciprocity and were called upon to reduce our annual expense 5 or 6 millions, there would be very little difficulty in doing so. I think, although I have never held an office of any kind, that I can look over the pages of the Auditor General's report and prove what I say. I think if you appoint a committee of earnest honest men to investigate that report in the interest of this country, they would be able, without much trouble, to cut down the payments very materially. I have no doubt that they might be cut down some 5, or 6, or perhaps 7 millions. Now, the hon. member for Lincoln says that he is pledged to the National Policy, he is bound to stand by it. That appears to me to be the position of hon. gentlemen opposite. I think they know

what they owe to the manufacturers of this country; the manufacturers have stuck by them like bricks, they have stuck by them in the last three elections, and they have, no doubt, contributed largely to the election funds. We have reason to believe they have done so, and the hon. gentlemen opposite cannot very well turn their backs upon National Policy men and the manufacturers. They are undoubtedly disposed to stick by them, and I suppose they will, until once they realise the fact that they are not able to carry them into power any longer; then, I think, they will throw them overboard and enter into alliances with some other classes. The hon. member for Lincoln characterised the Ontario Government as a very corrupt government; he said it was a corrupt House. Now, if there is any man in this Chamber who should have hesitated in making a charge of corruption against the Ontario House, it is the hon. member for Lincoln. That hon. member once held a seat in that House himself, he once had the honor of performing the duties of a representative, and he has a record there, and I am going to give this House a little of the hon. gentleman's record during the time he sat in that House. I do not know that I should have done so if he had not pronounced the Ontario House a very corrupt House. While he sat there he certainly sowed the seeds of corruption himself, and if they have not been eradicated it is simply because there are men of his stamp there still. I will read a report, Mr. Speaker, of a committee that was appointed for the purpose of looking into certain irregular transactions on the part of the hon. member for Lincoln:

"After hearing all the evidence submitted for their consideration, they find as follows:"—

"First—That the Great Western Railway of Canada, on or about the 1st day of February, 1870, paid the said John Charles Rykert, the sum of \$1,000 for parliamentary services, rendered by the said John Charles Rykert to such company in the then recent Session of the Legislature of Ontario."

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. McMULLEN—

"Second—That one Edward D. Tilson gave the said John Charles Rykert"—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must say that I think the hon. gentleman is digressing. These personal charges, unless they are to be followed up by some distinct proceedings against the hon. gentleman, should be avoided. I do not think they conduce to the good feeling of the House or in any way serve the public interest.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps you will allow me, Sir, to point out that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) made a distinct charge of corruption against the Ontario Legislature, and by his own act he has brought down on himself the exposure which the hon. gentleman was proceeding to give.

Mr. RYKERT. I made no charge against them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This has proceeded far enough. The charge, as stated by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), was one of those usual, although hardly justifiable, expressions that occur in debate, and I think such is quite different from specific accusations laid against an hon. member, unless it is the intention of the hon. gentleman making them to ask some other action on the part of the House, which I presume is not intended here. I would deprecate proceeding with that branch of the subject any further.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have read sufficient, I think, to satisfy this House, I am sure I have satisfied those outside of the House, that the hon. gentleman was wrong in making the charge of corruption against the Ontario Legislature in the way he did. I think when an hon. gentleman undertakes to make a charge against a House that is not represented here by any person to defend it, at the least the hon.

gentleman's own record when a member of that House should be unspotted. The hon. gentleman has acted I think unfairly in doing as he has done. I will not dwell further upon that question. The hon. member for Lincoln read a number of extracts from papers of the United States to show the views held over there with respect to commercial union. He endeavored to show that the American press was opposed to commercial union. He tried to leave the impression on the House that even supposing the Canadian Parliament and the people of the Dominion should consent to commercial union, the press of the United States were opposed to it. I would meet that argument by saying that we have the reports of meetings of boards of trade in the principal cities in the United States that have endorsed the movement in the direction of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity with Canada. Those boards have declared their belief that it would be advantageous to both, their country as well as ours, and I think those boards are as well posted with respect to what changes in commercial relations would be advantageous to the United States as well as to Canada as the papers from which he quotes. The hon. gentleman has also spoken at considerable length with regard to free trade. He has tried to place the Reform party in the position of advocating free trade, and he has tried to shoulder upon Mr. Blake a charge that he had advocated free trade, and he misquoted Mr. Blake's speech at Malvern, in much the same way as he misquoted other speeches. I will give to the House Mr. Blake's speech upon this question. When Mr. Blake uttered the words to which the hon. gentleman referred he was speaking with respect to free trade, and he declared it was impracticable to have free trade in a country like ours with our enormously increased burdens. This is what Mr. Blake said:

"You know well that I do not approve of needless restrictions on our liberty of exchanging what we have for what we want, and do not see that any substantial application of the restrictive principle has been, or can be, made in favor of the great interests of the mechanic, the laborer, the farmer, the lumberman, the shipbuilder or the fisherman. But you know, also, that I have fully recognised the fact that we are obliged to raise yearly a great sum, made greater by the obligations imposed on us by this Government, and that we must continue to provide this yearly sum mainly by import duties, laid to a great extent on goods similar to those which can be manufactured here; and which results as a necessary incident of our settled fiscal system that there must be a large and, as I believe, in the view of moderate protectionists, an ample advantage to the home manufacturer. Our adversaries wish to present to you an issue as between the present tariff and absolute free trade. That is not the true issue. Free trade is, as I have repeatedly explained, impossible for us, and the issue is whether the present tariff is perfect, or defective and unjust. I believe it to be, in some important respects, defective and unjust."

It was in this connection that Mr. Blake used the words that the hon. gentleman quoted; but the hon. gentleman did not go the full length:

"And it is clearer than ever that a very high scale of taxation must be retained and that manufacturers have nothing to fear. I then declared that any readjustment should be affected with due regard to the legitimate interests of all concerned. In that phrase 'all concerned' I hope no one will object to my including, as I do, the general public. In any readjustment I maintain that we should look especially to such reduction of expenditure as may allow of a reduction of taxation, to the lightening of sectional taxes, to the lightening of taxes upon the prime necessities of life, and upon the raw materials of manufacture, to a more equitable arrangement of the taxes which now bear unfairly upon the poor as compared with the rich."

Those were the words Mr. Blake used, and they were used in connection with the question of free trade or a revenue tariff. During this debate a great many references have been made to Mr. Blue's report, and to the fact that some statistics show there has been a great decrease in the value of land. I will show before I conclude my remarks that there are very great differences of opinion with respect to that subject; in some sections the people hope the lands may yet regain their former value, while in other sections they say that the value has very materially reduced. You cannot, therefore, rely upon these reports as absolute evidence of the price of the land being kept up. With

Mr. McMULLEN,

respect to the arguments the hon. gentleman presented as regards our population, the hon. gentleman went on to criticise the statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and to show that his statement with respect to the exodus of population could not be correct. He quoted the reports made at Sarnia by the American officer, in which he admitted that those reports were taken from previous records and were made out for numbers about the same as in previous years. In answer to that we simply ask, where have the inhabitants gone? They are not in Canada—our own statistics show they are not here. If they have not gone by Sarnia, they must have gone out of the country by some other route. Our immigration statistics show that we brought them here, and our provincial statistics show that our population has not made even the natural increase, without taking into account immigrants brought into the country. When the hon. member for Lincoln was dealing with this question, he might have shown the House where those people have gone, which would have been some satisfactory evidence on the point. We say they are not here, and we prove it by the statistics of the different Provinces. Where, then, have they gone if not to the United States? If they have not gone there, they must have gone to some other place. That is the best answer to an argument of that kind. Then, Sir, he went on to compare the several Provinces with the several States of the Union. He said there had been a reduction of population in some States, but the difference between our reduction of population and theirs is this: Their census shows decidedly in the increased number that they have in the new States, that the population has gone from east to west. If our increased population in Manitoba was caused by a very large number of the people who had left the east and gone to the west to settle in Manitoba, that would be satisfactory. But they have not done that. While in the United States those who have left the older States have gone to the west and settled in Dakota, Minnesota, Washington Territory and other places, those who have left the east of Canada are not found in the west. They are not found in Canada at all, and that is just the mistake made by hon. gentlemen opposite when they compare the United States to Canada in this respect. Now with regard to this tax sale list exhibited by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). I should state that the mode of advertising tax sales in the States and here is very different. It is well known that in several States of the Union that, if a tax is levied and not paid immediately, the farm is advertised for sale, while in our country we hold land for some three or four years before advertising them for sale. In the States they advertise them right away if the taxes are not paid. I have been trying to deal with some of the arguments that have been used by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), and I shall now present some reasons why I think it my duty as the representative of an agricultural district to give my support to the resolution brought before the House and moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The question of bank deposits and deposits in our savings banks has been referred to almost by every man in this House who has spoken on the question, and it has been declared that deposits in savings banks are decisive evidence of the prosperity of the country. They say there is no better evidence of our prosperity than the increase in the savings banks deposits. Let us, Sir, take that and compare the statement with the general condition of things in England. In the year 1866, 1867 and 1868, when they had one of the greatest financial crises they have had in England during the present century, we find that the bank deposits in England never reached as high a point before as they did during those three years. Now, in England at that time they ought to have had good times, and they ought to

have had prosperity if we were to judge of the financial condition of the country by the savings banks deposits. They certainly had not good times, and we all know that they had the worst period of depression during the present century. This shows that on the whole the bank deposits are no criterion to judge by in regard to the condition of the country. In dealing with this question we have got fairly to face the fact that we have been doing a considerable trade with the United States for several years. Our trade with that country has been increasing, and notwithstanding the efforts made by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to prove that the farmers of this country do not pay the duty I think there is not a farmer, not a sensible man in this country, who does not realise the fact that he does pay the duty on what he sends across to the American side. That is the feeling of the farmers of this country. Before I conclude I shall give a few extracts to show that the intelligent portion of the farming community are under that impression. I hold that it is our duty under present circumstances to try and remove that burden off the shoulders of the farmers if we possibly can. When I come to consider that the farmers are the most important class in this country, and that they ship one-half of the entire exports of this Dominion, we see that they are undoubtedly the most important class, and they deserve our first and best consideration. We must remember that the manufacturers only ship about one-twenty-third part of the exports of this Dominion, and it is unfair to say that the interests of the farmers, of the laboring classes, of the lumbermen and of the fishermen should be sacrificed simply because manufacturing institutions have got to be sustained at all hazards, although they only export one twenty-third part of the entire shipments of this Dominion. We know that in 1886 we imported from Great Britain \$40,600,000 worth in that year, and from the United States \$44,800,000 worth. Then of a total export trade of \$74,975,000, we exported to England \$36,700,000 and to the United States \$31,463,000. Now, on our exports to the United States of all the different commodities of products as well as cattle, we paid about \$3,500,000 duty. We paid that each year. And I think if we can, by any change of our fiscal policy, remove from the shoulders of our farmers that very heavy drain upon their resources it would be a wise and prudent act on the part of this House. We shipped to the United States last year 10,200,000 bushels of barley, on which we paid \$1,020,000. Barley is an important factor in this Dominion, and we are coming to that period when if the older Provinces cannot make money on growing barley they cannot certainly make money on growing wheat, when we come to consider the low prices for wheat. The probabilities are that the price of wheat will still go lower, when we remember the enormous production of wheat in India and the very cheap rate at which it is now carried to Liverpool. We must therefore look for low prices as far as wheat is concerned. Four years ago it cost 64 shillings to take a ton of wheat from Bombay to Liverpool, to-day it can be carried for 21 shillings and 4 pence or just about as low a price as we can take a ton of wheat from Toronto to Montreal. When we take this fact into consideration together with the very low rate of wages in India and the enormous development in the construction of railways there we must expect low prices for wheat. The farmers of the older Provinces must give up growing wheat if they cannot grow it lucratively, and consequently barley becomes a very important product. If we can increase the annual receipts of the farmers who grow barley by relieving them of the taxes or duties they have to pay to get it into the American market, it will be a decided advantage to them. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in treating this subject, said that wherever we had a natural outlet for our surplus produce, and where it was wanted, was undoubtedly our best market. We have a natural outlet in the United States for barley. It is wanted there and it is the best place we can send it to. If

we can change our policy so as to enable those people to receive it from us without our farmers having to pay the duty, it would be a step in the interests of the farming community. I know it is said that if you open up the American market for the shipment of our surplus produce, including horses, sheep and lambs, the result would be we would flood that market. I intend to prove that it is impossible for us to flood that market in this respect. The United States barley crop amounts to 60,000,000 bushels a year, and we send them 10,000,000 bushels, or one bushel in six that they raise themselves, so that we cannot possibly flood that country with barley, even suppose we had the advantage of unrestricted reciprocity. Then take the item of horses and we have the same result. In 1866 we sent to the United States 21,000 horses, in 1887 we sent them 18,500 horses, and the duty paid was \$442,000, and our census returns show that we had altogether 570,000 horses in this country at the last census. According to the census of the United States, the number of horses in that country is 10,357,000. Then, if we divide the number we send to the United States into this number, we find that we virtually send them one horse for every 500 they possess, and if we sent them all the horses we possess in one year, we would only send them about one in every twenty. So it is utterly impossible for us to flood the American market even if it was entirely open to us. Again in regard to sheep; in 1886 we sent them 365,000, or 1,000 sheep every day in the year; in 1887 we sent them 363,000, so that the shipment of sheep is about the same each year. According to their census returns, they had themselves 35,192,000 sheep, so that we only sent them one sheep for every 97 they have themselves. The same is the case with cattle. The United States had some 36,000,000 cattle last year, and we sent them, in 1886, 36,000, and in 1887, 45,767. Our trade with the United States in cattle is evidently increasing and if we could get the duty of 20 per cent. removed it would undoubtedly be a decided advantage to the farmers of this country. The farmers of this country must pay attention principally to cattle and sheep and the growing of peas, barley and oats, the only industries they can follow with any hope of profit; and if we can, by a change of policy, such as is proposed, open to them unrestricted markets in the United States, we shall add to the gross receipts of the farmers of this Dominion \$3,500,000 a year. Now, when we come to look at the financial condition of this country, as compared with that of the United States, I am sorry to say it does not appear in a very favorable light. I am sorry to say that year after year we have been adding enormously to our indebtedness, while the United States have been reducing their debt. I know it was said last year, by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that the indebtedness of the several States, taken along with the federal indebtedness, is in excess of our indebtedness in the Dominion of Canada. That I am going to prove is not correct. The State, city and county debt, in the United States, according to their own census in 1880, amounted to \$1,056,584,000. Their population being then 50,000,000, their *per capita* debt for State, county and city, was \$21 a head. Then, the federal debt in 1887, was \$1,700,771,000, while their population being taken at 60,000,000, would amount to \$28.30 *per capita*. Taking these two amounts together, we find that their total debt, federal, state, city and county, amounts to \$49.30 *per capita*. The net debt of Canada is \$227,000,000; and our provincial, city and county debts do not amount to less than \$200,000,000, making a total of \$427,000,000, or a *per capita* debt of \$85 a head, as compared with \$49.30 in the United States. But this does not include all our debt, because we have railway bonds and other indebtedness to a very large extent. Now, Sir, the London *Economist*, one of the best financial journals in England, made an estimate last June of the entire indebtedness of

Canada to England. That estimate was based upon information gathered from all sources. It estimated the entire debt of the Dominion to Great Britain, at \$675,000,000. It took our net debt as \$200,000,000, when in reality, it is \$227,000,000; our provincial, harbor, municipal and railway debts at \$325,000,000; and loans on stocks, mortgages and other securities at \$123,000,000, making \$675,000,000 in all. The interest on that sum at 4 per cent., amounts to the enormous sum of \$27,000,000 a year, on a population of 5,000,000, or \$5.40 a head. Now, the hon. member for Lincoln, when speaking of statements made to the people of this country at the last general election, said the Government had presented true and correct figures on that occasion. He stated that they had presented the financial condition of the country in a manner that had drawn from the people their confidence. Now, I hold that the statements the Government made in that election, whether knowingly or not, were not correct. Every Minister of the Crown started out on his election tour, one to the Maritime Provinces, one to Quebec and one or two to Ontario, everyone making the same statement, that the net indebtedness of this Dominion was \$196,000,000. They also stated that the *per capita* tax was \$1.63, only 3 cents above what it was during the time of the Mackenzie Government. Would any man in this House dare to get up and say that these statements were true? The evidence that has come to our notice since they were made proves that they were not true. We know that the net debt was really \$227,000,000; we know that the *per capita* interest, based on that amount, was at least \$1.98, if not \$2, instead of \$1.63. Yet it was on such statements that the confidence of the country was secured. The present Government have increased the burdens of the people of this country enormously. I have in my hand a statement, made up from the Auditor General's report, which shows that the present Government have increased the indebtedness of this country since 1880 to the present time, \$106,559,000. In 1880 they added to the debt \$15,000,000; in 1881, \$5,000,000; in 1882, \$8,500,000; in 1883, \$3,000,000; in 1884, \$40,223,000; in 1885, \$22,221,000; in 1886, \$8,461,000; and, in 1887, \$4,154,000. In seven years they have added \$15,000,000 a year. They have added \$1,250,000 every month. They have added to the debt, every day the sun rose, since they took office, \$41,333 a day since 1880. These figures show plainly the course in which this Dominion is drifting; they show the cause of the hard times; they show profligacy in the management of our affairs, and hon. gentlemen opposite will have to bear the responsibility, in this generation and in generations to come, of the enormous increase in our debt, and the constant yearly drain on the people's resources. The *per capita* figures during the time I have referred to is \$21 a head. Take the case of the United States by way of contrast. The United States came out of a civil war with a debt of \$2,500,000,000 and with a loss by death of nearly a million subjects. They have reduced their debt since that time \$1,362,000,000, and they have increased their population from 38,500,000 to 60,000,000. The yearly reduction in their indebtedness is as follows:—In 1882, they reduced their debt \$145,000,000; in 1884, \$132,000,000; in 1885, \$63,000,000; in 1886, \$93,000,000; in 1887, \$109,707,000; in all, in six years, they reduced their debt \$542,542,707, or at the rate of \$9 per head, while we have added to our indebtedness at the rate of \$20 a head.

Mr. HESSON. In what way did they accomplish their reduction?

Mr. McMULLEN. By economy. By devoting their surplus revenue to the payment of their debts, in the place of squandering it, as we did.

Mr. HESSON. By taxing the people.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have taxed the people more than they.

Mr. McMULLEN. In 1870, the net debt of Canada was \$227,341,000, which, with our population of 5,000,000, makes \$45.46 a head, while the indebtedness of the United States shows but a *per capita* amount of \$19 a head. In dealing with the question of how far unrestricted reciprocity would be an advantage to the farmers of this country, I shall give you a calculation which I made, which, I think, will bear investigation, and I am willing that it should be submitted to every farmer in this Dominion. I claim that unrestricted reciprocity would be, at the very least, an advantage of \$1 an acre yearly to every cleared acre of land in this Dominion. Take, for instance, a farm composed of 100 acres, with 75 acres clear. Let us say that the farmer is able to sell one colt for \$100, the duty on which will be \$20; one yoke of steers at \$40, on which the duty is \$8; 12 lambs, on which the duty is 50 cents each, \$6; 300 bushels of barley at 10 cents duty, \$30; 5 tons of hay on which the duty is \$2, or \$10; 30 bushels of potatoes on which the duty is 15 cents, \$4.50. Now, any farm of 100 acres, with 75 acres cleared, would easily furnish that quantity of produce in a year. There is not a farmer in this Dominion who claims to hold a farm at all, who would have less produce to dispose of than that. The entire duty would be \$78.50, which does not include the sale of poultry, fresh butter and vegetables. Now, I hold that any farmer who will seriously consider the question will easily come to the conclusion that the calculation I make is really below the mark. I will prove that it is below the mark, by a reply made by a farmer whom I dare say some of you know. I allude to Mr. Patrick McCallum, who owns one of the best farms in Pittsburgh township. It is named Spruce Lawn, and is not far from Kingston. Mr. McCallum, like many of his class, feels the duties on his exports to be burdensome in the extreme, and calculates that the sum of money he pays into the treasury of the United States on his exports amounts to a sum equal to what would be considered a reasonable rent for the part of his farm under cultivation. He was asked:

"How would commercial union benefit the Ontario farmer?—In many ways. The duty they now pay to the United States they would put into their own pockets, and they could get cheaper goods in many cases than they do now.

"What do you export to the United States at present?—I export barley, hay, horses, cattle, sheep and wool.

"What is the extent of your farm?—It is 500 acres, 400 of which are under cultivation.

"Can you give me any figures as to the quantity of produce you export?—Yes, as regards the leading products. Last year I exported to the United States 200 tons of hay, 800 bushels of barley, 6 horses, 80 sheep and lambs, and 1,000 pounds of wool. The duty on hay is \$2 per ton, making the total duty \$400 on my shipment. The duty on barley is 10 cents per bushel, so that the 800 bushels which I exported cost me for duty \$80. On each of the six horses I paid \$20, making \$120. I paid \$1.50 a head on my sheep, they are superior sheep, which amounted to \$120, and 10 cents per pound for my wool, which cost me \$100. That is a total of \$920, or at the rate of \$2 per acre for each acre I cultivate. From these figures, which I have no reason to believe are exceptional, you will see that the loss caused to the farmers by the tariff is \$2 per acre, or a sum equal to an ordinary rent in these times."

These are the statements of a man who is a practical farmer. I want to show also something with regard to the values of land, concerning which we have had quite a discussion, some hon. gentlemen quoting Mr. Blue's report, and others quoting other statistics, to try and show that land has not decreased in value, but I hold in my hand a copy of the report published by the Dominion Grange at their last meeting in Toronto:

"In five counties, viz., Waterloo, Durham, Bruce, Grey and Peterborough, farm property was said to have depreciated in value, the depression in Durham, according to a delegate from there, amounting to a 'marked decrease.' In Halton, Mr. Fisher, who spoke for that section, said the value of property had not fallen to any appreciable extent. In Haldimand, it was 'difficult to sell;' in Peel, Wellington and Simcoe land values 'were stationary;' in Welland and Oxford values were 'still holding their own, but with a downward tendency,'

and 'the mortgage debt was increasing.' The farmers who rent farms and those whose land is mortgaged—and these two classes probably constitute the majority of those engaged in agriculture in this Province—naturally feel the pinch more severely than the comfortable few who have got out of wheat and gone in for raising well-bred cattle and cattle products. Hence the partial failure of the crops this year, added to the fall that has taken place in prices, has broken the backs of many weak men; and loan companies and private mortgagees find themselves compelled to foreclose and throw their property on the market, to the injury of the solvent farmer, whose land is depreciated by the forced sale. In several parts of the Province well-to-do farmers have become disheartened, and are selling out with a view of trying their luck at storekeeping."

That is the report of the Dominion Grange that held their meeting in Toronto a short time ago. I was referring to the amount that each class contributed to the exports of the country in 1887. The forests supplied over one-third in value of our exports, the fisheries one-twelfth, the farmers one-half, and on the other hand the manufacturers only furnished one twenty-third part of our entire exports.

Mr. SPROULE. If that is correct, why does the Ontario Government put up the price of the royalty on the forest?

Mr. McMULLEN. I claim that, notwithstanding the statements which have been made with reference to the prosperous condition of the farmers, if any man will go through the several sections, especially in western Ontario, with which I am best acquainted, he will find that the farmers are not in as good a position as they were some years ago. I listened to the statement of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, in reply to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that the farmers were generally content, that generally they were better off and making better financial progress, that they were doing well. Well, I would like that hon. gentleman to go to his own constituency, or to any constituency west of Toronto, I would like him to advertise a meeting of farmers, to ask them to meet him, and to ask them to pass a resolution stating that they are making progress financially, that they are better off than they were before, and that their prices are better than they were years ago. I think the hon. gentleman would have some difficulty in getting such a resolution passed. Even in his own constituency, with all the influence he exercises there, I do not believe he could get a resolution of that kind passed. I also maintain that the Minister of Fisheries, notwithstanding his declaration that the farmers are doing well, would have great difficulty in getting any number of the farmers in his Province to agree to any such statement. As I have said before, barley, peas, sheep and cattle are the staple products of the older parts of this Dominion, and if, by a change of policy such as is proposed by the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), we can open up for our farmers, who are in financial embarrassment, better markets for their produce, markets free from the exactions to which they are now subject, such a proposition well deserves the attention of the people of this Dominion. The farmers are the backbone of this Dominion. They are the people upon whom the country's finances rest, and if we leave them to continue to contend with the difficulties which they have now to contend with, we may find out too late that we have neglected the means required to relieve them, and through them to assist the country that we live in. Have they asked anything unjust? Have they asked what the manufacturers asked in 1878? No, they have not. At that time the manufacturers asked for a positive increase in the tariff in order to give them advantages over imported goods. They asked that the farming community and the consumers of this country should be subjected to an increased taxation on certain commodities which they were going to manufacture, in order to enable them to manufacture them. Do the farmers ask now that the manufacturers should be subjected to an increased amount of taxation in order to benefit their condition? They do

not. They simply say, "Give us free and unrestricted markets, markets where we are sending our stuff, and where it is evident we will still have to send it; remove the restrictions if you can, by any policy you may agree on with the United States, and give us the advantages which that change will bring to us, and that is all we ask; we do not wish you to subject the manufacturers to any special tax in order to benefit our condition, but we simply ask you to relieve us from these restrictions." That is all they ask, and I say it is only fair that we should grant them that request. They have labored under their disadvantageous circumstances for ten years. They have waited long for the fulfilment of the promise of the First Minister that their prospects would be improved by the adoption of the National Policy. I remember hearing the Finance Minister, who is now the Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick, state that farmers never received better prices than were received under the National Policy. That hon. gentleman, I am sure, is possessed of more wisdom and common sense than not to know that he was simply humbugging the people of this country in making that statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must call the gentleman to order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite willing to withdraw the statement if it is out of order, but it cannot be too forcibly put to the members of this House and to the people of this country as to the deceit which was practised in holding out the advantages which were held out to the farmers under the operations of the National Policy. They have not received the advantage which was promised them, they have not got the increase in prices which was promised them, they have not got the home market which was promised them; our shipments show that they have not got that home market, and, in place of getting that home market they have been compelled to seek another market for a larger portion of their produce than ever before. In order to illustrate the way in which the farmers of the country have been used, I may tell a story or an anecdote of a Scotchman and an Indian who went out together to shoot. The Scotchman was a long-headed Scotchman, something like the Premier of this Dominion. They made a bargain that, when they came home at night, they would divide the game. During the day they shot a duck and a crow. At night the long-headed Scotchman said to the Indian, "Now, Indian, you take the crow and I'll take the duck, or I'll take the duck and you take the crow." "But," says the Indian "you always say crow to me." Yes, every change that has taken place in the tariff, the farmer has got the crow and the manufacturer has got the duck. That has been the case every time, and so it will continue as long as we have our present trade policy. Now, I shall not say anything with regard to combines, except on one point. Very few have any idea of the extent to which these combines exist in this Dominion. I know a man in my section of the country who wanted to go into the undertaking business, and could not get the necessary supplies unless he went into the combine. He was compelled to pay \$30 as a fee to go into that combine, and he could not get the necessary trimmings for his business unless he produced a certificate that he was a member of that combine. Has it not come to a pretty pass in this Dominion, that, after paying all the extra and increased amount that we are compelled to pay for the special benefit of manufacturers, we cannot even commit our deceased friends and relations to their last resting place unless under the auspices of a combine? It is an outrage that things are in the condition in which they are. Now, it is always said that our manufacturers cannot compete with the United States. I maintain that our manufacturers can compete with the United States. There is

nothing in the world to prevent them. But the reason that they do not want to compete is that under the operations of the National Policy, they have got a soft thing, and they think to themselves that they would be fools to part with it so long as they can hold on to it, and as long as they can persuade the Government and the people of this country that they cannot compete, so long will they hold on to the advantages which they now enjoy. That is the reason why they are not disposed to compete. Why can they not compete? Cannot raw material in the articles of cotton or sugar be laid down in Canada as cheaply as in any other place? I was amazed at the remarks that fell from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with regard to the article of sugar. He challenged the correctness of a statement made by the hon. member for South Oxford with regard to our interest in Canada. He said we owed a certain debt of national honor to England, and he went on to explain that statement, and before he got through with the speech he said, take the article of sugar. It was carried in British bottoms from the place of production to England, it was there transferred to railways and carried on British railways to British factories, it was there manufactured by British labor, and was then re-shipped in British bottoms and brought to our shores; on that article we paid the duty after it had been brought to the highest condition of manufacture. "Now," said he, "take the condition of things as we find them at present. We bring sugar from the place of production, in our own ships to our own shores, we manufacture the sugar ourselves, our own people get the advantage of all the labor, and all the profit goes into the pocket of our own people." Well, now, I thought that if he was so strongly devoted to the interests of England, if he wished to hold so determinedly to his allegiance to the manufacturers of England, he certainly should not have made that comparison, because it clearly shows the truth of the statement made by the First Minister, when he said that if the National Policy endangered British connection, all the worse for British connection. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite never say a word about the smuggling going on from the United States into Canada, of which there was never more done than at the present moment. At one time, after the close of the war, all the smuggling was out of Canada into the United States, simply because goods were cheaper in Canada than in the United States. Now, I want any hon. member on the other side of the House, who advocates the National Policy, to say why it is that under the operations of that policy the tide has turned, and that to-day goods are dearer in Canada than they are in the United States. There is a very large smuggling going on; I know from personal knowledge that I have obtained from parties who live in Buffalo, that the goods are smuggled into Canada as far up as Brantford, bought there and taken into this country free of duty. Now, this shows that while in our country articles have been increasing in price, they have been lowering on the American side. Now, who is going to be at the expense of preventing all this smuggling? Before things got to this condition the Americans had to pay the cost of a large staff of preventive officers to prevent smuggling; now, our Government will have to pay that cost. The Americans have no fear of goods being bought in Canada and carried across to the States, simply because people can buy them in their own country cheaper than they could here. They have reached that point in their history that they will be relieved to a large extent of that expenditure. Here we have an enormous frontier of several thousand miles across which goods will be continually smuggled so long as the respective prices remain as at present. I say in order to relieve us from that enormous expense it would be much better to have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States in the natural products of the soil as well as in

Mr. McMULLEN.

manufactured goods. Now, it is said also that we should be loyal to the Empire; we should be loyal to ourselves. Well, Sir, I will venture to say that perhaps there is not an individual within the reach of my voice who has not got a relative in the United States; I would venture to say that from one end of this Dominion to the other, you will meet with but very few who have not got relations over there. Now, is it to be looked upon as a national crime on our part because we send to our own relatives across the border, things that they want, and we take from them things which we require, and that they have to part with. And is it looked upon as disloyal that we should trade with our own blood relations? You will not find on the face of the earth two nations so near together, so conveniently located for trade in many respects, the same race of people, that are subjected to such absolute restrictions in trade as exist between Canada and the United States—caused, first by the National Policy introduced into the United States after the close of the war, when they put on a very large duty; and, secondly, caused by the foolish and unwise course we have adopted in increasing, from year to year, the duty upon goods coming from there, so as to make this absolute wall of separation. Now, hon. gentlemen are very loud with regard to the question of loyalty. You would fancy, to hear them speak, that there was not a loyal man on this side of the House; you would fancy we were all rebels, that we are all annexationists, that there was not a drop of loyal blood in our veins, and that we are disloyal to the core.

Mr. SPROULE. Correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, we had better go back and review the history of this country. The best way to judge of a party is in the same manner that the hon. member for South Oxford stated at one time that he judged the First Minister of this country; he said he never took much stock in what he said, he always took stock in what he did. I think that is the best way to decide our loyalty. We had better go back and see what they did in the past. We had Parliament buildings in this country burned at one time; I do not think the Grits did it, they were never charged with doing it. We had a Governor General in this country who was stoned and rotten-egged on a certain occasion; I never heard that it was the Grits who were charged with doing that. Then again we had an annexation manifesto signed at one time; I never heard they were all Grits who signed that manifesto. Now, when hon. gentlemen undertake to lecture us about loyalty, they should look back over their own record, and see whether there are any black spots on it before they attempt to charge us with being disloyal. Now, the next question I shall touch upon is the iron duties. Last year we had increased iron duties put on, and we know that England remonstrated with regard to the increase of iron duties. It is said, of course, that no change in the tariff should ever be made that would be likely to offend the mother country or estrange it from us; but hon. gentlemen opposite do not appear to have given that consideration much attention when they increased the iron duties. We find remonstrances in regard to the iron duties made by the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, by the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, by the British iron trade, all the iron associations joining in denouncing the increase in the iron duties. They went on to show that this was not a friendly act on the part of Canada towards the mother country, and that the imposition of those duties was very likely to strain the friendly relations existing. When these protests were made one of our Canadian journals undertook to prove that these duties were not imposed for the purpose of striking the English iron trade, but for the purpose of striking the American trade, and after that paper had used the argument the Minister of Finance took it up and used it likewise. The statement made was as follows:—

"It was implied that the Canadian duties on certain lines of iron goods were only a little over 25 per cent.; whereas a writer in the Liverpool

Post shows that the duties referred to range from 40 per cent. on pig to 55 per cent. on bar iron. Lastly, the statement made by one of the Ministerial journals and re-echoed by Sir Charles Tupper, to the effect that the iron duties had been imposed out of a sincere desire on our part to strengthen the Empire, struck the English press as peculiarly audacious. It would have been more ingenuous in Sir Charles, they thought, as well as more complimentary to British intelligence, to have confessed at once that our aim was to protect the Londenberry venture regardless of British interests."

It is thus apparent that hon. gentlemen opposite were not so particularly anxious about our relations with England, when they imposed the iron duties, as they now appear to be in regard to unrestricted reciprocity. They now hold up before the eyes of this House and the country that such a policy is likely to strain the friendly relations between the Dominion and England; but, as I have said, when they imposed the iron duties, this never seems to have entered their minds. In discussing this question further and in connection with commercial union English manufacturers say it matters little to them how we supply ourselves with iron if the duty is placed in such a way that they are virtually shut out of the market—they say it matters not whether we produce the iron ourselves or take it from the American side.

"If it be said that under commercial union we should have to adopt a higher tariff than the existing one, and that British exporters would therefore be injured more seriously than they are at present, the answer is, that whilst the tendency in the United States is to reduce duties the tendency in Canada is to increase them."

So much for the imposition of the iron duties. When the Minister of the Interior addressed the House upon this resolution he said that a number of people who had gone to Dakota were returning. In my section of the country I can assure the hon. gentleman that there has been quite an exodus to the western States, but I do not know a single instance of a man who has returned. I would indeed be glad if they did return. I was rather amused that the hon. gentleman, in comparing the prices received for farm produce in this country and the United States, went all the way to Milwaukee for prices to compare with Toronto prices. Another peculiar point in the discussion is that hon. gentlemen opposite are always ready, as stated by the Minister of the Interior, to give the largest measure of reciprocity, consistent with the National Policy. Only keep the National Policy intact, only protect the manufacturers, and if you can by any side wind, or in any other way, give a little advantage to either the laboring classes or the farming community all right, but do not disturb the National Policy. I notice also that the operatives are threatened with being thrown out of work; hon. gentlemen opposite say they will not have the labor, that this resolution strikes at them as well as at the manufacturers. Machinists coming from the United States into Canada can come across the border without paying any duty. There is no protection on labor coming in or going out. How, therefore, is unrestricted reciprocity to strike the laboring classes? I noticed, the other day, that a certain railway company ran out of engineers, and the company sent to Montreal, and, from the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway, obtained almost all the men they required. The men had no duty to pay on going to the United States, as Americans have no duty to pay on coming here. Consequently, there is no protection for the laboring man, while there is a protection for the manufacturer. If a manufacturer comes to this country he has to pay duty on the machinery and raw material he uses, and in that way the resident manufacturer has protection. I was rather amused by the Minister of the Interior saying we did not want reciprocity or commercial union. It is singular that he should express that view when the Government in their tariff policy of 1878 stated they would be only too glad to accept reciprocity if the Americans would give it to us, but now they are not willing to accept it. The hon. gentleman also made reference to Mr. Blake's speech at Malvern.

That speech appears to be a source of comfort to hon. gentlemen opposite; but if hon. gentlemen will turn up the proceedings of the House they will find that, on the very first occasion last year Mr. Blake took the opportunity of showing that he did not intend and did not accept the interpretation put upon his speech at Malvern. Mr. Blake has always held to the principle of a revenue tariff, so adapted that it would give the manufacturers incidental protection by allowing them to import their raw materials free. He has not, on any occasion, departed from that view, and when he spoke at Malvern he merely wished to convey the idea that there was no question as between free trade and protection but as between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff, because those were the great questions then before the country. The Minister of the Interior declared that up to this time we had been without a policy. We will not be a party without a policy any longer. We have a policy, which we will try to make the people understand and which will be fully explained to them. Some hon. gentlemen seem to be terribly confused with regard to this reciprocity question and do not realise what it is, although we have endeavored to grind it into their understandings in very plain and pointed speeches. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in a very able speech, very plainly and pointedly declared what, in his opinion, would be the effect of unrestricted reciprocity, and if hon. gentlemen are in ignorance of the true meaning of that principle, it is because they have not listened to the statements made. In 1879 the Minister of the Interior said that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie had offered reciprocity and had done their best to secure it. No doubt that Government did try to secure reciprocity, and hon. gentlemen opposite have declared by the National Policy that they were prepared to accept reciprocity when the United States were prepared to give it. I believe that clause in the protective tariff was inserted for the purpose of misleading the farmers. They went to the farmers and said: We are willing to have reciprocity with the United States just as soon as they are willing to give it to us, and I have no doubt that when another general election takes place in this Dominion you will find the amendment proposed to the resolution now before the House by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, hawked around every constituency, and the supporters of the present Government will say: Do you doubt that it is not our intention to give you better trade relations with the United States? Look here, there is a resolution moved by us in the House of Commons, and your friends opposed it and voted against it. We are earnestly anxious to do everything that we can for you and we are going to give you reciprocity just as quickly as we can get it. That will be in accordance with the promise made in 1878, when the party opposite was going to give the farmers home markets, and better markets, and better prices, for all products than ever they got in previous years. Another statement the Minister of the Interior made was when he told us that the farmers of this country did not send 10 per cent. of their stuff to the United States. If he looked up the returns he would have seen that the farming products exported to the United States last year amounted to \$15,000,000. Well now if 10 per cent. is sent to the United States, then the entire product would be \$165,000,000. I can hardly think that he intended to make such a statement, but it is evidently a statement made without due consideration. He also spoke in regard to the increase of population and wealth in the city of Toronto. Allow me to tell the hon. the Minister that Toronto has increased at the cost of the outside towns. I know that in my own town that there have been I am sure quite 150 of our population who have left and gone to Toronto. The reason for that is that manufacturers are being centralised largely there. I also know the town from which the hon. member for North Perth

(Mr. Hesson) comes, and I think he will not dare to deny the statement that a large manufacturing institution in that town has established a branch institution in the city of Toronto, and they were just about to move their entire plant there when the town legislature decided to give them a large bonus to keep the manufactory or part of it in that town. In my own town we have lost very seriously under the operation of the National Policy, and how? Why, Sir, those blacksmiths and carriage makers who in a quiet and small way produced what the people wanted, have been compelled, owing to the extensive manufacturing institutions that have been put up, to quit the business altogether. We have to-day in our town two foundries and a carriage shop standing idle, and not a single hammer going in either of them—monuments to the destruction the National Policy has worked in those trades. This is simply because under the operation of the National Policy the tendency is to centralise and get up large factories while those small places have been ruined. I believe this is the case with many places as well as the town I come from. While we rejoice at the progress which has been made in the city of Toronto, we claim after all that it is largely caused by the influx from the country towns and villages around of manufacturers, laborers and others, and that it is not a growth that has been caused by the influx of population from other parts of the world. I come now, Sir, to say a word or two with regard to the statement of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and I am sorry he is not in his place. He ought to be because Ministers are paid annually their salaries to attend to the duties of the House, and they are paid a sessional allowance to be here and discuss public questions. The hon. the Minister of Fisheries, in the introductory part of his speech, found fault with some expression used by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He tried to show that that gentleman was in the habit of using certain words very frequently, and he said that one word "it is clear, it is clear, it is clear" was used several times in his speech. I remember on a former occasion the hon. the Minister of Fisheries undertook to reply to the hon. the then leader of the Opposition, and he commenced a criticism on the same line. He said he had read over his speech on that occasion once, and read it over a second and a third time, and all he could find in it was a repetition of the word "maybe, maybe, maybe." The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) on that occasion undertook to deal with the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, and he compared him to a bird of prey flying over the landscape. He failed to behold the beauty of the rivulet; he failed to behold the grandeur of the landscape; he failed to admire the fragrance of the flower garden; but if he saw a dead horse in the fence corner he descended and stuck his bill in up to his eyes. We find the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries still a bird of prey. He has started on the same course again, and it appears that his classic ear is wounded at the use made of the Queen's English in this House. He has no doubt been hobnobbing at Washington, and I suppose he takes it upon himself to criticise all that is said and done within this Chamber. The hon. gentleman had better, perhaps, not be too severe in that regard, for although he holds a portfolio in the Government just now the days were when he used to deliver lectures on temperance at \$10 apiece. I am told he has stabled his temperance horse for the present, but he might be yet called upon to take it out and saddle it and do the same duty with it again. I notice he has pretty well avoided his temperance sentiments, but he does not care just now. It does not serve any good end, and as long as he is permitted to occupy a seat in the Cabinet with \$7,000 a year he puts his temperance sentiment to one side.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question; order.
Mr. McMULLEN.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I request you to confine yourself more closely to the question under debate.

Mr. McMULLEN. He stated in his address that the only market or outlet we could get for our surplus product was where it was wanted. I would like to know if the United States is not our natural market for what we send there, and if our only market is to be found in the United States? The reason why we send them there is because we get better prices for them there than we can get in other places. He spoke also with regard to the population in his own section who have left there. He said the reason they went to the United States was because they wanted freer and better and broader lands. Now, Sir, that is rather a peculiar admission for a Minister of the Crown to make. I thought we had as broad and free lands here as could be got in any part of the world. I thought we had a great deal to boast of with regard to the extent of our fertile territory in the North-West, and that the inhabitants of New Brunswick should go to the western States to get broader and freer lands I cannot understand. He referred also to the quantity of coal that is carried over the Intercolonial Railway, as an evidence of the growth of international trade. I do not think that this is much evidence. The fact of the matter is, when we take the history of the Intercolonial Railway, and notice that it is run at a very serious loss of income, and consider the fact that last year the Minister of Railways and Canals acknowledged that coal was carried at a loss, I do not think it is a very great advantage to this entire Dominion that we are working up at an annual loss an international trade in the matter of coal. He also stated that if we got unrestricted reciprocity trade, it would tend to increase the combines rather than reduce them. He pointed out that combines existed in the United States. They may possibly exist, but an argument that extending our commerce and obtaining trade with an extensive country, composed of 60,000,000, would tend to increase the number of combines is a rather peculiar argument. According to that argument, if the whole world had adopted free trade, then there would be huge combines, because the more extensive you make the trade relations of a country the greater inducement there is to combines. The hon. Minister of Marine also stated that Sir Charles Tupper, when he was in Washington, made a demand for closer trade relations with the United States, but that demand was declined. It is very singular that he made a demand for what a number of hon. gentlemen opposite hold we do not want. One reason why we contend that it would be a decided advantage to the Maritime Provinces, as well as to Ontario and Quebec, to have unrestricted trade with the United States, is that the large population in the border cities would afford excellent markets for the products our people have to sell. When we consider that we have within twenty-four hours' run, New York, with 1,206,000, Brooklyn, with 553,000, Buffalo, with 155,000, and Rochester, with 100,000, it must be clear that with closer trade relations these cities would be large consumers of our surplus produce. In this connection I will read a letter which was written by a gentleman whose name I am sure is respected by every man in this House—a letter addressed by John Bright to Joseph Aspinall, of Detroit, in answer to an invitation to be present at a convention in favor of reciprocity between the United States and Canada. It is as follows:—

"The project of your convention gives me great pleasure. I hope it will lead to a renewal of commercial intercourse with the British North American Provinces, for it will be a miserable thing if because they are in connection with the British Crown and you acknowledge as your chief magistrate your President at Washington, there should not be a commercial intercourse between them and you as free as if you were one people living under one government."

That is the view held by Mr. Bright of what should be the prevailing sentiment in regard to reciprocity of trade. Now,

Sir, I have some quotations here from the speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Marine. He says, speaking of the farmers :

"But I have full faith in the intelligence of the farming community, that, if this question comes to be a serious question, to be fought out before them, and both sides of it are fully ventilated, the farmers of this country will hold themselves aloof from the bait held out to them, and will keep themselves to the connections they have to-day, well assured that by so doing their future will not be prejudiced, but, on the contrary, will be prosperous."

Well, Sir, I would like to hear the hon. gentleman address a large gathering of farmers, and present these views to them; I think he would find they would not be prepared to endorse them. I believe he would realise that the time is past when farmers can be misled by statements of that kind, and that they are not willing to listen to promises of good prices and better times as they were in 1878. The hon. gentleman said again :

"A large proportion of the clothing he and his family wear is also paid for out of the products of his farm, and no taxes paid."

I cannot understand how the hon. gentleman comes to that conclusion. Again, in dealing with the farmer, he says :

"Oh, but my hon. friend says, there is the tariff on coarse woollens, and consequently the man who wears these woollens pays a heavy tax on every yard he uses. Does he? The farmer has sheep on his own farm, which he often shears himself, and whose wool he has often made up in the mill of his own locality, and his family wear the clothes thus manufactured. Where is the tax that is paid on these?"

At the present time there is not a single woollen manufacturing establishment in this Dominion that will take wool from a farmer, and manufacture it into cloth. The manufacturers will take his wool at the market price, and will sell their manufactured goods to him at the market price, with all the advantages of the tariff under which they manufacture, but there is not a single one of them who will take his wool and make it into cloth for him. They know too much, because under the operations of the National Policy they know that they have the advantage of the farmer, and they take all the advantage they can get. Again the hon. Minister says:

"If we consider it advisable to discriminate against Great Britain, we have the right to do so. We have our own interests and they are paramount, and that assertion was made still stronger to-day by the hon. member for Queen's, and it was echoed by my hon. friend from South Oxford. The hon. member for South Oxford says: If it does discriminate against Great Britain, we have a right to do it, our own interests are paramount."

That part of the statement I referred to a short time ago, showing that under the imposition of the duties on sugar the hon. gentleman was not consistent in holding those views. I shall now say something with regard to the value of lands. Mr. Blue's book is quoted as an authority on this subject. Mr. Blue does not go back and give full quotations, but he gives quotations for only some years. I notice that, in 1882, the value of farm lands was \$632,000,000; in 1883, \$664,000,000; in 1884, \$625,000,000; in 1885, \$626,000,000; and in 1886, \$648,000,000—a considerable decrease on what it was in 1883; so that when hon. gentlemen attempt to say that farming lands are still getting more valuable they are mistaken, even basing their arguments on the evidence produced by Mr. Blue.

Mr. HESSON. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that Mr. Blue reports farm lands throughout Canada as lower to-day than they were last year?

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Blue may be correct with regard to some sections, but I say he is not with regard to all sections. Then, Sir, we had the production of wheat. The hon. member for Lincoln gave us some idea of the amount of production of wheat in 1882. The following are the figures of our wheat for several years past:—

	Fall Wheat.	Spring Wheat.	Barley.
1882	31,277,048	9,655,995	24,284,407
1883	11,656,957	9,726,063	18,414,337
1884	20,717,631	14,609,661	19,119,041
1885	21,478,281	9,129,881	16,533,687
1886	18,071,142	9,518,553	19,512,278

In 1885 the average yield of fall wheat was 20·4 bushels per acre, and the largest yield was in Hastings, where the average was 26·2. In 1885, the average all over the Province was 24·5 bushels. Of spring wheat the average yield, in 1886, was 16·5 bushels. In 1885 it was but 11·4 bushels. The average yield of barley, in 1886, was 26·5 bushels. In 1885, it was 27·7 bushels. The average yield of oats was 36·2 bushels in 1886, and 35·8 bushels in 1885. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said what the prices were. Let us see what the prices were for the last seven years. The prices, taking an average of what was paid in all the principal Ontario markets, were:

	Fall Wheat.	Spring Wheat.	Barley.	Oats.	Peas.
1882	\$1 01	\$1 05	\$0 65	\$0 43	\$0 74
1883	" 1 05	1 07	0 57	0 38	0 71
1884	" 0 80·5	0 81·4	0 53·6	0 33·1	0 64·4
1885	" 0 81·5	0 80·6	0 55·2	0 31·5	0 58
1886	" 0 73·6	0 72·5	0 51 8	0 32·0	0 52·6

This table proves that—in place of the farmers getting increased prices, the prices have been running down every year; yet still the Minister of Marine and Fisheries declares the farmers are getting good prices.

Mr. TAYLOR. Give us the prices for 1876 and 1877.

Mr. McMULLEN. Now, with regard to the price of farm lands—I can speak only for my own section—and I can say I have had considerable experience both in selling and buying lands, both for myself and for other people. I know personally that four miles from the town where I am, a man in 1880 was offered \$7,500 for his farm. He refused, and rented the farm for five years. Before the five years were up, he died, and the farm was sold, under his will, for \$4,900. I also know the case of a man who went to Dakota and borrowed money on his farm for which he was offered \$3,200. He refused the offer and left his property in the hands of his land agent and of another man, who was to take some interest in its disposal, to be sold. It was advertised three months for sale, but not an offer was made for it. It had then to be sold by auction, and was bought in for \$2,800, or \$400 less than the owner was offered for it when he went away. These are cases that came within my own knowledge, and I care not for what Mr. Blue or any other man may say, when I have personal knowledge that furnishes undoubted evidence that land in our section is not holding its own. I could make similar statements with regard to North Perth, where I know some of the lands are not holding their own. I have been making valuations, and I know that in my own section of country to-day, there are no less than six farms put up at public auction under mortgages, and in not one single instance has a buyer been found. I know of an instance where a farm was bought for \$3,700 in 1879. The owner mortgaged it, and it was offering within the last month for \$2,300 without being able to obtain a buyer. To say, therefore, in the face of these facts that farm lands are holding their own is an absurdity, as regards my section at any rate.

Mr. HESSON. I will give you evidence about North Perth.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have had some discussion with regard to the article of butter. An hon. gentleman the other afternoon contended that England was the market for our butter, and that we could always get good prices there; and that even if we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, we could not sell our butter there. I have a letter from a practical gentleman addressed to the

Mail. In this letter, Ambrose Zettel, a Bruce county farmer and secretary of the Formosa Butter and Cheese Company, gives some excellent reasons for his belief in commercial union :

" At the end of last season our company had 20,000 pounds of very fine butter on hand for sale. The English market, however, was so overcrowded that the buyers would not give a satisfactory price and the company were forced to look to the United States. My brothers, who own a creamery in Minnesota, informed me that our butter would bring from 25 to 26 cents a pound any day in St. Paul, and the same class of butter was quoted in the Buffalo wholesale market at from 28 to 30 cents. The duty, however, was in the way and the company were forced to keep their stock in the hope of getting a market elsewhere. We kept it until the holidays, when the patrons of the factory, becoming anxious to receive their money, insisted on a sale at whatever price could be obtained. The price obtained was 20½ cents and the butter was shipped to British Columbia. The patrons thus lost about \$1,200 on their stock by being kept out of the Buffalo market. Other factories lost even more in the same way, as they were obliged to sell at even lower prices. Mr. Zettel states also that even in the face of the duty, large numbers of fine stall fed cattle are shipped to the United States. If the buyer had no duty to pay they would not only buy more cattle, but would pay our farmers just so much more for them, for we have better facilities for raising and breeding cattle, and are nearer the eastern markets than the western farmer. I advise Canadian farmers to study this question carefully, aside from party politics, and I feel convinced that if they do so they will be almost to a man in favor of commercial union."

That is the view which that man holds in regard to butter and in regard to stock. I was rather amused to hear the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown) state that commercial union, or unrestricted reciprocity, was putting in the thin edge of the wedge of annexation. I do not see how he can reconcile that with the position that hon. gentlemen opposite take in regard to extended relations with the United States. During the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty from 1854 to 1866, I do not think that our people were more inclined to join the Americans than they are at the present moment. I believe that, instead of our people becoming Americans, they will continue to be Canadians; but I believe that, unless you carry out unrestricted reciprocity, or give our people some advantage in the way of extended markets, you will compel them to become Americans by going over there to live; but if you give them an opportunity of parting with their stuff in a lucrative way, the probability is that they will remain in Canada and will continue to be Canadians. The hon. gentleman also stated that he was afraid he would lose his nationality by the adoption of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, that, after that had been in force for a year or two, he would not be able to say whether he was American or Canadian. That reminds me of a story. An Irishman, whose sister got married, met a friend of his about a year afterwards, and said: "Dan, did you hear the news?" "No," said Dan, "what is it?" "Why," said he, "my eister has presented her husband with her first born, and the peculiarity is that I don't know whether I am an uncle or an aunt." So, the hon. gentleman said, that he would not know at the end of a year whether he would be an American or a Canadian, and therefore he was afraid to encourage reciprocity lest he might get mixed on his nationality. Another thing which is said is that the result of this will be to wipe out all our industries. I do not think it is right to impress upon the people of the country that there is any such intention on this side of the House. We are willing, and we always have been willing, that our industries should have all the advantages that justice to all the other sections of the country will allow them. We do not believe in burdening the people who are now in financial embarrassments, in order to keep up the manufacturers. We are willing that our manufacturers should continue to prosper, and should have all the advantages which we can extend to them, but, if they think the rest of the population of the country are to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for their advantage alone, they should be made to understand that the people of this country will not bear with anything of this

Mr. McMULLEN.

kind. They should be willing to get from this House justice, and no more. They have been getting more than justice for ten years. They have had all the advantages, and the other portions of the people have been having all the injustices, and it is time that these manufacturers should be asked to stand alone without drawing on the resources of the consumers to an unjust extent, as they have been doing. There has been no case in the history of any country where those restrictionists have been willing to give way when once they have obtained an advantage. Look at the United States and see how manufacturers there are fighting against the reduction of the tariff, because they have had for many years the advantage of a high tariff, and consequently have been making millions; and the history of every country shows that, when once a high tariff gets a foothold, the manufacturers will fight for the continuation of the advantages they have, and that will be the case with the manufacturers of Canada. Hon. gentlemen have declared that we will lose \$7,000,000 if we adopt unrestricted reciprocity. They cannot think it possible for us to conduct the affairs of this country under those circumstances, without direct taxation. In their hands, it may be impossible to do so, but I believe that, in the hands of gentlemen on this side of the House, it would be possible. I believe we could make such reductions in expenditure that the government of this country could be conducted without direct taxation. I believe that hon. gentlemen on this side are prepared to pledge their word to the people of this country that they will so handle the affairs of the country that direct taxation will not be necessary, even with unrestricted reciprocity. I could quote some articles on which I think they could save at least five millions and a-half. For instance, there are legal expenses, on which \$61,000 were spent last year. There is outside printing, which could be easily done under the contract with the Government here, for which we paid last year \$97,500. At least we could make a reduction in that amount. Then there is outside advertising, which amounted to \$68,000. Reduce that by \$50,000 and you still leave \$18,000. Then there were payments to extra clerks, or to clerks hired in the several departments for extra work, amounting to \$120,000. I think that the clerks should be made to understand that all the duties they perform should be done within hours, and that no extras would be allowed for work after hours. If they understood that would be the rule, I believe they would do all the work without extra allowance. Last year we paid \$3,542,406 for reduction of debt, though the estimate was \$2,097,958. I do not know whether the extravagant commissions which were paid were the result of the absence of the High Commissioner from London, but, when he was appointed, we were told that he would save us an enormous amount of money by living in London in connection with these commissions. On that item, \$1,444,000 should have been saved. On Civil Government, I think, \$150,000 could be saved; and on Civil Government contingencies there could be a reduction of \$100,000. I think we could save \$100,000 by economy in our penitentiaries. If you compare the cost of our penitentiaries with that of the Central Prison in Toronto, you will find that the latter is managed for \$55,000 a year, while one of our penitentiaries, which accommodated about the same number of prisoners, costs, \$106,000. We have not a penitentiary in the Dominion which is conducted on the same economical basis as the Central Prison in Toronto. That expense could be easily reduced by \$100,000. Then, we could very well do without the superannuation system; and I was glad to see that a deputation which was introduced to one of the Ministers recently petitioned the Government, amongst other things, to do away with superannuations. If you abolish that, we will save \$150,000. Then, again, if you will do away with pensions, this change will save \$160,000. Then, in regard to public works, we spent last

year something like \$2,500,000 in that branch. We might cut that sum down by \$1,000,000, and we might make less expensive post offices, such as we have built down in St. Jérôme, in the constituency of the Secretary of State. There are some 300 or 400 people in that village, and we pay the round sum of about \$16,000 for a post office—I forget exactly what the postmaster gets. We appropriated last year \$10,000 for that post office, and I notice in the Estimates this year \$6,000 more are asked to build a post office down in a little village where there is no necessity whatever for it, but simply because the Secretary of State wanted it in his constituency to strengthen his cause with the people. It will be a benefit to him when the elections come round; I suppose it was a benefit last election. Go into western Canada, and there is only one town in the county of Wellington that has a post office, that is in Guelph. I live in a town of 2,500 inhabitants, where the returns are something like \$1,400 a year, but there is no post office. The returns at St. Jérôme are not one-half that sum, I think the entire receipts of the office are something less than \$800; I do not know that it reaches that sum. You could make a reduction of \$250,000 in the matter of immigration. Then, again, you could reduce our legislation expenses by \$100,000. We could easily reduce our railway expenses by \$150,000, by dismissing all the unnecessary officials and running railways on economical principles. Then again you could save a very large sum in the item of feeding Indians in the North-West, in place of giving it to a whole lot of officials. I think there is about a million altogether spent in connection with feeding the Indians, and I think about one-half of the money goes into the pockets of officials. Now, if you were to establish a system whereby the public money would be economically expended I think we might save, in connection with the Indians, \$400,000 a year. Then again on Miscellaneous, we might save \$140,000 in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. We add to the capital of that line about \$1,000,000 a year, and I think we could well do without it. During the time of Mr. Mackenzie's Government, they closed the capital account, and made up their minds that they could make the road pay its own expenses, and I think they did, or nearly so. It is time it should be done, but this Government have opened a capital account, and year by year they have added to it. Well, Sir, all these expenses I have read over to you amount to \$5,641,000. Now, I wonder if any economical Government cannot go to work and reduce the expenses of this country by at least six millions, if they are disposed to do it. But hon. gentlemen opposite never will do it, because they are not in the direction of reducing the expense, their direction is rather to increase it. Now, these hon. gentlemen talk to us loudly about their loyalty. We come across things at times that show their loyalty is from the lip out. They deprecate, strongly and pointedly, investments outside of our own Dominion. Why, I can remember, last year, when some members of the Ontario Government were supposed to own lands in Dakota, what hue and cry there was, a perfect yell, that Ministers of the Crown of the Province of Ontario should be owners of land in Dakota, and they were taken very pointedly to task in the Conservative press because they were supposed to have invested some money out there. Well, now, Sir, we come across an investment that was made by some hon. gentlemen opposite some time ago, away down in the State of Texas. We find there, Sir, a gentleman—I do not know who he is—but I find that his name is William Bullock Ives. I do not know where he lives, but I notice that he has led a whole lot of them into the bullock business down in that wonderful bullock-producing state of Texas. I do not know whether he has made it a profitable investment or not, but I know that he has been the principal instrument. I find that there are a great many prominent men who have invested in this

bullock business. There is the Hon. Senator Cochrane, who is a large stockholder. Hugh Ryan is a large stockholder, to the extent \$133,000. Then R. R. Pope—who he is, whether he is a relative of the Minister of Railways or not, I do not know, but he is a stockholder to the extent of \$20,000. I find, that this individual, William Bullock Ives, is a stockholder in two companies, in one for \$14,500, and jointly with Mr. Pope for \$33,000. I find, Sir, in the list—who do you think? The Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Finance Minister of this Dominion, who is a stockholder to the extent of \$21,000. They are all stockholders in this wonderful company away down in the State of Texas, in which they have invested quite a lot of money. I notice, amongst other names, that of Alexander Ferguson, \$5,000; and I notice that they have got one Grit, in the city of Montreal, I do not know how they got hold of him—he is a stockholder to the extent of \$80,000. Well, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, he was a stranger to them, politically, and they took him in. I do not know if he has made any money by going in with them; from all I can learn he has lost about all he has put in. It is rather amusing to think that our Finance Minister who, by the way, was home at the Indian and Colonial exhibition in London all last year, and who, no doubt, was telling the people that he interviewed, of the enormous resources of our North-West, the enormous amount of land, the grand ranching country we had there, without its equal on the continent of America, the grandest place for producing stock that possibly could be found—and while he was telling them all that, he was going secretly away down into the State of Texas and investing \$21,000 himself. That plainly shows that he has no confidence in the country. If he had confidence in the ranching capacity of the North-West he would not have gone away down in Texas to invest his money. Now Sir, there is one peculiar thing. Of course these men are very loyal; if a lot of Grits were to invest their money in that way, there would be a terrible yell about it, and every Conservative paper in this country would publish that the Grits were untrue to their country, that they were not faithful to its interests, that they were taking their money to invest it in the United States, instead of using it to develop the resources of their own country. Now, Sir, the First Minister of this Dominion has had a very peculiar career. He has held, or attempted to hold, the reins of power in this country for a great many years. Well, he has held them in a very peculiar way. His policy has been a political gospel of loaves and fishes at the country's expense. His appeals have been to the needs and the greed of the people with regard to railway subsidies, public buildings, and advantages of one kind and another. And, Sir, he has had a following in this country, yes, quite a large one, I admit, a following that has followed him, not because of his statesmanship, not because of his ability, not because of his patriotism, but they have followed him from day to day, and year to year, and Parliament to Parliament, because they do eat of the loaves and are filled at the country's expense. They get advantages, offices, and positions of one kind and another, until our country to-day is filled with officials of this Government from one end to the other sucking the life blood out of the people of this Dominion. I say it is time we had an end of this thing, and I believe the day is not far distant when the people of this country will wake up and will declare that they will not put up any longer with the extravagant condition of things that exists in this country; and when they will call to account, very pointedly, the men who are at the head of the Government for the manner in which they have handled its public affairs. The First Minister has quite a record. He has erected a monument to his memory; his friends will not require to erect a monument to him as they did to Sir George Cartier. The right hon. gentleman has erected a monument of \$150,000,000 of national debt, under which the people will grind for years after we have ceased to take part in public discussions,

a monument which generation after generation will feel the results of, and future generations will feel the extravagance that characterised the acts of the Government over which he presided, and in consequence of the manner in which public affairs were administered by his Government, the people will be called upon to bear the burden and meet the consequences.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland), moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:45 a.m., (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 27th March, 1883.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORTS OF THE PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. BERGIN moved the adoption of the first, second and third reports of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Will the hon. gentleman explain?

Mr. BERGIN. It is simply the account for printing. The account for printing is the first one, the second one is the report of the said committee auditing the account, and the third, the report and the documents ordered to be printed last meeting.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a question of a quorum.

Mr. BERGIN. Yes, a question of a quorum.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What is the quorum?

Mr. BERGIN. Nine.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 68) to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 69) to confirm a mortgage given by the Central Railway Company to the Central Trust Company of New York to secure an issue of debentures.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Montreal Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

Bill (No. 71) to grant certain powers to the St. John's, and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Vanasse.)

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the New York, St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company.—(Mr. Fisher.)

Bill (No. 74) to amend the Act to incorporate the Kincardine and Teeswater Railway Company.—(Mr. Rowand.)

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Renfrew.)

Mr. McMULLEN.

GOVERNMENT OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 76) to amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 50, respecting the North-West Territories. He said: I make this motion now for the purpose of having the Bill stand for a second reading at as early a day as convenient after the recess. The Bill is on the lines of the measure introduced by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) when he was Minister of the Interior. It provides that the North-West Council shall have the character of a legislative assembly, having not less than 21 nor more than 25 members. A schedule of the constituencies is now under consideration, and is not yet attached to the Bill. It is proposed that the nominated members of the council shall cease; but as there are at present no legal men in the council, nor is there much chance of there being many legal men in the first assembly, it is proposed that the Government may have power to appoint certain legal experts, not exceeding three, who shall sit and assist in the drafting of Bills, and have the power of discussion but not the power of voting, something like the representative delegates from the Territories in the United States Congress. That provision is intended to apply to the present term of the legislative assembly; it is hoped that in the second term some legal gentlemen may find their way into the assembly, and enable us to do away with that provision. It is proposed to extend the term of the existence of the legislature from two or three years. The qualification will remain the same, household suffrage with the addition of an income suffrage. The Lieutenant Governor shall no longer sit with the council or assembly, but shall, as in the Provinces, be a separate estate, and the assembly will be presided over as this assembly is, by a Speaker. There is an extension of the powers of the assembly which I need not trouble the House with now, but the subject will be fully entered into when the Bill is under discussion.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What about executive councillors.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We do not propose to have executive councillors. There is a proposition of that kind in one of the petitions of the North-West Council which is before the House, but after consideration those gentlemen are opposed to it themselves. They say that it is really a retrogressive step, rather than one in advance. These are the principal features of the measure.

Mr. LAURIER. I am not aware that the resolutions of the North-West Council with respect to this matter have been placed before the House. If they have not been, I suppose the hon. gentleman will place them before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am sure the House will be glad if the hon. gentleman would afford us some further information on this important Bill. The people in that country have made considerable progress in number and in the development of the country, and a government a little more approaching that of a Province than that which at present exists there is no doubt required; but in all our Provinces we have parliamentary responsible government, and I do not understand from the hon. gentleman's observations how he proposes that the executive government shall be carried on. The proposition he has made relates purely to matters of legislation. Does he propose that the Lieutenant Governor of the Territories shall have the power of vetoing the measures of the Legislative Assembly of the Territories? Does he propose that when the Legislature meets and passes a law which it believes to be for the good of the Territories, within the legislative limits assigned to it, the Governor in Council here shall

have the power, by instruction, to disallow it? Does he propose that the Lieutenant Governor of the Territories shall have an executive council to advise him with regard to the administration of the affairs of the Territories? For you will observe that the powers possessed by the Governor in Council there, now are not purely legislative powers, but administrative and executive powers as well. How are those administrative and executive powers to be exercised? Are they to be exercised by the Executive of the Territories, acting under the advice and approval of the majority of those whom the people have elected to represent them? Does the hon. gentleman propose they shall act on the advice which they may, from time to time, receive from the Government here? Now, I say that these are matters of the very first importance, and that before we are asked to take any step in advance in the legislative and governmental development of that country, we should note precisely what we are called upon to do; for it does seem me to be rather extraordinary to admit that the people of the Territory are so far advanced, by way of organisation, into a political and social community, as to make it necessary that they should have what may be considered a mature system devised for the purposes of legislation, and yet that the legislative and administrative affairs of the country should be in the hands of an irresponsible body. Certainly the power of legislation and administration should go hand in hand. If the community are entitled, and I am inclined to think that the hon. gentleman is doing right in recognising that they are entitled, to complete legislative control over those matters which are exclusively assigned to them, they should have equally independent control over the executive and administrative affairs of the Territory, within the same limits. They should be made commensurate with the legislative authority; they should be governmental to the same extent, and it would be a wholly anomalous condition of things for the executive and administrative affairs to be directed, not in consonance with the views of the majority of those whom the people have returned to the Legislature, but should be controlled by instructions given, from time to time, to the Lieutenant Governor from Ottawa. That would be simply Downing-street over again. It would be simply introducing into the North-West Territories precisely that condition of things which existed in Upper and Lower Canada before responsible Government was established. They had legislative bodies that represented the people, but they had an executive Government that represented Downing-street, and it would be rather a retrograde step to introduce any analogous system of government into the North-West Territories. I am sure the House will be anxious to know precisely what the hon. gentleman proposes to do in this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is, perhaps, not the time to discuss, *in extenso*, the various questions which the hon. gentleman has raised. In the first place, I must tell the hon. gentleman that in the North-West they have a most holy horror of responsible government. The representations are, I may say, without any exception, against the premature introduction of responsible government. If the hon. gentlemen were in the position of the Minister of Interior, he would find that the one cry is: do not at all at present give us a government of that kind. I take it the assembly, although sitting separate from the Government, will have the same administrative as well as legislative powers which they had when under the name of a council. The relations between the Lieutenant Governor there and the Government here will continue to be the same as they were before this Bill was introduced—

Mr. MILLS. They cannot be.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—or the same as between the Lieutenant Governors of the Provinces and the Gov-

ernor General. All these are important matters, and I am glad the hon. gentleman has called attention to these points. They will be discussed more conveniently after the Bill is in the hands of the hon. members.

Mr. MITCHELL. I can understand that a certain class of the people in the North-West should have a holy horror of responsible government, but, in my opinion, the experience of the past few years shows the people there should have a holy horror of bureaucratic government. I am glad this question has come up for discussion. It is a very important one, not only for the people of the North-West, but for the people of the whole of Canada, who are interested in seeing that administration of public affairs in the North-West should be a little different in the future from what it has been in the past.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Now the Governor votes with the council, and if he happens to be in the minority he is outvoted and has to submit?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But the hon. gentleman proposes, by this Bill, to separate the Governor from the legislative body. What is his position? Has he any voice at all in the legislative assembly?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think that he has much. I take it that the veto by the Lieutenant Governor is like the veto by the Queen. It is, in fact, gone.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Queen is advised.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The utmost we could do, and I think it ought to be reserved to him, is to reserve that power.

Mr. LAURIER. Has he to sanction the Acts passed by the Legislature?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so.

Mr. LAURIER. That is a veto.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Her Majesty sanctions all the Bills, but she never has in Her long life exercised the right to veto.

Mr. LAURIER. She has it in *esse* if not in *posse*.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Her Majesty is advised by those who sit in both Houses. Now there is nobody responsible for the legislation. The Governor exercises no control whatever in the initiation of measures in this assembly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not now.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read first time.

REPORT.

Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year 1887.—(Mr. Carling.)

REPRESENTATION OF RUSSELL.

Mr. LAURIER. I now beg to renew the motion which I made yesterday:

That the warrant issued by Mr. Speaker for a new writ of election for the electoral district of the county of Russell, Ontario, as appears in the Journals of this House, on the 23rd January last, be withdrawn, and that Mr. Speaker do forthwith issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. After considering, I have come to the conclusion that this motion ought to carry. The House knows that I consistently and persistently have pressed that such matters in connection with elections should go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and in two cases, the one the rather celebrated case of Queen's county, New Brunswick, and the other that of the county of Kent, there were points of law raised that had to be

settled, and we considered, and the majority of the House considered, that whenever a question of that kind arose, it ought certainly to be sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Motion agreed to.

THE NORTHERN LIGHT.

Mr. WELSH. May I ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries when the papers in connection with the *Northern Light* will be laid upon the Table?

Mr. FOSTER. In reference to Captain Finderson?

Mr. WELSH. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. They will be ready for the hon. gentleman after Easter.

Mr. WELSH. Immediately after?

Mr. FOSTER. Nearly so.

Mr. WELSH. I suppose they are under consideration.

GOVERNMENT MEASURES.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Before the Orders of the Day are called I propose to make some observations. I have on two or three occasions asked the Government when they proposed to introduce their measures relating to Parliamentary Elections, Voters' Lists and Controverted Elections. All those are referred to in the Speech from the Throne, and last week, in response to an enquiry which was made to the Government, the Minister of Justice informed the House that these measures would be brought down early this week. If I understood the statement of the First Minister yesterday, those measures are not to be brought down until after the vacation. That seems to me to be a highly objectionable course. The Government must have considered the present law to be very defective when they proposed to amend it, and, when they so advised His Excellency on the 23rd February, it must be taken for granted, that Ministers had, at that time, marked out the lines they proposed to follow in amending those Acts. We have been in Session nearly a month. We know that our usual Sessions last about three months. Up to this time, we have no knowledge of the changes which are proposed in the law, and that is a procedure which has never been adopted in England. I have on two or three occasions before brought under the attention of Parliament the practice in England in relation to the amendments proposed to the Franchise Law, the Representation of the People in Parliament, and other important measures, and I have shown that in fifty years there has scarcely been an instance in which those important measures, which are referred to in the Speech from the Throne, are not brought down within the first three weeks of the Session. We know that in England the Session extends for six or seven months, so that several months are allowed for the country to consider the matters which are submitted to the House. That is not the course adopted by the hon. gentleman. In this country we are peculiarly situated. In England the members receive no sessional indemnity, and no salary for their attendance. Here it would be impossible to constitute Parliament in that way. Here members receive an indemnity which is supposed to cover the expenses to which as members they are subject, and we know that our usual period for a Session is three months, and that the indemnity allowed to members has reference to the ordinary period of a Session. What is the plan the leader of the Government has adopted during the whole continuance of this Parliament? The hon. gentleman keeps back important measures in regard to which there may be differences of opinion on the two sides of the House, and between the different parties in the country—he keeps them back until near the period for the conclu-

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

sion of the Session, and then they are submitted to Parliament, not with the view of giving the country an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the contents of those measures, but simply to convert this House into a mere registry of the Government, whose business it is not to criticise, not to supervise, not to exercise an efficient control over the legislation submitted to it, but simply to approve of what hon. gentlemen choose to submit to us.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman indicate the nature of the motion he proposes to move?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I propose to move the adjournment of this House. I was going on to say, when you, Sir, interrupted me by your observations, that the course pursued by the Administration was altogether at variance with the principles of responsible government. The hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches are a committee of Parliament, they form a permanent standing committee, possessing for the time the confidence of the Crown and the confidence of the people's representatives, and it is the business of those hon. gentlemen, acting on behalf of Parliament, to advise Parliament in reference to the measures they propose to submit, before Parliament votes the supplies which are necessary to carry on the works of the country. We know the course that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have pursued, with reference to these measures before. Has any hon. member in this House forgotten the Gerrymander Bill, the circumstances under which it originated, and the solution which the First Minister and his colleagues proposed in order to secure to themselves a majority of the representatives from Ontario by the vote of 1884. We know what he did at that time, and we know also what he did in regard to the alteration of the franchise, when he proposed to confer upon the wards of the Government the controlling influence in certain constituencies; and we know what he did when he took the control of the voters' lists out of the hands of the municipalities, and we know the result. We know that under the old system it cost the Government nothing to obtain the voters' lists. The hon. gentleman took that matter out of the hands of the local authorities, and, in the eleventh week of the Session, he introduced a Bill which occupied the attention of the House for three months afterwards; we know that he would consent to very few amendments being made, and that, after he succeeded in carrying that measure at the end of a Session of nearly six months, he found that it cost upwards of \$400,000 to prepare the voters' lists. That was the result, and, while it was contrary to the promises of the hon. gentleman, it was consonant with the predictions made on this side of the House as to the result of that Bill. The hon. gentleman did not allow that measure to continue in force, but last Session introduced a suspensory clause, providing that last year no voters' lists should be prepared. At present there is no provision by which these voters' lists can be prepared. Yet we know that there is a variation of about 10 per cent. in every constituency every year. That being the case, I think that, at the period of the Session at which we have arrived, we ought to know what proposition the Government has to submit to the House in this respect. The country is entitled to be consulted in regard to it. Some of the supporters of the hon. gentleman, when discussing this motion put forward by my hon. friend as an abstract proposition, have said that we have no mandate to alter the fiscal policy of the country. I would like to know what mandate the hon. gentleman has had to legislate in regard to these two matters which he promises to deal with this Session, in regard to elections. What is the policy adopted in England? Does any Government there propose to adopt radical changes in the representation of the people without giving an opportunity to the people of expressing their views on the subject? What were the views expressed by

Mr. Disraeli when Mr. Gladstone introduced his measure to disestablish the Irish church? He said, We are entitled to allow a certain length of time to elapse, in order that this Bill may be sent to the country, and that we may have the views of the country on the subject. What opportunity does the hon. gentleman give us, in regard to the policy which he is adopting, to consult the country on the measures affecting the representation of the people which he proposes to submit? My constituents are intelligent men, and I dare say that those who returned the First Minister are intelligent men. Have they no opinions or views on this subject? Are they not entitled to be considered? Are they not competent to advise the hon. gentlemen upon the subject of the measures which they propose? Why, Sir, no Ministry in England would think of carrying through an important measure of this sort without giving the country an opportunity of considering its merits, without giving those who choose to express opinions upon the subject, an opportunity of consulting their representatives. But the hon. gentleman, from the first time he took his seat on the Treasury benches to this hour, has denied to the country an opportunity of considering any important measures submitted to Parliament. Why, Sir, when the hon. gentleman proposed his National Policy, he proposed a resolution here and was prepared to go to the country upon it. Why, then, is he so much averse to giving the country an opportunity of knowing what he proposes to do upon this important matter? I say that the course the hon. gentleman is taking is one which converts parliamentary government into a farce. I say it is one which denies to the representatives of the people an opportunity of exercising that controlling influence over the policy of the Administration which is necessary to the preservation of parliamentary government. Why, Sir, if those hon. gentlemen who sit behind the First Minister and support him, did their duty to the members of the Government and to the country, they would refuse to sustain the Government, no matter what might be the character of the measures, unless they introduced them at such a time as to give them an opportunity of fairly considering them. Why have these hon. gentlemen had commissions issued in their case, and put their judgment under the control of the First Minister? If not, how is it that they have not failed to remonstrate with him and with those associated with him in the Government? On this very important matter, I will move Sir, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am very sorry, indeed, that the mere circumstance that the hon. gentleman will not have an opportunity of spending Good Friday in considering the Electoral Franchise Bill has induced him to occupy the time of the House in making an attack upon the existing Franchise law, upon the National Policy, and upon everything else that was remotely removed from the subject on which he rose to speak. With regard to the hon. gentleman's contention that we ought to follow English practice with regard to the introduction of those Bills, I would remind the hon. gentleman that procedure there in connection with the time at which measures are introduced, and the time which is given for their consideration, is wholly different from that in this country. It is, as the hon. gentleman says, not uncommon in that country for Government measures to be introduced at a very early period of the Session; it is not at all uncommon, in that country, to see bills, after having been so introduced, stand over from year to year because Parliament has not time to consider them, or any other important business which the Government desire to bring forward. The condition of things during the present Session, in which the hon. gentleman's indignation is more particularly excited, is that never in the history of this Parliament has Government business been so far advanced as it has during

the past four weeks. The time of the House, not only on the Government days, but on nearly every private members' day, has been fully occupied with the consideration of the business which the Government had presented. In regard to the Bills which are indicated in the Governor General's Speech, there are nine mentioned, four of which are now before the House, and not one of them has the House had time to take up and dispose of; and yet the hon. gentleman makes a grave complaint against the Government because the other five are not laid upon the Table of the House waiting the consideration which the House has not time to give them. I think that the fact that the Railway Bill, the Bill relating to the North-West Territories, the Bill mentioned in the Speech relating to the law in Manitoba, and the Bill relating to the Audit of Public Accounts, are before the House, removes the hon. gentleman's complaint altogether from the province of reasonableness. Now, with regard to the hon. gentleman's complaint as to the Franchise Act, I think the hon. gentleman was led, by his desire to find fault, into a mistake, when he assured the House that there was at the present time no machipery by which a voters' list could be established. The hon. gentleman by this time has reflected that there is a full and complete enactment by which a voter's list can be established during the present year, and, therefore, that criticism—made a ground for finding fault with the Government for not having brought forward earlier the Franchise Bill—certainly appears to be of little weight. It is true, as the hon. gentleman has said, that when a question was asked on the subject a few days ago, I expressed the hope that early in the present week these Bills would be ready to lay upon the Table of this House; they are not so ready, and as the First Minister has informed the House, they cannot be presented until after Easter recess, when I hope they will be laid upon the Table the first day after the re-opening. Until then I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that it would be more decorous to reserve his reproaches about radical measures, and his discussion of what those measures are to be, and the necessity of submitting them to the people at the polls, because I venture to say that when they are introduced, they will be found to be measures that even hon. gentlemen cannot ask to have delayed until the opinions of the voters have been expressed upon them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of fact I think the hon. Minister of Justice is seriously misinformed when he supposes that the Government business is more advanced in the present Session than it has been in former years. Unless my memory is altogether at fault, I could refer him to two or three years, at least, under the presidency of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) when we had passed pretty nearly all the Estimates before the fifth week in the Session, besides bringing down a very considerable number of Government measures to a vote. Now, it appears to me that reason and common sense, and the convenience of members on both sides, are wholly on the side of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). There is no doubt whatever, that it would be a saving of the time of the House, that it would save us very many prolonged and inconvenient sittings—at the close of the ordinary Session—if full information was given in good time of the measures which the Government proposed to introduce. Sir, when measures are mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, we have a right to suppose that they are ready for introduction. Those measures, a reference to which is put into His Excellency's mouth, ought to be so far advanced that they merely required to be printed and placed into the hands of members. That is, as both the First Minister and the Minister of Justice know, in conformity with English practice and precedent, and, as I have said, with common sense, and the convenience of members. Now, Sir, it is

doubly so in this case. The hon. gentlemen summoned us together, in the first instance, for the end of January, a proper thing to do, a very good time for the meeting of the House. Then, for reasons connected, I presume, with the fishery negotiations at Washington, they put us off until the 23rd February. Now, they were doubly bound, under these circumstances, to have all their measures ready. It will be, as everybody knows, extremely inconvenient if we are thrown into the summer, as we have been once or twice, inconvenient to hon. gentlemen on that side quite as much as to hon. gentlemen on this. Therefore it is exceedingly to be regretted, I think, that the hon. gentlemen, with their customary habits of procrastination, were not ready in the first or second week of the Session to inform us what they proposed to do. Now, there is an additional very strong reason which justifies my hon. friend in calling attention to the state of things. Every one knows that there are an unusual number of very important questions which will probably occupy a very large proportion of the time of this House, over and above our ordinary and necessary work. We have in the first place, I presume, to discuss the fisheries treaty and the negotiations there anent, a subject which will undoubtedly occupy the House for some days. We have the Budget to be discussed, a matter that cannot be got rid of in an afternoon, even if hon. gentlemen, as indicated, do not propose any considerable changes in the tariff, because, unless I am very much mistaken, it will be found, whether changes in the tariff are made or no that very heavy additional liabilities are likely to be inflicted upon the people of this country before we separate. The hon. gentlemen have stated from their own places in this House that they expect a deputation from Newfoundland, and I presume there will be a discussion, an important discussion, with respect to the proposals those gentlemen may bring. And there is, as everybody knows, a very important question indeed, involving probably many other important questions, the action to be taken with respect to the Province of Manitoba. I forbear to speak about that at this moment, but I have no doubt a good deal will have to be said on both sides of the House before that matter is disposed of, and therefore it is exceedingly important that we should have in our hands, at the earliest moment, the Government measures, unless, indeed, the Government are prepared to assure us, as the Minister of Justice, in a sort of way, did, though not very emphatically, that those measures, when brought down, will be of a very perfunctory nature, or, at all events, of a character which does not involve any important changes. I agree with my hon. friend in thinking it is a very great mistake, and a thing very much to be regretted, that the Government, when they introduce measures into the Speech from the Throne, do not, at the earliest date, place the House and the country too in possession of their intentions in detail.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879, and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other, and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Mr. Speaker, in resuming the discussion of the question before the House I promise one thing, and that is, that I will be brief. I will not attempt to follow the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) in his periphrastics in search of scandals or of evidence to show that distress prevails in the country. I will merely take up a few of the points and leave the House to judge of the balance. I hope in the few words I have to say that I will be able to avoid anything that has heretofore been gone over in this House, and I think hon. members will agree with me that this is a very difficult task at this particular stage of the debate. I may just say here, as it may be referred to by hon. gentlemen who may follow me, that a meeting in favor of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, which means one and the same thing, was held in my county a few days ago. I have looked at the paper, and I find all the men at that meeting whose names were published with the exception of one, were opponents of mine at the last election, and would continue forever to be opponents of mine. They are an unforgiving people and they remain Grit, and will eternally remain Grit, I suppose. I found, however, one of those Reformers, a strong, substantial and influential one, raised his voice against commercial union, and notwithstanding the fact that that meeting was almost exclusively composed of Reformers, they only carried the motion by a three-fourths majority. I will say, before going further, that in my section of the country, and throughout the Niagara district, we are large growers of fruit of all kinds; and only two years ago I was requested by the Reformers and Conservatives in the counties of Lincoln and Welland to endeavor, if possible, to have further protection placed upon the fruits grown in that district. I may say also that I was petitioned, in 1883, the first Session I sat in this House, to see if an increased duty could not be placed upon oats and coarse grains, in order to protect the people of those counties against the importation of coarse and cheap grains from the western States, brought down by vessels and thrown upon the markets on the Welland Canal. So I am not afraid at this time, or at any other time, to discuss this question. It was said in my county that I had better wait to see how the cat jumped before I came to a conclusion on the question. On any matter affecting my country I have an opinion of my own. I do not believe in swinging on the coat tails of public opinion in a matter of this kind; every man ought to have an opinion and express that opinion fearlessly, and I am not afraid of this question. I might just say here that I am in favor of such a reciprocity treaty as will be fair to both contracting parties. I say we should have a voice in determining what that treaty should be, and it should be a treaty that would be fair and honest to every particular department of trade and agriculture in this country. I am entirely opposed to unrestricted reciprocity, as I believe it would not only injure the manufacturing industries of the country, but would injure the farming industry as well. I will endeavor to compare those two industries before I close, and I think hon. gentlemen will concur with me that the manufacturing industry is only second to the agricultural industry—and I

am an agriculturist myself—in point of money and value. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) talked of the scrap-book of the hon. member for Lincoln, and said the Government ought to make an appropriation to buy the scrap-book and burn it. I undertake to say that every hon. gentleman opposite would vote for that appropriation. It is the most inconvenient thing for hon. gentlemen opposite, because they never have a solid opinion upon any subject but are always wavering; they are found on every twig of the bush when it suits their particular purpose, and, accordingly, they do not wish their acts put on record. But the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), who spoke last night, has a scrap-book containing the history of every hon. member opposite, as well as hon. members on this side of the House, and he is always ready and prepared to bring it forward. The hon. member for Wellington took occasion to speak of a certain timber limit, and he said that that timber limit was the cause of the election of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) in 1887. I can tell the hon. member for Wellington that if during thirty years he continues to represent his present constituency and then stands half as well in the estimation of the people of his county as does the hon. member for Lincoln, he will have a good record. There is no man in this House who has fought a bolder and nobler party battle than the hon. member for Lincoln, and for that reason he has opprobriums thrown across the floor at him. The hon. member for Lincoln is admired by his constituents and by every one in the Niagara district, in my constituency and in the adjoining constituency, as a fearless opponent and one worthy of his position, and he will adorn the Upper House should he get there. I will now follow rapidly a few of the observations made by the hon. member for Wellington. The first point is with respect to increasing the burdens of the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite now complain that our importations are decreasing. If duties place a burden upon the people and our importations are decreasing, the burdens of the people must be decreasing as well. Now, Sir, he speaks of "combines," and I will run over that subject hastily. Why, Mr. Speaker, the "promised land" of hon. gentlemen opposite is the mother of "combines," and it is well known that the combines regulate the whole trade of the country, and yet this is the country the hon. gentlemen invite us to go to. The hon. gentleman refers "to the poor innocent farmers of Canada." The only evidence I see of the "innocence" of the farmers of this country is the presence of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), in this House. I have remarked, Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate that not a solitary word can be said in derogation of the United States, but that gentlemen on the other side of the House jump up to defend and explain away. This is very strange. They are presenting such a spectacle as is not to be found in any other legislative assembly in the civilised world. It is a strange spectacle to see nearly one-half the representatives of the people standing upon the floor of their own Parliament, ready and prepared to refute any little thing that may be said in favor of their own country, and standing up in defence of a neighboring country. Such a spectacle has never been seen before and never probably will be seen again. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) rises in this House and apologises for the land sales in the State of Dakota, and he says that there must be something wrong and that Dakota is a haven of rest and joy instead of what it has been shown to be. Let me just give an answer to one of his arguments. He says the farmers of this country pay the duty upon horses. I will deal with that question further on, but I would just ask this question in answer to his assertion: If the farmers of this country pay the duty upon all horses exported to the United States, how is it that the United States Government found it necessary to make half the horses imported, free of duty? Was it for the purpose of saving the

people of this country from paying the duty? I think not. It was for the purpose of saving their own people from paying the duty, or they would not have taken the duty off. That I believe is an answer to this argument. Now, Sir, it is said that the United States have reduced their debt, and I will deal with this question further on; but I assert here that they have reduced their national debt at the expense of increasing their State debts, and I will show that. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has made a calculation upon the farmer selling a colt and a steer and matters of that kind. I want to know how many farmers find a market in the United States for colts and steers? Nine-tenths of all the products of our country are sold in our own markets, and I will show that there is no market in the United States for the products of the farmers of this country. The hon. gentleman contends that farming produce is reduced in value, but he must know that this is due to the reduced prices on articles of export in the Liverpool market, the only market there is for the produce of the farms in North America. This is not due to the National Policy, and I will be able to prove my statement. He further contends that the farmers in Canada are not in as good a position as they were. This is true of the farmers of the United States, Great Britain, and all other agricultural countries. I will prove from the statistics of Mr. Blue's report, that the agricultural interests of this country have grown to a proportion that is not equalled even by the farmers of the United States. We will take Mr. Blue's report, in preference to the tale told by an hon. member in this House, of a particular farm which he drove somebody out to see and which did not suit the somebody because, perhaps, the percentage required on the sale was too small. I want to ask the hon. gentleman also whether the farmers in the United States are not in a worse condition than they were in a few years ago? He must know that throughout the known world complaints are now made in all agricultural industries that the farmer is not in the position that he was a few years ago, and that this is simply because of the over-production of farm products, which has reduced the values, and as the values are reduced so the value of the farming industry must reduce. The hon. gentleman tells us that 150 people have gone from his county to the city of Toronto, and that Toronto's population and wealth is enhanced by reason of the population coming from the surrounding country. He must remember that if we had had unrestricted reciprocity those 150 people would have gone to the United States, and that 300,000 people in this country who are engaged as artisans and mechanics would have gone there also. He complains that Toronto has grown at the expense of Listowel, but were it not for the National Policy, the cities of the United States would have grown at the expense of Listowel and of Toronto as well. The hon. gentleman, as well as the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), spoke of the markets in Buffalo, Detroit and Rochester, but they must be aware that there is more produce grown in the neighborhood of those cities than those people can consume, and that they are even exporting almost every article that the farmer of this country has to sell. Why, Sir, they can get wheat cheaper at Cleveland and Buffalo from the city of Chicago than they can get it from any point 100 miles from the frontier in the Province of Ontario. It only costs 3½ cents a bushel to place wheat from the elevators in Chicago into the city of Buffalo and you cannot send wheat from the city of Toronto to the city of Buffalo at that price. Neither can you send it from the city of London, nor from any point in Ontario to the city of Buffalo at so low a rate. They can send it far cheaper even to the city of New York through the Erie Canal. The hon. gentleman has also spoken about oats and butter, and I will tell you my experience of what the export of those articles means in a border county. When I left home oats were selling

in the city of Buffalo at 42 cents, and I had to pay 53 cents in my own town. As regards butter, in Niagara Falls we had to pay 25 cents during the winter season, and I know of others in the township of Bertie whose names I need not give who were selling their butter for 24 cents. When I went down there I told them that they could get 25 cents for their butter at Niagara Falls, and they were surprised to hear that they could get more there for it than they could in Buffalo. There are a great many other articles of our commerce which are exactly in the same position. I can tell the hon. gentlemen opposite that there is a higher price for the produce of the farmer in Canada than there is to be found in the United States. There is more raised within easier access to the markets of the eastern States east of Indiana than would feed the whole people of the eastern States, and they have even a surplus to spare. So that from Indiana east they are large exporters of everything that the farmer produces in this country, and we can find at home a more profitable market for our produce than we could in the United States. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), said that the right hon. the leader of the Government had built up a monument that would stand in history to his dishonor and disgrace in the debt of the country. If the hon. gentleman had been candid enough he would have told us that \$109,000,000 of that debt, which he says has been heaped up by the right hon. gentleman, was taken by him from the shoulders of the Provinces, and at the time when it was paying an interest of 5 per cent. by the Provinces, and he has added it to the debt of the Dominion at an interest of 3½ per cent. thereby saving over a million dollars to the people of this country. I wish there were forty monuments of that kind, and it would be all the better for the country generally. I do not intend to deal with this public debt question just now. But, Sir, I say that provincial debts which we assumed relieved all the Provinces of bonds bearing 5 per cent. interest which they could only realise on at about par, and the Dominion has taken those debts and at the same time relieved the Provinces, while paying only 3½ per cent. To-day 3½ per cent. bonds are selling at 116 in the European market. Hon. gentlemen talk about deterioration, about woe, despair, and desolation in this country; but the most sensitive test to be found in the world as to the prosperity and financial condition of the country is in the money markets of the world; and a complete answer to all the speeches made on the other side of the House is this: that the credit of Canada is continually rising in the money markets of the world—that in the opinion of people who have not an interest to get into office in this country, we are steadily advancing and increasing in prosperity. The hon. member for North Wellington ought to know this, if he knows anything, that the name of the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government will live in the hearts of a grateful people when the memory of his detractors will be forever forgotten, and history will give him the credit of having made a country. Now, the hon. gentleman spoke about the Intercolonial Railway; and, although he was very minute in all his facts regarding everything that might damage his country and injure the Government of this country, he was not so particular in his facts about the management of the Intercolonial Railway when the hon. member for East York had control of the affairs of this country. He forgot to tell the House that, instead of its running to pay expenses at that time, there was a deficit of about three-quarters of a million on the running expenses every year.

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). The hon. member for North Wellington said last night that the right hon. the leader
Mr. Ferguson (Welland).

of the Government kept himself in power, not by his statesmanship or by any virtues he possessed, but by buying all of us who are sitting on this side of the House. I should say, judging from the hon. gentleman's conduct in this House, that if I wanted to get a supporter for money, I would go across there. When he stands up in this House, and accuses others of that sort of thing, I say he would be one of the first men who would offer himself for sale, and his price would be small.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rise to order. You were good enough, or the hon. gentleman who occupied your place last night was good enough, to interrupt the hon. member for North Wellington a great many times for far less offence against the decorum of the House than the hon. gentleman has committed. I call upon you to press the hon. gentleman to withdraw his words.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). If I have used language that is unparliamentary, and I suppose I have, I will gladly withdraw it, but the provocation was very great. Now, I said I would endeavor to compare the product of the farm with the product of the factory in the United States, and I will take the year 1880, for it is the last year for which I could get returns. The total value of farm products for that year was \$3,764,743,327. The capital of the factories was \$2,790,223,506; the number of hands was 2,738,930; and the total amount of wages paid was \$947,919,674, or nearly a thousand millions a year paid to the factory hands of the United States. The value of the products of the factories of the United States was \$5,369,667,706, less raw material, say one-third, \$1,789,889,235, making the net products of the factories \$3,579,778,531, about equal in value to the products of the farm. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen say that the factory is of very little consequence in this country. I say it is of great consequence, and I think I shall be able to show that it is. The net product of the factories of the United States is equal to \$65 per head of the total population of 55,000,000. The product of labor is the only source of wealth in any country, whether that labor is expended on the farm, in the factory, in the mine, or anywhere else. Now, let us compare the product of the factory in Canada with the product of the farm. The total value of the field crops in the Province of Ontario, in 1886, was \$110,764,623; for the whole Dominion, say three times as much, which is a fair calculation, making \$332,293,869. Now, let us see what the factory has produced. In the same year the total value of the product of the factory was \$460,000,000, less raw material, say one-third, \$153,333,333; leaving the net product of the factory at \$316,666,667, or within \$16,000,000 of the total value of the field crops. Now, we find that the amount of wages paid to the hands employed in the factories of this country was no less than \$85,000,000. What does that amount of money represent? It represents a market for the products of the farm; but hon. gentlemen opposite desire to transfer that \$85,000,000 across the line, along with all the capital invested in factories, and they ask the farmers of this country to sell their products across the line instead of to people in this country. Now, the total farm population of Canada is estimated at 3,200,000. Thus we find that the wages paid by the factories amount to about \$26 per head of the farming population; that is to say, the wages paid annually to the factory employes secure a market to every farmer in this country of from \$160 to \$200 a year, which is about the total value of field crops he is able to spare off his farm. Now, the \$85,000,000 which is paid to the factory hands is about one-fourth of the total value of the field crops of the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite say that we have a market in the United States, and I propose to deal with that subject in a few words. In 1886 the United States exported:

Animals.....	\$ 12,518,660
Breadstuffs.....	125,846,558
Beef products.....	18,599,017
Pork products.....	58,072,932
Dairy products.....	10,876,466
Imitation butter.....	93,363
The oil.....	2,954,954
Clover, timothy and other seeds.....	1,949,990
Fruits.....	2,967,801
Hay, hides, skins, honey, hops, eggs, oil, cakes and meal, broilers, vegetables and wool.....	12,741,259
Total.....	\$246,621,000

Now, this is the market that hon. gentlemen tell us will be of great value to the farmers of this country; yet the great majority of these articles are raised within easier and cheaper access to the eastern markets than the products of the farms of Ontario. Transportation from Chicago is as cheap or cheaper than from any point within 100 miles of the American frontier in Canada. Canada's exports of sheep to other countries during 1887 was as follows:—

To Great Britain.....	\$ 568,433
Germany.....	20,975
Belgium.....	368
British West Indies.....	1,285
British Guiana.....	380
Newfoundland.....	19,017
St. Pierre.....	7,227
Total.....	\$617,685

The United States took \$974,282, or very little more than we exported to other countries. Now, Sir, take horned cattle. Our exports for the year 1887 were as follows:—

To Great Britain.....	\$5,934,375
Germany.....	23,040
Belgium.....	71,000
Newfoundland.....	133,408
St. Pierre.....	26,619
Total.....	\$5,558,442

To the United States, \$887,756; or we sent to the United States only 15½ per cent. of our total export, and we are asked to drop a market to which we sent 5½ million dollars worth in order to accept a market to which we only sent \$887,756 worth. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to make us believe that every horse we sent to the United States was charged with a duty of 20 per cent. Well, I find that the United States imported, in 1886, \$6,944,000

worth of animals, and out of that \$6,944,000, we find that \$3,330,595 worth was free of duty, or one-half of the importation of animals into the United States is now free of duty. Hon. gentlemen opposite, therefore, when they make their calculations, should take this into account. And, Sir, the other half we sent through in bond and otherwise to the European markets. Now, the United States is not a market for the Canadian farmer, but it is the home of the middlemen, who buy in the Canadian market for transshipment to Liverpool. We want these middlemen to reside in the cities of Montreal, Quebec, Toronto, Halifax and St. John, and not in the cities of the United States. Let them be stationed in our cities and buy the products of our farms, and in place of sending our products to the United States for the Liverpool market, we will ship them direct from Canada, and have here all the profit and advantage which now goes to the middlemen in New York. I desire for a few moments to show this House how the debt of the United States stands, because in this paradise, in this promised land, we ought to see how things stand before we take the leap we are invited to make. My opinion is that should we take this leap, we would find that we had jumped out of the frying pan into the fire. If we are highly taxed here, we would still be more highly taxed there, and under unrestricted reciprocity, we would have to resort to direct taxation in order to pay the interest on our public debt and to meet our other expenditure. Let us see how the debt of the "promised land" stands at present:

In 1880.	
Net State debt.....	\$234,486,261
Net County debt.....	123,877,686
Net Municipal debt.....	698,270,199

Total, 1880.....	\$1,056,584,146
Total, 1870.....	868,676,758

Increase in 10 years..... \$187,907,388

Or an increase of 22 per cent. in 10 years. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the increase in our debt, but it is well known that our Provinces are very little in debt, and that we have but little municipal debt, while the municipal debt of the United States, the county debt and the State debt, in 1880 was \$21.07 per head in every State and Territory of the Union, every cent of interest on which has to be paid by direct taxation. Let us take the debt of the different States. The public debt of the different States is shown by the following statement:—

	Net State.	Net County.	Net Municipal.	1880. Total Debt.	1870. Total Debt.	Increase per cent., 1870-1880.	Population.	Total Debt per capita, 1880.
Arkansas.....	\$ 4,039,737	\$ 3,135,749	\$ 763,298	\$ 7,938,784	\$ 4,151,152	80	\$ 9 89
California.....	3,306,614	7,312,489	6,136,685	16,755,688	18,089,082	19 38
Colorado.....	212,814	2,492,441	889,441	3,594,296	681,158	512	194,327	18 49
Connecticut.....	4,987,600	101,409	16,932,661	22,001,661	17,088,906	30	622,700	35 33
Illinois.....	None.	14,181,134	30,999,788	45,180,922	42,191,869	14 68
Kansas.....	1,087,700	7,950,921	6,967,232	16,005,853	6,442,282	250	698,098	16 07
Maine.....	4,682,741	451,809	17,272,300	22,488,850	16,624,624	40	648,936	31 53
Massachusetts.....	20,159,478	1,371,219	69,768,222	91,283,913	68,211,538	45	1,783,085	51 19
Minnesota.....	2,565,000	901,412	5,009,652	8,476,064	2,788,797	240	780,773	10 86
Missouri.....	16,859,000	11,923,312	29,249,010	57,431,322	46,909,865	26 46
Nebraska.....	375,582	5,120,362	1,929,813	7,425,757	2,089,264	255	452,402	16 41
New Hampshire.....	3,681,209	779,034	6,383,936	10,724,170	11,163,373	30 91
New Jersey.....	813,675	6,668,463	42,064,964	49,547,102	22,854,304	116	1,131,116	43 80
New York.....	7,596,732	12,899,808	196,767,274	218,723,314	169,808,234	33	5,982,871	43 03
Ohio.....	5,732,500	2,962,649	40,058,805	48,753,954	22,241,988	120	15 24
Dakota.....	7 39
Montana.....	19 41
Idaho.....	7 22
Wyoming.....	9 88

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. gentleman please inform us where those statistics are taken from?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). From the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department, Washington.

Mr. CHARLTON. The debt of New Jersey, as given last year, was \$1,496,000.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Let the hon. gentleman look at page 305 of the book he has in his hand.

Mr. CHARLTON. The discrepancy is so great that I thought proper to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to it, and it would be more satisfactory if the hon. gentleman would give us the statistics for 1887.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I am giving the latest statistics as published in 1887.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for Welland is quite correct. I hold in my hand another report of the same kind.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). The United States raised for State purposes in 1886, by direct taxation, no less than \$62,773,366 including the Territories. This amounts to \$1.12 per head of the population of 55,000,000, and I think that is a fair calculation for the population of that year. We pay about 80 cents per head of the population to the Provinces for provincial purposes. Then, if we take that \$1.12 a head for their taxes for State purposes, and add to it the 80 cents which we pay for provincial purposes, it will make a difference of \$1.92 per head for every man, woman and child of our people, in our favor. Take our population at 5,000,000; that would amount to \$9,600,000 in favor of our people, which would allow this country to pay off her national debt at that rate, in case we would submit to the taxation which is placed upon the people of the United States. Together with that, it will be remembered that the tariff of the United States is somewhere between 20 and 30 per cent. higher than the tariff in Canada, so, if the tariff in this country is, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, the measure of the taxation of the people of this country, they must add 20 or 30 per cent. which the tariff of the United States is higher than ours to the taxation of the United States, as well as the amount of \$1.92 per head, and what do we find in that case? The State of New York—and the hon. gentleman will find it in that red book, and it is the highest authority on this continent—raised in 1886, for State purposes, \$9,512,813. Placing the population of that State at 5,000,000, that would be equal to \$1.92 a head of the population; to this must be added the 25 per cent. that their tariff is higher than ours, making their taxation, on this basis, \$2.40 more per head than ours. Now, compare that with the Province of Ontario. The State of New York is taxed by money taken out of the pockets of the people directly by the tax collector \$1.90 per head. Add to that 90 cents which we receive, and that would make a difference in favor of the people of Ontario of \$2.70 per head for every man, woman and child. The comparison with the State of Maine is about the same, with the exception that it is more favorable to Canada. The taxation there was about \$2 per head of the population taken from their pockets and collected by the tax collector, so that would make a difference in favor of our people of \$2.80 per head. He can find, in that red book which the hon. gentleman has, what the taxes were for State purposes in 1886, the amount raised on real and personal property, and the hon. gentleman will find that it is as follows:—

Amount of Taxes.		
New York.....	\$9,512,813	3 mills on the dollar.
Maine.....	1,301,270	4 do
New Hampshire.....	400,000	1 1/2 do
Vermont.....	371,697	1 do
Massachusetts.....	2,005,987	8 1/2 do
Connecticut.....	1,463,328	1 1/2 do
Colorado.....	534,228	4 do
California.....	3,861,644	5 do
Arkansas.....	966,000	4 do
Alabama.....	1,041,898	6 1/2 do
Illinois.....	3,000,000	4 1/2 do
Iowa.....	1,148,396	2 1/2 do
Nebraska.....	1,117,934	7 1/2 do
Nevada.....	616,861	9 do
Kansas.....	1,082,477	4 1/2 do
Minnesota.....	658,998	1 1/2 do

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland).

This shows an average taxation of 4 mills on the dollar in these States. Then, take the taxation of the American cities which the hon. gentleman will also find in that red book, and we find this as the amount of taxation on each \$100 of taxation:

1883 Chicago.....	\$3 37
1883 Jersey City.....	2 90
1883 Louisville, Kentucky.....	2 35
1882 Lewiston, Maine.....	2 25
1883 Milwaukee.....	2 50
1883 Minneapolis.....	1 92
1883 New York.....	2 25
1882 Peoria, Illinois.....	5 76
1883 Philadelphia.....	
1882 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.....	2 92
1883 Portland, Maine.....	2 15
1882 Poughkeepsie, N.Y.....	2 53
1883 Rochester, N.Y.....	2 86
1882 Schenectady, N.Y.....	3 00
1882 Savannah, Georgia.....	3 00
1882 Springfield, Illinois.....	3 00
1883 Troy, N.Y.....	4 16
1882 Topeka, Kansas.....	2 75
1883 Toledo, Ohio.....	2 59
1882 Scranton, Pennsylvania.....	2 40

All this is for municipal purposes. You may add 4 mills on the dollar, which is the average for State purposes, and you will find that the taxation in the United States is from 3 to 4 per cent. of the total value of the real and personal property. If we would submit to that heavy taxation, we could easily pay off our national debt in a short time. I want now to give you the United States market, and the hon. gentleman will find the figures in the same book, comparing the twelve years of the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty, and the twelve years succeeding the Reciprocity Treaty. I will take the statistics as given in the city of New York, giving the lowest and highest prices in the years named:

Year.	Beef, Mess.	Butter.	Cheese.	Flour.	Hams.	Wheat.
	Bbl.	Lb.	Lb.	Bbl.	Lb.	Bush.
	\$ cts.	Ots.	Ots.	\$ cts.	Ots.	\$ cts.
1852	8 25 to 17 00	15 to 29	6 to 9	4 25 to 6 00	8 to 10	1 03 to 1 15
1853	7 00 " 11 25	13 " 24	8 " 10	4 87 " 7 50	8 " 10	1 22 " 1 80
1854	8 00 " 13 00	15 " 24	6 " 12	7 25 " 10 75	7 " 11	1 75 " 2 50
1855	8 25 " 14 00	17 " 28	6 " 12	7 50 " 10 18	8 " 11	1 96 " 2 80
1856	8 00 " 12 00	13 " 28	6 " 11	5 20 " 8 31	9 " 11	1 30 " 2 17
1857	9 50 " 15 00	18 " 28	5 " 14	4 25 " 6 70	6 " 10	1 25 " 1 95
1858	9 00 " 12 00	13 " 25	3 " 10	3 75 " 5 25	9 " 13	1 20 " 1 50
1859	5 00 " 9 75	14 " 27	2 " 11	4 00 " 6 50	9 " 12	1 30 " 1 65
1860	4 50 " 5 20	10 " 21	9 " 12	4 25 " 5 50	10 " 13	1 35 " 1 70
1861	5 00 " 6 25	8 " 22	2 " 10	3 90 " 5 65	7 " 11	1 20 " 1 60
1862	5 00 " 10 75	10 " 26	4 " 13	4 20 " 5 85	5 " 9	1 30 " 1 55
1863	5 00 " 9 00	14 " 30	8 " 16	5 00 " 8 00	5 " 8	1 30 " 1 55
1864	5 00 " 16 00	21 " 48	12 " 27	7 15 " 11 75	11 " 17	1 72 " 2 75
1865	9 00 " 14 00	20 " 38	10 " 16	5 00 " 8 80	11 " 23	1 25 " 1 88
1866	11 00 " 21 00	25 " 60	5 " 23	5 25 " 11 70	11 " 22	2 20 " 3 45
1867	12 00 " 28 00	15 " 48	7 " 20	6 25 " 11 30	10 " 18	2 30 " 3 40
1868	11 00 " 24 75	28 " 60	7 " 19	5 50 " 9 75	11 " 18	2 05 " 3 25
1839	5 00 " 16 50	16 " 55	11 " 23	4 95 " 6 40	17 " 24	1 45 " 2 18
1876	8 50 " 11 00	15 " 33	8 " 13	4 00 " 6 00	7 " 18	84 " 1 27
1877	9 50 " 11 25	13 " 14	8 " 16	4 75 " 8 00	10 " 14	1 06 " 1 85
1878	9 00 " 13 50	6 " 20	3 " 14	3 75 " 5 50	7 " 12	83 " 1 31
1882	11 50 " 16 00	16 " 38	9 " 13	4 65 " 8 75	11 " 16 1/2	1 05 " 1 43
1885	16 00 " 16 50	11 " 20	6 " 10	2 90 " 3 70	9 1/2 " 12 1/2	88 " 1 05

Averages prices, 1854 to 1866--12 years.

Beef Mess.	Butter.	Cheese.	Hams.	Wheat.	Oats.	Mackerel.
Bbl.	Lb.	Lb.	Lb.	Bush.	Bush.	Bbl.
\$ cts.	Ots.	Ots.	Ots.	\$ cts.	Ots.	\$ cts.
6 94 to 12 16	15 to 31	6 to 14 1/2	8 1/2 to 13 1/2	1 44 to 2 08	43 to 69	15 to 20 41
9 55	23	10 1/2	11	1 76	56	17 76

Average prices, 1867 to 1878—12 years.

8 02 to 15 37 11.69	16½ to 40½ 28	7½ to 17½ 12½	8½ to 13½ 11½	1 41 to 2 02 1.71	45½ to 67 56	13 06 to 23 61 18.33
------------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	----------------------	-----------------	-------------------------

The hon. gentleman can get the statistics in that book; let him go over all the figures and he will find my calculation is correct; you can take any year you like; you can take the average of 12 years succeeding reciprocity, and the 12 years of reciprocity, and the former period gives a higher price for the total products of the country than the 12 years of reciprocity, with the exception of one article; in the article of wheat there is a difference of 5 cents only. I was going to deal with the value of farm property, but I will not do so now. I think, you will agree with me, Sir, that I have given you figures enough; they are all correct, and they will, to some extent, at least, satisfy the House that when comparisons are made, figures do not redound to the advantage of the scheme of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if, during the election of 1887, the Liberal party had succeeded in reaching the Treasury benches, would this proposition ever have been brought before this House? No, Sir, it would not. It is brought here now because they are disappointed and have been rejected by the people of this country. They are taking their sweet revenge upon the people of the country, because they would not place their confidence in them during the late election. Now, as long as they go on in this way, decrying their country, doing all manner of things to injure their country, the people never will have confidence in them. I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, what the object of this discussion is, at this particular time. It is not for the purpose of forming a party policy, because there is no election in view. Then what is the object? The object is to strengthen the hands of the opponents of this country at Washington. They tell the people at Washington: "Stay your hand, wait, and you can get better terms." Sir, it would be a curious thing if, during the negotiation of that treaty for the settlement of difficulties between the United States and this country, the people of this country should, in their legislative halls and on public occasions, say to the United States: "Do not sign the treaty, wait, and we will give you better terms." There can be no other motive, no other object. If there is a motive, if there is an object beyond that, I would like to hear it, and I will gladly withdraw the inference, because I do not like to think it, but I am forced to think it. Now, Sir, there is another point which I will just mention. A very strange thing was said, that we could have our tariff, and they could have their tariff, that we would have control of our tariff, and they would have control of their tariff under free trade between the United States and Canada. What would induce the people of the United States to join hands with us? Only one of two things—they either want our market, or they want our territory. If they want our market, what use would it be to them unless it was protected in the same degree that theirs is protected? No, Sir, they never would submit to join hands in equal trade, or free trade, unless we made the protection of our market as high as they are protected themselves. If the United States, for instance, want a 40 per cent. tariff to protect their market against outsiders, what use would this market be to them if we only had a tariff of 20 per cent.? Of no value or use at all. Sir, we could not have two tariffs. They may just as well acknowledge the corn at once, and say commercial union. Then I say that if there is commercial union, we must have political union. You cannot have commercial union with one nation and political union with another. Why, Sir, what would be the result of commercial union? A barrier set upon the shores of this great Dominion against the whole outside

world, whether it be Asiatic or European. We set up a barrier, and we say to the outside world: "You shall not trade with us, we are a people within ourselves, we can trade within ourselves, and we do not want you at all." What would be the result? Ships would be withdrawn from our shores, the trade of the St. Lawrence would be diverted, in a short time Montreal, Quebec, Halifax, St. John and Toronto would disappear as commercial centres, all the ships crossing the Atlantic would come to New York city, the leading commercial houses would be there, and we would have none of that trade whatever. Why, Sir, we would be abandoned by the rest of the world. If we had a treaty to-morrow for unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union, that treaty would last just so long as it suited the American people, and no longer. The moment it ceased to suit them, they would then abandon that treaty, and might would be right with them, and we would be abandoned by the rest of the world. Besides that we would be a small people and they would swallow us up. Their invitation, if there is any, is the invitation of the spider to the fly; they will take us in and consume us, and then they are done with us. What does Mr. Hitt say?

"But we can at any time withdraw from commercial union if it works unfairly."

That is just what they are after, Mr. Speaker, they want to get us into a commercial union with them, and then, Sir, these combines that exist in the United States, both agricultural and manufacturing, would pour down their surplus upon us here for the purpose of extinguishing every ember of life in every industry in this country. Just as soon as they succeeded in extinguishing these, then the whole of the capital of this country would be transferred to the United States, and when they had all our artisans also on the other side of the lines, they would say: "We want your treaty no longer," and might would be made right in this case, as I have already said. Then in what position would we be placed? It would cost us to try the experiment—and it would be only an experiment—what? It would cost us about three hundred thousand artisans. What do three hundred thousand artisans mean to this country? Each one of those artisans and his family are worth to Canada at least \$1,000, and you can multiply three hundred thousand by one thousand dollars and find the cost. We would lose that to start with. We would also lose two hundred or two hundred and fifty millions of capital now invested in manufactures. And what would we lose besides? We would lose the respect of every right thinking man, not only in this country and in Great Britain, but of every honest, patriotic and right thinking man in the United States, who would look upon us with scorn and contempt. That is the situation in which hon. gentlemen opposite desire to place Canada. I repeat that this question has not been brought up for the purpose of forming a party policy, because it is useless now; it has been brought up for some other object, and I wish some hon. gentleman opposite would relieve me from the suspicion that it has been introduced at this time (when we are endeavoring to settle existing international disputes) for the purpose of damaging the best interests of the people of this country.

Mr. BECHARD. Mr. Speaker, after the numerous and elaborate speeches which have been delivered on both sides of the House since the beginning of this discussion, I feel it would be idle on my part to attempt to review at any length the different branches and details of the question or to read long statistics which would probably have no other effect than to weary the House at this advanced stage of the debate. To say, Sir, that free trade between Canada and the United States is a question which is highly interesting and popular is simply asserting a truth, which is so manifest, so palpable, so vulgar, if I may use the expres-

sion, that no one would venture to deny it. The people of Canada remember that under the old Treaty of 1854 they enjoyed a prosperity unknown to us before, and since its abrogation they have continuously wished its renewal. Before the abrogation of that treaty the Canadian Government took steps towards its renewal, and since its abrogation they have on different occasions attempted to negotiate a new treaty, one on a wider and more liberal basis. Subsequently, the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, being the leader of the Opposition and perfectly acquainted with public opinion in this country, thought he could do nothing better to win the confidence of his countrymen and be restored to power than to persuade them that it was in his power to give reciprocity of trade with the United States to Canada, that he had found the means whereby that beneficent measure could be secured—he would apply reciprocity of tariff and within a few years that measure would produce reciprocity of trade. In 1879, when the National Policy was inaugurated under the auspices of the right hon. gentleman, he had placed on the Statute-book of the country a declaration by which he gave information to the people of Canada that he was determined to fulfil his promises, and to carry out the reciprocity policy which he had enunciated and promised on the hustings, as soon as the Government of the United States was ready to reciprocate. But they did not reciprocate. Eight years have elapsed. During the interval we have had the National Policy, and we are still waiting for a reciprocity of trade with the United States. But will it be said that the people of Canada have become indifferent towards reciprocity with our neighbors? Surely no one will pretend to make such an assertion in face of the numerous meetings that have taken place lately in Ontario, and in the presence of the correspondence which has taken place recently between the Canadian and American Governments. On reading that correspondence it is reasonable to hold that the Canadian Government, by proposing to the Americans to make some arrangements providing for freer commercial relations between the two countries, intended, if they succeeded in negotiating a new treaty, to give to such a treaty wider limits and a more liberal basis than those of the old Reciprocity Treaty, because they knew that the American Government had refused to renew simply and purely the old Treaty of 1854. These facts to which I have referred show conclusively that the Government of this country, from the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1854, up to no longer ago than December last, held that reciprocity between Canada and the United States was a desirable measure and one advantageous to Canada. How is it to-day? They have changed their programme. To-day you could hardly find any vestige of reciprocity on the other side of the House. By the amendment moved by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the gentlemen opposite have entirely banished reciprocity from their quarters. Since that amendment was placed before the House reciprocity meets with no friendly feeling on the other side of the House. What does that amendment say? Let us see:

"That all the words after 'That' be struck out in order to add the following:—'Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879, and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.'"

What is the real and precise meaning of this language? What is its interpretation? You will find it in the following sentence: Canada in the past has been desirous of securing reciprocity with the United States, but as for the future, Canada is no longer desirous of securing such reciprocity, as it would interfere with the National Policy. That, Sir, according to my humble judgment, is the true meaning of this amendment. We all know, Sir, that the National Policy has been formed not only for the purpose

Mr. BECHARD.

of protecting the manufacturers of this country against foreign competition, but it has also been instituted for the purpose of protecting the Canadian farmers against competition on the part of the farmers of the United States, and surely no man will pretend to say that even reciprocity limited to the exchange of natural products between the two countries can exist without interfering to that extent with the National Policy of this country. I hold, Sir, that if this amendment contains the real opinions of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House with regard to this question; they are to-day opposed to any sort of reciprocity between Canada and the United States. It is true that we have heard some of those gentlemen express opinions favorable to limited reciprocity, but at the same time I have noticed and I found it very strange that their whole line of reasoning on this point, if not positively antagonistic was very far from supporting such a policy. We heard the Minister of the Interior—for whose talents and eloquence I always had a great admiration—say that he was favorable to that "limited reciprocity," and by limited reciprocity I mean reciprocity only in the interchange of natural products between the two countries. He said he was in favor of such reciprocity, but at the same time he took care to tell us that the United States produced the same kind of natural products that we produce in this country. It is easy, Sir, to see the inference from that statement. The last speaker who has just taken his seat has spoken in the same way and expressed views in the same direction. He said that the western States produced a large surplus and that the United States were bound to export their surplus of those products to other countries. What does it mean? It means that the United States market is not after all so good a market for the exports of the natural products of Canada. Those two gentlemen are not the only ones who spoke in the same strain. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault) whom I am glad to see in his seat opened in the same way. That hon. gentleman told us in a short speech a good many things which going to the country need I think some discussion. He told us exactly the same thing as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat—that the United States possessed a large surplus of natural products, they are bound to export to other countries, and that we in Canada must expect to send our surplus of natural products to markets where they are needed. What is the meaning of this language? How do you interpret it, Mr. Speaker? I do not know, Sir, although I am aware of your abilities and of the very logical mind that you possess—that you would interpret it in the same way as it would occur to my mind. But the interpretation which I make of it is this: The United States possessing a large surplus of natural products, a larger quantity than is needed to supply their own market, therefore the market of the United States is not the real market to which our farmers ought to export their natural products. Yet in the same breath those hon. gentlemen tell us that they are in favor of reciprocity so far as the free interchange of natural products is concerned. I would ask my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault) and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat for what reason, under such circumstances, would they be favorable to reciprocity at all? Under circumstances such as they have described, of what avail would it be to the farmers of Canada? My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault) said in his remarks that the great prosperity enjoyed by this country under the Treaty of 1854 was principally due to the American war. My hon. friend had forgotten, surely, that the treaty was inaugurated in 1854, and that the war began only in 1861, therefore seven years elapsed from the inauguration of the treaty to the breaking out of the war, and surely during that long interval the farmers of Canada enjoyed great prosperity. The volume of trade between the two countries was, in 1853,

the year immediately preceding the treaty, \$23,000,000 in round numbers; in 1854, the first year under the treaty, it amounted to \$33,000,000; and in 1866, the last year of the treaty and one year after the war, to \$84,000,000. I deeply regret the attitude my hon. friend has taken with regard to this question. I have much personal esteem for my hon. friend. Our counties lie adjacent to each other. Both are agricultural constituencies having identical interests. Although my friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault) and I have not often agreed in politics, I did hope that upon a question of this kind we could stand together. It is true that my hon. friend advocated and supported the National Policy, but I thought that, like his distinguished former leader, he had supported it only as a means in order to secure free trade—or reciprocity—between Canada and the United States. My hon. friend said that our farmers were satisfied with the National Policy, that they were making money under its operation, and that some of them had deposits in banks. Well, Sir, I do not think the fact that some farmers have deposits in banks is conclusive proof that their business is actually good and prosperous. It may show that they enjoyed some prosperity in the past, which enabled them to make some savings. But, Sir, we all know that the farmers as a class do not generally keep their money in banks. They are rather inclined to suspect the stability of those institutions, and they are not satisfied with the small profits they draw from their deposits. They generally prefer to invest their money in land; but, Sir, within the last few years business has been so dull—I speak of the farmers of the Province of Quebec—that those of them who have been most prudent and have made some savings, prefer to have their money in the banks to investing it. Some of those who have invested money in land, find themselves to-day pledged to obligations which they cannot fulfil, and they have been obliged to go to the United States. But those who keep their money in banks are only waiting for better times to bring them better opportunities for investing it. That a large number of the farmers have been for a time satisfied with the National Policy I do not undertake to deny. They were led to hope that that policy would make them all rich; but a change of times has brought a change of mind, and to-day those farmers have their eyes open. They understand that the great prosperity they enjoyed a few years ago is not to be attributed to the National Policy, but to the abundant crops with which we were blessed in this country, and the great increase in the demand for our natural products in Europe, where the crops were comparative failures. They understand to-day that the high prices which they obtained for their products during those prosperous years were not fixed by the National Policy, as they understand that this same National Policy is powerless to raise the low prices that prevail at the present time. Sir, the farmers in Rouville are not any more indifferent than those in the other counties of Quebec to free trade with the United States. They know very well that the horses they sell are shipped to the United States. They know that a large proportion of their cattle, their sheep, their wool, their barley, their eggs, and their poultry which they sell is shipped to the American market; and they know that every ton of hay which they sell is also shipped to the United States. The hon. gentleman for Rouville knows that in many counties of the Province of Quebec hay has become one of the principal products of the farm, and the one upon which the farmers depend most to make money. There are large tracts of land in the Province of Quebec which are natural meadows, the soil being specially a hay-producing soil; and there are other large tracts where artificial meadows are made with great profit to the farmers. For a number of years our farmers, finding that they could produce hay more profitably than grain, have given their attention to that industry, and they are to-day producing large quantities of hay, the surplus

of which is almost wholly shipped to the United States. The hon. member for Rouville, I regret to say, endeavored the other day to create the impression that this hay trade has been diminishing in importance within the last few years. He quoted statistics to show that the importation of hay by the United States has been decreasing since 1835; but if the exports of hay from Canada to the United States have brought less money to the farmers this year than last year, that does not prove that the trade is decreasing, because the reduction in the value may be due to the fact that the price of hay is lower in the American market this year than it was last year; and it may also be due to the fact that the hay crop has been smaller this year than last year, and therefore that a smaller quantity has been exported. Now, Sir, I find by the Trade and Navigation Returns that, in 1885, the whole of our exports of hay amounted to 134,936 tons, of which the United States imported 127,820 tons, leaving only 7,000 tons as the quantity exported from Canada to other countries. In 1886, the whole export was 93,944 tons, of which 85,490 tons were exported to the United States, leaving a balance of 8,000 only exported to other countries. In 1887, our whole export was 76,843, and from that quantity we exported to the United States 69,450 tons, leaving 8,000 tons for export to other countries. You see by these statistics that this trade between Canada and the United States is not losing its importance. I repeat what I said a few minutes ago that the farmers in the constituency of my hon. friend are not indifferent, but are far from being indifferent to reciprocity with the United States. Does not my hon. friend remember that, a few years ago, some leading men of his constituency made strenuous exertions to secure the construction of a railway which has placed the greatest portion of that constituency in direct communication with the Boston markets? Does not the hon. gentleman remember that some of the municipalities, through which that railway has been built, voted bonuses in order to secure its construction? Why, he knows that his town, where he lives, voted a bonus of about \$40,000 to that company, in order to secure the construction of a branch which would connect it with the railway to which I have just referred, and consequently place it in direct communication with the markets of the eastern States. These facts show conclusively, according to my humble judgment, that the farmers of Rouville, as well as the farmers of other constituencies in Quebec, consider the markets of the eastern States good markets for the sale of a large portion of their products; notwithstanding the large surplus possessed by the United States. This can be explained by the excellent quality of our products, and by the fact that we are in closer proximity to the eastern States than are the western States, which produce the large surplus exported by the United States. Here I must pay my respects to my hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Dupont) to whose speech I listened with great attention. He said that he could not understand why we should grant free trade to the United States when we did not grant it to England. The reason seems obvious. If with reciprocity with the United States, we discriminate in favor of the United States against England, in return the United States will discriminate in our favor against the whole world, while England, in receiving free of duty all our products, confers no favor upon us, but does for us what she is doing for the rest of the world. My hon. friend told us that we pay 20 per cent. duty to-day on our exports to the United States, but that with unrestricted reciprocity, we will pay much more than that by direct taxation. If my hon. friend is as friendly as he professes to be to the farmers of Canada, and the farmers of his constituency and Province, he should go in heart and soul for unrestricted reciprocity, for that measure would have the effect of removing immediately all those obnoxious

taxes which are weighing so heavily, according to my hon. friend, upon the farmers of the country and which the National Policy has always been, and shall always remain, powerless to remove. With unrestricted reciprocity, when a farmer in Rouville sells a horse worth \$100, he will not be obliged, as he is to day, under the National Policy, to lose \$20 on the price, so as to pay the American duty, but he will receive the full price without any deduction. My hon. friend is afraid direct taxation will be the consequence of unrestricted reciprocity. Sir, I confess that if I were persuaded such would be the result of the policy, I would not only hesitate to vote for it, but I would unhesitatingly vote against it. I am far, however, from being persuaded that such will be the result of the adoption of this policy. My hon. friend from South Huron, in his able speech the other day, explained in a satisfactory manner the various ways by which we could compensate for the loss of revenue that would follow the adoption of that policy. Sir, we governed this country with an average expense of \$23,000,000 a year when the hon. member for East York was at the head of the Government; and I do not see why we should not still govern the country with about the same amount. Reduce the expenses of the country to that figure, and there will never be any fear of any direct taxation. Unrestricted reciprocity, instead of leading to direct taxation, would have the effect of rendering us more economical. It would be the antidote which would cure the spirit of extravagance that now reigns in the expenditure of public money. Hon. gentlemen opposite object to unrestricted reciprocity, because they fear it would injure our manufactures, and on that account my hon. friend for Rouville told us that he would not sacrifice the manufacturers even to give reciprocity to the farmers. He said that with unrestricted reciprocity, the American manufacturers would not come to Canada to manufacture but would slaughter our market. Well, market slaughtering can only occur under certain conditions. No market can be slaughtered unless there is some market perfectly glutted where goods are sold at a great sacrifice. Under such circumstances I can understand that large quantities of goods may at some time be poured from the glutted market into the other market, which may then become glutted, but, with unrestricted reciprocity, there will no longer be a Canadian market and an American market, but they will be one and the same market where the prices of goods will be the same from one end to the other. Under such circumstances, there could not exist any market slaughtering. I admit that some manufacturers will be injured in their interest, perhaps, by unrestricted reciprocity, and especially that class of manufacturers who take advantage of the high tariff which protects them, only to enrich themselves and supply the consuming public with an inferior article. They will surely be condemned to choose one of two alternatives, either to improve their manufactures or to disappear from the scene and make room for others, and I think that their disappearance would be no loss to the country. But those manufacturers who have sufficient intelligence to conduct their business properly, who do not depend entirely upon the tariff to give stability to their industries, knowing the great natural advantages which have been given to this country, knowing that labor can be procured here as cheap, if not cheaper, than in the United States, knowing that living here is cheaper than in the United States, knowing that improved machinery and raw material could be bought here as cheap as in the United States, I say that those manufacturers do not fear competition, because already they have taken care to equalise the conditions of manufacturing between themselves and all possible competitors. Those manufacturers do not dread competition from the United States, but what they dread is the narrow market in which they are situated, and what they want is a broad market in which they can easily sell their products. He does not see that,

Mr. BECHARD,

attracted by the superiority of our natural resources, American capitalists would invest money in their development, and that, within ten years, manufacturing would take such an extension as it could never reach in half a century with the National Policy. The National Policy, according to the intention of its promoters, was to accomplish one great thing amongst others. It had for its mission to stop the emigration of our countrymen to the United States, and not only that, but to bring back those who had already emigrated. How many of them did it bring back home? I do not think it would be a very difficult task for the hon. the Minister of Agriculture to count them, and we all know that the emigration has been going on just the same. If you go to the Province of Quebec at this season, every Sunday you will hear, after divine service, the announcement that some farmers are going away, that they are renting their farms and selling their stock because they are going to the United States. This is the state of things in the Province of Quebec. But, with unrestricted reciprocity, that national evil which no policy has been able to cure yet, would find its remedy, because those who now go to the United States would find here what they are seeking when they cross the frontier. Hon. gentlemen opposite have raised the cry of annexation. I cannot take my seat without making an observation on that point. Those hon. gentlemen seem to think that annexation would be the unavoidable result of the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity, and they seem to dread that result so much that they are inexhaustible in their expressions of loyalty. It is not the first time, since I have had the honor of a seat in this House, that I have witnessed such an explosion of loyalty. I have never yet spoken of mine, because I always thought there was no reason for it, and, if on this occasion I briefly refer to it, it is not because I think that my own interests will be served by it, but I will do so in order to prove to hon. gentlemen opposite that loyalty is not their exclusive property. I am not an annexationist. I think we enjoy as much liberty in this country as they do in the United States, and if there is any difference between the two countries in this regard, the difference is in our favor, because I think that sometimes their idea of liberty in the United States goes a little too far, and is conflicting with the preservation of good order. Like the rest of my French-speaking countrymen, like the rest of the French Canadians, I am loyal to British institutions, although, not being of British extraction, and consequently not feeling, perhaps, in my bosom that same degree of filial affection for England which burns in the hearts of her own sons, yet, Mr. Speaker, from boyhood, I have been led to admire and to love England. I have studied her history, and have admired her great achievements and the genius of her great men. To a certain extent, I have been acquainted with her literature, and have been charmed with its beauties. I have endeavored, although I have succeeded but imperfectly, to learn the language of her sons, amongst whom I am happy to count good friends and men for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration. But above all, Sir, from boyhood I have been imbued with her principles of self-government, which she has taught the civilised world. Being born a British subject, and with such a training, you will easily understand that I could not help loving and admiring the great nation to whose destinies the fate of my native country was bound. But, Sir, permit me to add that while I love and admire England, I love Canada more, and should a day occur when the course of events would place me in the alternative of choosing between my loyalty to England and my loyalty to Canada, I would not hesitate to side with my native country. I feel in my heart that by doing so I would be playing the part of a patriot. But, Sir, the contention that annexation must be the unavoidable result of

the adoption of unrestricted free trade with the United States, is untrue. I cannot see any reason why a broad and liberal measure of reciprocity between these countries would accomplish more in that direction than has been, or could be, accomplished by a narrow and small measure of reciprocity such as the Treaty of 1854. Sir, before the Treaty of 1854 was in existence, annexationists were found in Canada; men of high standing became annexationists, and published a manifesto expressing their annexation opinions, which was spread broadcast throughout our country. Annexation meetings took place in some of our rural districts, where resolutions were passed endorsing annexation. I was a young man then, attending college, but I remember quite well those meetings. I have particular reasons to remember them. I remember that all persons whose names were published as being connected with those meetings, or as having endorsed those resolutions, were dismissed by the then Canadian Government from the honorary offices which they held under the Crown, such as justice of the peace, or an officer in the militia. Well, Sir, these facts show that there was an annexation feeling which, at one time, found favor in Canada. But no sooner had the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 produced its first results, than the feeling vanished and disappeared. Sir, a very old axiom says *si vis pacem para bellum*—if you want to preserve peace, prepare for war. Let me tell this House, let me tell all public men of this country, if you wish to prevent the development of an annexation feeling in Canada, give to the Canadians unrestricted free trade with the United States.

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

After Recess.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, this, as has been very often said, during the course of this debate, is a matter of very great consequence to this country, and I could not give a silent vote upon it inasmuch as it is a matter that has never come before the people yet. It is only a year ago in February that we had a general election, and then we went to the country with all the matters of practical politics that had been talked about for years past; and one would have naturally thought that if there was to be such a very strange and startling departure from our fiscal policy, hon. gentlemen opposite and the hon. leader of the Opposition, who was then in the country leading that party, would have promulgated it and brought it before the people in order to give them an opportunity to decide upon it. The National Policy was no new thing. It had been spoken about from the hustings, and in every school house in every part of the country from 1878 until the date of the last election, and at the general elections and at every bye-election changes were rung on the National Policy, on the one hand upon the great benefits derived from it by the people, on the other upon the great ruin it brought upon the people. One would have naturally thought that if a great change was to be placed before the people, and that not only were we on the brink of a great calamity that might have been averted by hon. gentlemen opposite, but that we had actually fallen into the abyss of misery and despair and there was no help for us now except by this heroic treatment of which we have heard,—one would have naturally thought that the country being in such a desperate state, requiring such heroic treatment, those hon. gentlemen would have taken the people into their confidence, would have spoken to them as a physician would speak to his patient, would have asked the patient the seat of the pain and the seat of the disease, and having ascertained what was the trouble would have prescribed accordingly. But we heard nothing about it. On the other hand, candidates who were running in opposition to the

Government not only did not oppose the National Policy, not only did not speak against it, but in very many instances within my own knowledge, they came out as advocates and supporters of the very National Policy which for many years before they had so bitterly denounced. What was the excuse for this turn-about? Their leader had come to the conclusion that the country was so much involved in debt, that it would be dangerous to introduce any new fiscal policy, and therefore they had perforce to accept the policy of their opponents, and they told the people that if they would entrust them with the reins of power they might rest assured that the industries of the country would not be interfered with. That was the state of things in February last year. We heard nothing about this new policy during the last Session of Parliament. The leader of the Opposition was then in his place in this House, and yet we heard nothing of this terrible calamity that in the meantime had overwhelmed the country, and nothing of the necessity for this heroic measure being adopted. But after that hon. gentleman, through indisposition, was obliged to leave this country, temporarily, I hope, then we find this policy is introduced suddenly upon this House. Now, I take it we are in this position—I am in this position and every other hon. member is in this position—he is not here as the representative of this new fangled idea. The people have not sent representatives here to say what should be done in this crisis. On the contrary, the majority of the members have been sent here as supporters of the National Policy, as members pledged not to interfere in any way with our industries or to change our fiscal policy in any way whatever. I would be recreant to my trust if I did not carry out that pledge, and I would never hesitate one moment about the way I would cast my vote in this matter. If I thought differently, if I agreed with hon. gentlemen opposite, having been sent to represent certain principles, I would feel it my bounden duty rather than vote with the opponents of those principles, although I agreed with their contentions, to resign my seat and go back to the people and ask them what they thought about the matter. That is the only logical way of doing in such a case. Is this country in that despairing state that hon. gentlemen opposite have depicted it? With the permission of the House I would like to take a brief retrospect of our history in Canada. It is not a very long history. Although born in Canada myself and not a very old man, I recollect the day, and it does not seem very long ago, when there was not a single railway in Canada and not a single telegraph line here, when all the passenger traffic between Montreal and Toronto was carried on by a single coach each way per day. Now look at the contrast. That was up to 1854, and the Grand Trunk, I think, commenced in that year; and not very long before that, probably in 1848, the first telegraph line was built in this country. Canada in those days was, comparatively speaking, a wilderness compared with what it is to-day. With the permission of the House I will read a short extract from a work by Mr. Talbott, the son of Governor Talbott, I think, who describes the country then in better language than I can use. He said:

"Nature has probably done more for Upper Canada than any other tract of country of equal extent; and art seems to conduct herself upon the modest principle, that it would be an act of unpardonable presumption in her, to attempt the further improvement of a country so greatly indebted to the kind indulgence of her elder sister. Here is the finest field for the exercise of human industry and ingenuity; a soil not only capable of producing in abundance all the necessaries of life, but equal to the culture of its greatest luxuries; a climate not only favorable to the human constitution, but also eminently calculated for the cultivation of every species of grain and fruit. And yet, so great is the delusion under which many Europeans still labor, with respect to the real character of this fine country, that most of those who have not seen it compare it with the deserts of Siberia; and receive all that travellers relate in its favor with no more candor than can be expected from persons who evince no wish to be undeceived."

I think we are a good deal to blame for the idea that the people of England and other countries have of Canada. It seems to be thought that the only things we can send from Canada to represent the habits of its people and the products of its soil, are small articles made by Indians, little canoes, snow shoes, toboggans, a miniature of the ice palace at Montreal, all of which go to give people in England the idea that Canada is a perfect desert, just as Mr. Talbott wrote over forty years ago. It is said that Canada is not well known in England and other countries. Why it was only the other day that an historian—a very celebrated man, Froude—came as far as Buffalo, and when he looked across Lake Erie and saw the waste of waters, and the ice floating about, he did not think that he ought to come to Canada, and he afterwards talked about our country as a perfect Siberia. I am sorry he did not come into this country because he would have found that it was a different place from what he represented. I have told the House the position Canada occupied in 1840 and 1850. In 1854 the Grand Trunk Railway was commenced, and in 1853, I think it was, the Crimean war began, and those two influences gave a very great impetus to trade in Canada. For instance land went up to a very high figure. In 1856 I went from Cobourg to Lindsay, in the county of Victoria, and I have lived there since. Farms which you could have bought for \$20 an acre went up to \$60 an acre at this time, and town lots that were sold in Lindsay—quarter-acre lots—at \$700 in 1857 and 1858 are not worth one-quarter the money to-day. There was an extraordinary advance in the price of land at this time, and there was also an extraordinary advance in the price of grain. I recollect that wheat sold at \$2.50 a bushel, and farmers thought there was no end to their wealth, and they were prepared to buy any amount of land either in town or country. This state of things could not, of course, last forever. The land from being an extraordinary price had to come down somewhat, and it did come down, but I do not admit it has come down to such an alarming extent as gentlemen opposite have stated. I wish to say a few words in reference to the remarks made by the member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron), and I am sorry he is not in the House, because I told him I was going to comment on his speech and on some very extraordinary statements that he had made. In the first place he states that he was alarmed to find the extent that farmers in his county were ready to go in order to obtain access to the American markets. I suppose what he meant by that was that they were in favor of this motion now before the House, or rather commercial union, because it was commercial union that was talked about at the time that he must have met those persons. I take issue with the hon. gentleman on that statement, although he is their representative. I know the people of North Victoria probably far better than he does. As I told you I have lived in the town of Lindsay, in the centre of the county, about thirty-three years, and I know the people, and I know further that there is no constituency that will give a more decided vote upon unrestricted reciprocity than will the electors of North Victoria. Were my hon. friend here I could tell him what he probably knows, and that is, that he represents that constituency to-day not because they love him more but that they would have nothing to do with the party who was there before. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Barron) seems to have loaded himself up with figures and statistics gleaned from I know not what source, because they are very erroneous indeed. I think that he has well earned the name and title of "Baron Statistics the Second." He told us that he wanted to be very accurate, and that he had gone to a great deal of trouble in order to make out his facts and figures correctly. Notwithstanding this he makes the astounding statement that in the county he has the honor to represent there are 31,563 farmers or 12,717 more than the entire population engaged in other industries.

Mr. HUDSPETH.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are just about 1,700 farmers in North Victoria, and that is all; I wish there were 21,000 farmers engaged in agriculture in North Victoria, and if there were it would be a splendid county. But this statement shows that the hon. gentleman, knowing nothing whatever about the facts, loads himself up with those figures without knowing what he talks about. I will not quote the figure of speech used by the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), but I may say that we have heard a great many gentlemen in this debate and "an avalanche of figures with a desert of facts." It is an extraordinary thing that of over 200 representatives chosen by the people of this country for the purpose of coming here and legislating for the good of the country, we cannot find out such simple matters as who pays the duty on horses, or barley, or butter, and when they have to go to all kinds of figures and statistics, both in Canada and the United States, to find out whether or not the United States pays the duty on horses exported to that country. I think the best thing we can do is to get two or three practical men to solve that question, because after all it seems to me to be an important question in this debate as to who pays the duty on horses and lumber, or anything of that sort.

Mr. SCRIVER. You solve it for us.

Mr. HUDSPETH. You have not succeeded in having it solved yet. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills)—for whose ability I have a great respect—as I understand him, says that the Americans pay the duty on barley. I am quite willing to take the hon. gentleman's opinion because I think he is correct, but then the great majority of the hon. gentlemen opposite are not content to take that opinion, and they have not yet solved the question. I must congratulate the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) who spoke last on the very sensible speech that he made, and I could agree in a great measure with his remarks were it not that I am so very strongly attached to British connection, and I cannot bear to do anything that would in any way lessen the bonds that bind us to the mother land. Were it not for this, Mr. Speaker, I think I could agree with everything he said, but I will have some remarks later on to make about matters on which I think he is a little mistaken. Now, Mr. Speaker, talking about the depression in the value of land. There is no doubt that owing to the Crimean war, owing to the extraordinary expenditure in Canada by the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway and other railways, and owing to the American war which followed in 1861 and which paralysed all the industry and trade of that country, not only during the years of the war but for many years afterwards, there was an impetus given to every kind of business in Canada, and to the farming interests it gave a very extraordinary impetus. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, I am allowed to have my opinion, and I express the belief that it was those wars and this large expenditure of money which increased the price for horses, cattle and all kinds of products and which raised the price of land to an abnormal extent. There had, of course, to come a reaction. When the Americans recovered themselves, as they did very rapidly, they no longer paid such high prices for grain and everything we had to sell, and the influences of those wars passed away. The large expenditure of money for railways in Canada, ceased to a very material extent; our north-western country was opening up; an immense territory in the western States had been opened, large wheat-growing tracts in South America and Central America as well as in India were being developed. All these things combined to pull down the prices of our farm products. I think it is absurd for hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to argue that the National Policy alone could raise the price of everything we produce. It has assisted, no doubt, but there are other powers and influences at work. Nor can I agree with

hon. gentleman opposite that the National Policy has been a bad thing for this country. I think it has been a good thing for the country on the whole. I think we ought to protect our industries, and it would be a very silly and foolish thing to attribute the depreciation in the value of land and the lowering of the prices of our products, to the National Policy; the man in the moon has got just about as much to do with it. Now, I am not going to trouble you with very many statistics, because they are not very reliable things after all. You can prove almost anything from statistics, I have heard one hon. gentleman say, and I believe there is a good deal of truth in that. But I will give you this for what it is worth—it relates to my own riding of South Victoria. I wrote to the county treasurer, without the slightest idea of what the result would be, to send me the assessed value of property in that riding from 1876 to 1887, inclusive, which he has done. I find that there has been no very material change in the value of the land. The township of Mariposa was assessed in 1876 for \$2,712,940, and it varies very little. It goes down a little in 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, and 1884, and then it goes up again in 1886 and 1887. In 1887 it was about a dollar more than it was in 1876; so there is very little change in the value of land in that township from 1876 to 1887. In the township of Ops the assessed value has decreased some \$300,000 in 1887 from what it was in 1876. In Verulam it has decreased \$100,000 odd. In Emily it has increased enormously. That shows how little reliance can be placed even on this class of statistics, which is probably the best that can be obtained. My idea is this: Different assessors are appointed, and they have different ideas of the value of land. Then, a few years ago the Ontario Legislature passed an Act requiring the assessors to value the land at its actual cash value, that is, at the price at which it would sell at an ordinary sale. So, I think these figures are probably as good as any could possibly be, and are worth something. I do not say that they are actually reliable, because a man would assess his farm at a great deal less than he would sell it for; but if you took all the municipalities throughout the Province in the same way, you would be able to see whether the land had depreciated to the enormous extent hon. gentlemen opposite say. Now, the town of Lindsay was one of those places which was boomed by the construction of the Midland Railway in 1857, and the assessment of lots in that town must have been very high in the years immediately succeeding 1857. Notwithstanding the depreciation in the value of property in most of the towns of the Province—and we in Lindsay, like other neighboring towns, have felt very materially the effect of the land booming in the city of Toronto—yet the assessed value of Lindsay in 1887 was \$2,000,000 higher than it was in 1876. We have got over our depression; and although Lindsay is not what you might call a manufacturing town, we have a few manufacturing industries in it; the town is going ahead; we have not a single vacant house in Lindsay, and preparations are being made for building a great many houses as soon as spring opens. The hon. member for North Victoria spoke of the exodus which is going on in many parts of this country, and he mentioned one young man who left Lindsay to better his fortune in the United States. If he had applied to me I could have given him other instances. I know that a great many have gone from his constituency in the last few years, since the North-West has been opened up, and I do not blame them a bit. There is in North Victoria a great deal of very poor land, for instance, in the township of Carden; you would think no man would inflict such a punishment on any man as to compel him to go and live there. The Ontario Government built a colonisation road; settlers went in and built their houses; and as long as the lumbering operations went

on, and they were able to cut beaver hay, and grow a little oats and a few other things, they were able to make a living in the shanties in the winter. But after the lumbering was finished, they borrowed all the money they could from some unfortunate company on the rocks they occupied, and went to the North-West or to the States, whichever would suit them better. Travelling through that country a little over two years ago, I passed a great many empty houses which had no doubt been deserted in that way. But this is only the case on those poor lands. There is nothing of the sort in South Victoria, and nothing of the sort in North Victoria where the land is good. But I will tell you what is a great cause of the exodus. As hon. gentlemen know, the great majority of the farms in Ontario, at any rate, only comprise 100 acres each, and many are even smaller. The consequence is that a man who has a good farm, and is quite able to maintain his family comfortably, finds that if he has two boys, he is not able to buy land for them at \$60 an acre, and the result is that one boy gets his father's farm, and he gives the other what he can afford, and lets him go to the west and take up land for himself. Now, that will go on, and continue to go on, and I do not care whether you abolish the National Policy or have commercial union, or annexation, or whatever you will, it will not better that state of things. It is just as natural as that the bird shall leave the nest when it can fly. These people must have lands to live upon, and if they cannot get them here, they will go elsewhere. If our Government see their way to develop the North-West Territories, and in every possible way give advantage to these settlers, I have no doubt that in a few years our young men, farmer's sons, instead of going to the western States, will go to our North-West Territories, and make their homes in their own country, but that exodus must go on. Another thing which has a great deal to do with it, is education. Our farmers are educating their sons, our professions are crowded with their sons; they cannot find sufficient field for their talents in Canada, and they must go to the States. They will go to the wealthy country. Do you mean to tell me, Sir, that annexation is going to remedy that? You might as well try to keep Scotchmen out of London as Canadians out of New York, if they can better their circumstances in that city. There are more Scotchmen in London to-day than in Edinburgh, and more Irishmen than in Dublin, and it will ever be thus. The large centres will attract the clever men; and if you educate your sons you must expect they will go where their education will be appreciated. Why, we had two school teachers in the town of Lindsay, to whom we paid \$300 apiece, and since the first of January last we have lost them both. One went to Chicago and got there \$600 a year, and she telegraphed to the other, who joined her, and also gets \$600 a year. I could not blame the girls; no one could. They had a perfect right to better their fortunes. It was not because of the National Policy that they left Canada, but because they got \$600 in the States, when they could only get \$300 here. I know of two of our young men who left the town of Lindsay for New York, where they are now getting \$2,500 a year. You could not blame these young men. They did not leave the country because they hated it, for no more loyal men could be found anywhere, but they went to New York as Scotchmen go to London, because they had a field there for their abilities; and I am proud to say our schools are doing good work, and our farmers and mechanics and even laborers are giving their sons such an education as no other country on the globe gives them. The consequence is that for a time at least we must have an exodus of these young men. To say that can be cured by heroic treatment, such as annexation to the States, is utter folly; and I do not believe hon. gentlemen opposite believe it can be cured in this way. As to the value of lands, my experience is that they have not much depreciated in value. Within the last three or

four weeks two transactions have taken place in my presence which do not show evidence of depreciation. In one case, in Mariposa, a farm of 90 acres with very poor buildings on it was sold for \$6,100 cash; and in the other case a farm of 100 acres in the township of Ops was sold for \$6,900. The price asked in the latter case was \$7,000, but as the cash was paid down, the seller took off \$100. That does not look as if the people had no hope, and as if the country was in an abyss of despair. People who can pay \$70 per acre for land are not in a very bad way, and when that price can be got for land I do not think the country is in such a bad state. But I must confess that poor lands have gone down tremendously. I speak very feelingly on that subject, because I know it to my own cost. You cannot sell poor land at any price, for men will not go on poor farms when they can go to the North-West and buy good land at \$1 an acre. Now, a good deal has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite about the mortgage debt of the farmers and the miserable state they are in. No doubt, there is a good deal of mortgage debt in the country, and the mortgage debt shows two things. It shows not only the indebtedness of a great many of the farmers but also the money that other farmers have made off their farms, because, as was stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, there are a great many mortgages which the companies do not take. A great deal of private money—what is called private money in the country—is lent out, and the great bulk of that private money is lent by men who made it in farming. I speak advisedly upon that subject. I know many farmers in the town of Lindsay who live upon the interest of their money, men who retired from their farms and rented them, and came to the town where they educated their families, and they are now living, in their old age, upon their earnings. There is one thing on which we may congratulate ourselves, and that is the great decrease in the rate of interest. From 1857 down to 1868, when I had to do with that kind of business, the rate of interest was from about 10 per cent. up to 25 or 30 per cent. I have known many mortgages to have been drawn at 25 per cent., and a great many at 10 to 15 per cent. Now interest runs from 6 to 7 per cent., which is a great change indeed, a change of which the farmers have the benefit. But why was it necessary the farms in Ontario should be mortgaged to the extent they are? I think I know something about it. In the first place, owing, as I said before, to the very high price of produce caused by the Crimean and American wars and the expenditure in building railways, the farmer got an extravagant idea about the value of land. They, in fact, thought this thing was going to last forever. They bought lands, they paid a part of the purchase money, and gave a mortgage for the balance. Then the poor years came, poor crops sometimes came, low prices came, and they had to increase their mortgage debt, but I am happy to say a great many farmers have been paying off their mortgages. Some, of course, not so good farmers as the others, were unable to pay off their mortgages, and lost their farms, and have gone out of the country. I would like to give the House practical information on this subject, because we have had so much theory volunteered, and I will not read anything from any friends of my own, but I will give you the opinions expressed at a meeting of the West Victoria Farmers' Institute, where my opponent in the February elections, and several strong Reformers who opposed me as hard as they could, spoke; and I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will pay some respect to the opinions of these gentlemen. At a meeting held in Mariposa the other day Mr. Glendenning, from Manilla, who is a strong Reformer and a farmer, read the following paper upon the question:—"Does farming pay?" Now, so much has been said in the House about the farmers being in a dreadful state of despondency, that it will not be out of place for me to read this paper, which is not very long:

MR. HUDSPETH.

"The question is often asked: 'Does farming pay?' and nearly always answered in the negative by those asking the same, and in proof of this assertion they point to the increasing indebtedness of the farmers. Permit me to state that that is not sufficient evidence to establish the case. Mercants might answer the question: 'Does mercantile business pay?' in the same way by pointing to the large number of failures constantly occurring amongst their class, but the farmers would not accept that as conclusive evidence that the mercantile business was a failure, in general, and they would be wrong in doing so. Farming like other callings in life will pay just in proportion to the amount of knowledge, capital, skill, economy and labor put in the business. Many farmers sigh for the good old times they had and when they made money. Let us go back twenty-five or thirty years ago. What had the farmers to sell then? Wheat, pork, horses, cattle, sheep and wood. Except in the case of wheat can he not raise as much per acre as then? But even this point is questionable. On some farms the average has been higher within the last ten years than it was at that time. Pork can be sold for as much on the average now as then. Cattle can be sold for more. A better price and demand for horses. Wool will not bring as much, but lambs realise better prices, while, on the other hand, the farmer has many new avenues opened up to him to make money, notably among them is barley, clover-seed and potatoes. Also a better demand and prices can be obtained for poultry, butter and eggs. He also has the advantage of railways, enabling him to sell in the best markets when he is ready. He has larger clearings; his fields are free from stumps and stones, which permits him to work his lands more easily and to better advantage by using labor-saving machinery.

"He can buy his implements, groceries and wearing apparel for less money. Yet with all these advantages many farmers complain that they cannot make ends meet. For this there must be a cause, which I think can be accounted for largely by the following facts:—For nearly twenty years, with only short intervals during that period, the farmers had large crops and high prices for most of their products; and with their increasing prosperity many of them undertook the purchase of land on credit at high prices either to enlarge their own domains or farms for their sons, which seriously crippled them when less prosperous years came. All, or nearly all, acquired more extravagant habits of living which they have not learned to curtail. In many cases too much farm machinery has been bought, simply because some machines come out with high praises and flashy paint. After a time the purchaser finds out that he could have done nearly as good work with the old discarded machine that he gave to the agent or lies rotting in the fence corner. This brings us to another point. Many farmers have not provided sufficient house room for their increasing implements and vehicles, consequently some of them have to stand out in the weather to rust, warp, rot and break when hitched to, which operation tends to break their temper and break them financially. Farmers who have not contracted heavy debts and who live within their income will generally tell you that farming pays and be satisfied with their position in life, but it is sometimes very hard to make farmers believe that their present mode of living is different and more expensive than it was twenty-five or thirty years ago. Well, I will ask how many farmers at that time sported a carriage with fine harness, or they and their families wore as expensive clothes as they do now?

"I do not wish to deny farmers and their families the use and luxuries of these articles, for I think there is no class of people in the Dominion who should enjoy the good things of this life more than the farmer; but when we find a top buggy and trappings to match for himself and each boy that is grown up, and other things that are just as ridiculous, is it not time for him to stop and ask himself the question: 'Can I make farming pay at this rate?' One drawback the farmer has to contend with now is the high price of labor; but that is in part offset by labor-saving machines, which enables him to do a greater amount of work with the number of hands employed."

Now, Mr. Speaker, those sentiments were approved of by my friend Mr. Lownsbrough, who was my opponent at the last election,—

"Mr. Lownsbrough said he thought from an honest standpoint farming did pay. Mr. Glendenning thought the wages paid by farmers were too high. He could not agree with the assertion. The farm hands had only about half of the year to earn wages, or at best not more than eight months, and had to go idle the rest of the year.

"Mr. Glendenning called Mr. Lownsbrough's attention to his paper, that he had not said farmers were not paying too much."

Mr. Fee, who was one of the bitterest opponents I had, who is a farmer, was asked to criticise Mr. Glendenning's paper,—

"But found nothing to disagree with him. He fully agreed with him and more too. The farmers were to be greatly blamed for their extravagance in buying too much machinery and not taking proper care of it. A great many farmers bought farming machines they did not need."

There is the opinion of farmers who, I say, are second to no farmers in the Province of Ontario, and they say that they do not find any fault, and they give their reasons. Now, is the country in that dreadful state in which it has been depicted by hon. gentlemen opposite? Are we wallowing in the Slough of Despond? Are we vainly endeavoring to get assisted out of that Slough of Despond? Where is the evidence of it? Where are the people coming to this Parlia-

ment and asking to be assisted, and claiming that they are suffering in this way? I did hear some years ago that there was a great deal of destitution in this country, when petition after petition was sent in, and deputation after deputation was coming down and getting no assistance from the Government of that day. We heard of soup kitchens at that time, and we know that there was a great deal of destitution then. Can any one say that there has been any such destitution in the country of late years? There may have been some distress among people who have been borrowing money needlessly, but it is not of such a kind as to require the heroic remedy that the hon. gentleman proposes. The people of Canada are not in the Slough of Despond that the hon. gentleman has depicted. I have tried in my imperfect way to show what I think have been the causes of the depression, because we know that there is a depression in the price of wheat. I have tried to give my reasons for it, that it is principally because the supply exceeds the demand, and I cannot for the life of me see how this unrestricted reciprocity is going to remedy that, because we know that it is not the United States that settles the price of grain, but that it is the English market that settles it. It seems to me that there is no market for us in the States for wheat, and, as far as barley is concerned, I am inclined to take the statement of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), that the Americans buy our barley simply because they must have it, because it is of a brighter color than the barley which is grown by themselves, in preference to the statement of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who does not know anything about it except what he gets from blue-books and statistics, whereas the hon. member for South Leeds knows all about it as a practical man, and he stated, as I understood him, that the price in Canada is the same as the price in the United States, and, when they buy it here and take it over there, they pay the duty. If we get \$1 for our barley, and the price there is \$1.10, of course we do not pay the duty.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Of course you may laugh. I notice that those who laugh are generally those who do not know anything about the subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes, you may say "oh, oh." You are only making yourselves ridiculous, and more and more ridiculous, like the monkey climbing the pole. I do not think this is a laughing matter, it is a very serious matter, and we should try to find out the facts of the case. I hope I have not hurt any gentleman's feelings by any remarks I have made. I should be very sorry to do it. The hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) mentioned something about the benefits which would accrue to this country from unrestricted reciprocity, and he argued very neatly, what would be the good of reciprocity at all if we did not get any advantage from an exchange of our products with the United States? He said, very fairly, and very clearly, and very logically, that gentlemen on this side said that there was nothing to be got by the exchange because the United States had the same kind of products that we had, and therefore they did not require our products, and there was no necessity for any reciprocity at all. Well, I do not go quite as far as that. I think that an exchange, even by one town with another, is often beneficial, and that if we could have a reciprocity treaty that would be fair both to Canada and the States, it certainly would be an advantage to us, and I think it would be an advantage to them. Now, I was speaking to a gentleman in Peterborough who manufactures sawn lumber—he is one of the largest manufacturers in the western part of the Province—about this question of the duty of \$2 per thousand on lumber. I asked him if he thought that the abolition of the

duty of \$2 would give him that amount more for his lumber? He said: "No, I don't think it would, but I think we would get a little more for it." I said: "How much do you think you would get more for it?" "Well," he said, "I think about \$1 a thousand. The supply and demand regulate this matter to a great extent, and I do not suppose if the duty upon lumber was abolished to-morrow, that we would get anything like \$2 a thousand more for our lumber than we get now." Well, I suppose the same thing might be said about horses. It has been said by the hon. gentlemen opposite that the farmers lose about \$25 upon every horse they sell to the United States. Now, there are two young men up in my county, Bisailon and Dundas, who are buying horses. I saw them the other day in Lindsay, and I enquired what amount of business they had done in 1887, and they said they had paid out \$30,000 in the town of Lindsay and in the outlying county of Victoria for horses during that year. I asked them what was the average price that they paid for horses in Lindsay, and they said that they paid on the average \$109 for each horse. They bought them for the Montreal market, but a great many of them found their way into the States. I asked them what they thought of the duty upon horses. Well, they said they thought that if the duty was abolished, they would get a little more for horses in the States than they do now, but that the Americans wanted our horses, they were healthier than their own, and stronger. I suppose that the same rule applies to horses as to barley. The Americans must have our horses, or a certain number, and they must have our barley. Now, I cannot agree with the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) when he says he is prepared to pay the price for this unrestricted reciprocity. He is quite prepared to run the risk of our being isolated from the mother country in order to get the benefits which he imagines would be obtained by trading with the United States. He says they could sell their hay without the duty, they could sell their grain without the duty, and that they would be benefited in a great many respects. Well, I dare say from his standpoint he may be right, but that is a rule that works both ways. I suppose as far as the lumbermen in the States are concerned that if it was not a benefit to them to have this duty upon lumber continued, they would not be opposed to reciprocity, as they are now, and they would be perfectly satisfied to have the duty abolished; but it seems to me that they are very bitterly opposed to anything of the sort. They think that the duty enhances the price of the article, that by taking off the duty it might depreciate the price of the article. That is their opinion, at any rate, and I suppose the same rule will hold good with anything else. I am perfectly satisfied, and I believe that the great majority of the people of this country are satisfied, to have a very full measure of reciprocity with the United States, provided always that it does not interfere with our relations with England. That is the point, it is the crowning point, and that is the point hon. gentlemen will find when they go to the country. People will say yes, we want trade with our neighbors, we always want to trade with them, but do not ask us to trade with them at the expense of cutting us adrift from the mother country. They will not stand that one moment. Now, our country is not alone in suffering from the depression. One would think that our fair Canada was lying, amongst all the other countries of the world, a pitiable object, suffering from every possible political ill, and the hon. gentlemen want to apply this heroic remedy, as it is called, to relieve her in her miserable condition. England is surely as much depressed as Canada. There is real destitution there, there is great shrinkage in the price of land, a depreciation in the price of all articles raised upon the farm. A bitter cry has come out from all of the agricultural districts of England. Hon. gentlemen say nothing about that. So far as I can

learn, the farmers of the United States are in no better condition than the farmers of Canada, in any shape or way. I have read you the opinions of practical farmers in my own riding, showing you the causes which have led up to any depression that may exist among them. They tell you truthfully what the reason is. They tell you that farming will pay, if conducted skilfully by men who understand their business, just the same, with the present prices, as any other business. Then I say there is no need of this heroic remedy, the country is not in a state to require it. But there is a depression, there is a shrinkage. What is the remedy? I do not think it is annexation to the United States, I do not think it is commercial union—hon. gentlemen seem to have abandoned that name now—I do not think that it is unrestricted reciprocity. I must confess that I think there is some common sense if a man wants to break from the mother country and annex himself to the United States. There may be some common sense in commercial union, because people can understand it. I dare say that the United States would be perfectly willing to take us under their protecting arms and dole out to us our share of the duties, because there would be the same wall put all around both Canada and the United States. But I cannot understand unrestricted reciprocity. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will read an article upon this point from the *Chicago Times*. After leading up to this point that paper says:

"It provides that whenever Canada desires free trade with the United States, and the same system of internal and tariff taxes, it can say so, and thereupon the President will appoint three commissioners to meet the same number appointed by the Canadian Government and prepare a plan for assimilating the internal taxes of the two countries, and the taxes on imports from all other countries, and dividing equitably the revenues derived from these sources.

"This, at least, shows some comprehension of what is necessary in order to effect the kind of commercial union about which there has been so much loose talk—the kind which goes to the extent of absolute free trade and the entire obliteration of the customs line between the two countries. Mr. Hitt and the committee evidently see that this involves not only an identical tariff but an identical internal revenue system for the two countries, which most of the advocates of commercial union have either not seen or affected not to see. As *The Times* has repeatedly pointed out, if there is absolute free trade between the two countries, and no custom houses, as between any two States of the Union, there must be the same tariff for both, for otherwise the lowest duties imposed by either would practically be the duties for both. To illustrate: If Canada should lay 30 per cent. and the United States 70 per cent. on woollen goods imported from other countries, all woollen goods imported would be entered at Canadian ports and pay the 30 per cent. duties and thence be sent free of duty into the United States. Thus the Canadians could force us to adopt whatever duties they might impose for themselves or else lose the import trade of our seaboard cities. So, too, if they put a tax of 10 cents a gallon on whiskey we would have to do the same, or all our distilling business would go to Canada. Mr. Hitt and the committee see this, and propose a mode of agreeing upon an identical tax system for the two countries, because without it the sort of commercial union contemplated is wholly impracticable."

That is just my own idea, but I thought it better to give you the opinion of some one living in the United States. The American Government would never consent to it. Do not hon. gentlemen opposite know that? What is this thing brought into this House at the present time? In the opening of my speech I stated that it was not foreshadowed in any way at the last election, it was not a matter brought before the people, but it is sprung upon the House. It has not been discussed by the country or by the press, but it has changed its name like the chameleon changes its hue, and is presented to the House in the most beautiful form possible by hon. gentlemen opposite. But it is the same thing, only it will not take with our neighbors over the border—they say they will have none of it—Can it be possible that the hon. gentlemen leading the Opposition in this House have so little respect for the opinion of this House, have so little respect for the opinion of Canada that they will merely for the sake of making a point against the Government of the day, bring down a scheme which they know in their hearts will never be ac-

Mr. HUDAPETH.

cepted by the people of the United States, even if the people of Canada were to go upon their knees and ask them to take it. If they were to catch the ears of the people of Canada and catch their votes, so as to be placed on this side of the House, they would then offer this scheme to the United States, which would be repudiated and refused at once, and then those hon. gentlemen would turn around to the people and say: We have done all we could, we found the country in a destitute state and we applied an heroic remedy, but when we went to the United States they would have nothing to say to us, we can do no more for you, we are in office now, the scheme has acted admirably, like a perfect charm. Is that the idea of hon. gentlemen opposite? Do they think they can so befool the people with this scheme, do they propose to act like the ostrich, hide their intelligence in the sand, that the people might fall down and worship it not knowing what it is? What is this thing? It is not one thing or another? They say it is not annexation, that it is not commercial union; and the Americans say: We will have none of it. Yet the hon. gentlemen opposite have night after night risen and stated that this thing, which would not be accepted by the United States, was the only thing that would save this country from ruin. What is the remedy? If our country is not progressing satisfactorily, as I think it is progressing, what remedy should be applied? In my opening remarks I showed what the country was in 1840 and in 1850, that in 1840 it was comparatively a wilderness, and in 1850 was without a single railway or telegraph line. From 1854 to 1888 it made enormous strides, railways being carried into every portion of the Dominion, telegraph lines into every part of the country, the whole Dominion being rapidly developed. If this country can be benefited, if it is suffering in any way, if its trade is languishing, what must we do to improve it? Can we on this side of the House find no better remedy than the heroic remedy prescribed by the doctors on the Opposition side? I think we can. I think it is the duty of the Government to do everything in its power to open up and develop the North-West and encourage the immigration of a proper class of immigrants, not the rakings and scrapings of the towns and cities, but farmers and agricultural immigrants generally, not only from England, Scotland and Ireland, but from Germany, Norway, France, Sweden and other continental countries; to let our country be known, not according to the extract I have read you as a perfect Siberia, a land of frost and snow, of great frozen lakes, mountains and avalanches, but as the smiling, peaceful, happy land it is. Let the world know Canada as it really is, and let its fertility be known. The Dominion is better known in England from the exhibition there two years ago than it was ever before. Then we should strive to fill up our country, to protect our manufacturing interests, to protect them to a moderate extent, not to such an extent as will make a monopoly of any one single manufacture, to protect them to a moderate and fair extent, and whenever protection goes beyond that it is injurious to the country. Then we should develop our mines. There is no country in the world, as we have been told by hon. gentlemen opposite, and by the advocates of commercial union, that possesses greater riches in the shape of mineral wealth than our own country. I think everything should be done to develop those mines. There is another question that has been raised, and it will do no harm to mention it, as it has been brought to my notice by some of our farmers, and that is this: They tell me that a great part of the swamp lands in Scotland have been reclaimed by loans of money made by the Government at low rates. The Ontario Government have been doing something in this direction, but of course they cannot do everything. If the Dominion Government can see their way to loaning money for improving swamp lands, it might be a step in the right direction. A large area of such lands has already been

reclaimed in Ontario, and these lands have turned out the very best on account of the depth of the alluvial deposits. Then we should seek to develop our trade with foreign countries. An hon. gentleman who created a great deal of amusement, a member from Prince Edward Island, said the National Policy had ruined the shipping interests in the Maritime Provinces. He was evidently a strong advocate of annexing Canada to the United States, at all events commercially, forgetting all the time that the United States is a much more highly-protected country than Canada, and that protection was said to have ruined the shipbuilding interests of the United States. So in order to cure a burnt finger he puts it in the fire. We should endeavor not to decrease but to increase our shipping, and to do that by opening up new avenues of trade with other countries of the world. I have not the slightest doubt but that if our resources were known to people in other countries, trade could be established in a great many articles that we produce, and they do not. It is the duty of the Government to see that everything within reason that can be done should be done in order to spread and develop a foreign trade with not only our own colonies all over the world, but with foreign countries. Then there is another thing, Mr. Speaker, and that is if we are going to become a great people we must develop a nationality. It must not be Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario, or Quebec, it must be Canadian. People who come to this country should be taught just as in the United States that they come to a country where the people are a united people. The sooner that the different Provinces give over looking from a provincial point of view and take the broad ground of being Canadian the better it will be for the country at large. It seems to me that from the smallest institution that we have in the country, like a municipal council in a town or village or township, up to the Dominion Parliament that our people are very much imbued with one idea and that is a selfish one. They want something for their own particular locality and they will move heaven and earth to get it. No matter what Government is in power I suppose the same influence will be brought to bear. I think the sooner that every Province makes up its mind that it has got to bear and forbear, and to give and take, the better it will be for the whole Dominion. We never will have a united people unless they sink their provincialisms and become Canadians at heart. I am a Canadian by birth, but I never thought I was less a British subject. My parents when they came to this country did not think they were leaving their own country but that they were simply going to a greater Britain. I wish to carry out those principles, and to be as good an Englishman as my father, and to be as good a Scotchman as my mother—I suppose that would be considered an "Irishism"—and Mr. Speaker, I shall never consent by my vote to do anything that will in any way hazard our connection with the mother country. If the people of my constituency differ from me then I shall be very happy to retire and let them send another representative here. I shall not represent any constituency that will approve of shaking off our connection with the mother land. I am as much a lover of Canada as the hon. gentleman who preceded me, but there is just this difference, I am a British subject and I hope always to be a British subject.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. So is he.

Mr. HUDSPETH. He says he is a Canadian before being a British subject, and if the interests would conflict he would do what he thought the better for Canada. I am not prepared to go that far, although I do not think it is necessary. I have told you why I did not consider the country was in such a position that any such risk should be run. If there are

moneys spent by our Government extravagantly let us control it, if there are things that can be pruned down with a pruning knife let them be pruned down if that is an heroic remedy, but above all do not humiliate my country, do not ask our people to go on their knees and ask for something we have been willing to accept from the United States for years back.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No.

Mr. HUDSPETH. They know in their hearts we are just as willing to trade with the United States as they are, but we are not prepared to go the same length and risk so much as they want us to risk.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How far will you go?

Mr. HUDSPETH. I will go as far as I possibly can without discriminating against the mother country. I will go just as far as we can go without that, and that is the length the Conservative party will go. Just as far as the United States will meet us we are prepared to meet them half way, but we will not discriminate against English goods in favor of the goods of a foreign country.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You are doing it now.

Mr. HUDSPETH. No, we are not doing it now, and that is not a fair argument. We are putting a duty on the United States goods and the English goods for the purpose of revenue. They know that perfectly well, and I am not going to allow that language to be put in the *Hansard* without it being contradicted; because we are not discriminating against England. We are quite willing—if the United States Government will send commissioners, I am sure our Government would send commissioners too—to make a treaty just as wide as it can be made, provided it can be done in such a way that we do not tax the goods of England and admit goods of the United States free. In other points I agree with my friend the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and if I were an American citizen I would agree with every word that gentleman stated. It is one of the best speeches I have listened to in this House, a calm, dispassionate, argumentative speech, but, fortunately or unfortunately, I am not an American citizen and I hope I never will be. I have said all I have to say on this subject. I am neither a poet nor an orator, and I cannot treat you to anything very extraordinary, but I have simply stated from my own standpoint and knowledge of the country I was born and brought up in, the facts as I learned them from farmers and others. I have tried to give you those facts instead of quoting a lot of figures I knew nothing about. I am much obliged to you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen, for the patient hearing you have given my humble and imperfect remarks. I do not think that I often trouble the House, for I am better pleased to listen to those from whom I can learn wisdom than to give any ideas of my own. This was an important question, and one which I could not sit and silently vote for on account of the reasons I have given. I have tried to put my reasons fairly and squarely before the House, and they will go before my country and constituents, and, as I said before, I am perfectly prepared to stand and fall by them. If every man in my constituency was of a different opinion I should never come to any other conclusion than that I shall do everything in my power to strengthen the bonds that bind us to the mother land, and I shall do nothing to weaken, or lessen, or in any respect whatever loosen those ties of affection for our mother country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not, of course, rise to say anything more on this subject but I rise to make a personal explanation with reference to some statements made by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) yesterday. I have notified him that I intended to do so and, of course, if there is any objection to be taken to my making a

personal explanation I can be placed in order if you object to my doing so. That gentleman, in the course of his speech, made statements in reference to myself which were not founded. In fact the statements made by him in one part of his speech are contradicted by him in other parts of his speech. I do not intend to trouble the House with any explanation in reference to that for I can afford to let it pass. But, Sir, he introduced into the discussion the names of some men who are deemed respectable and trustworthy men and he made a statement that those gentlemen of respectability whose words would be taken, had stated that what I said with reference to them was not accurate. The language of the hon. gentleman was this :

"Now, let me take the hon. gentleman again into my confidence for a few minutes. It is just as well that I should deal with him now. The hon. gentleman took up the Depression Committee report in 1876, and he says, 'Why, Mr. Gurney is against the National Policy—he is in favor of unrestricted free trade,' and all that sort of thing. He took Mr. Massey, Mr. Goldie, Mr. Rosamond, and all those gentlemen. Now, let me tell the hon. gentleman that I took the trouble of telegraphing to all these gentlemen to know if what was said of them was correct. I have all their answers, and they are in the negative."

He made this statement that he telegraphed those gentlemen what I had said in reference to them, and that he had telegrams to say that what I had said was not true, or as he puts it "in the negative." Now, Sir, there are two points in this. I think the first point is to be found in the telegrams themselves, and that the hon. gentleman was mistaken when he said that he telegraphed what I had said. I think that is very evident, because I see that in the telegram he received from Mr. Goldie, one of the parties mentioned, Mr. Goldie telegraphed this :

"I am not in favor of commercial union ; I consider the country is prosperous under the present policy."

Now, I will read all I said with reference to Mr. Goldie, and you will observe that I made no statements that Mr. Goldie was in favor of commercial union, or that he did not consider the country prosperous under the present policy. We are at a disadvantage in not having the telegram which the hon. gentleman sent to these gentlemen. He was asked to say what he had sent, but he did not say it, and I can only imagine what the telegram was from what he received. This is what I said with reference to Mr. Goldie :

"Now, then, I propose to give you the testimony of James Goldie, one of the largest flour manufacturers we have in the country, a gentleman who became a supporter of the National Policy, and who opposed my hon. friend from South Wellington, I think, on three different occasions ; but nevertheless he is one of the largest flour manufacturers in this country, and he was examined in reference to it ; and what is his statement when he is asked whether he, as a manufacturer, would be afraid of reciprocal free trade with the United States and of holding his own with them ? He was asked :

"If you had free trade with the United States, would you not be able to get wheat in this country from which you could make as good flour as the United States ?"

"He says :

"I would undertake to compete with all the world if we had the United States market to send it to."

"Then he was asked :

"Q. What effect would reciprocity in wheat and flour with the United States have ? A. I would not like to say."

"Q. You think that would be the best thing which could be had ? A. Of course we would not ask any favors."

"Q. At the time you had reciprocity did you not manufacture very largely for the United States ? A. Yes, very largely. And since that, even since paying the duty, I had a large trade—10,000, 15,000 or 20,000 barrels a year."

"It is absurd to state that a manufacturer like James Goldie, who sold 15,000 or 20,000 barrels a year in spite of the duty, could not hold his own under free trade with the United States, with their bars down as well as ours."

Now, Sir, I have read you all I said with reference to Mr. James Goldie. I was reading from the report of the Committee on Trade Depression, as the hon. gentleman knows, because he mentioned that in his speech. Now, I will just read what I said in leading up to that :

"Now, I do not wish to read a great deal from the books, but I wish to read something which I think is rather valuable. If you remember, Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

we had a committee on trade depression in the year 1876, when trade was very bad in Canada. There was a committee appointed by the House which took evidence to ascertain what was the cause of the depression in trade and whether any remedy could be applied. Some of the first men of the country were summoned before that committee and examined with reference to the condition of business, and the difficulties in its way. I have not time to read all the evidence ; but there was one question put to all these gentlemen, as to whether reciprocal trade arrangements with the United States would remove the difficulties they were laboring under, the answers to which will be found interesting. Many of those gentlemen were advocates of the National Policy, and were seeking to impress upon the committee the necessity of imposing higher duties, which the right hon. the leader of the Government proceeded to do as soon as he obtained power in 1878."

Those were the remarks I made preliminary to what I read. There could be no mistaking what I read. Everyone observed it ; the hon. member for Lincoln himself observed it, because he stated that I was reading from that report. He then telegraphed to those different men to ask them whether it was correct, and he said he had their answers, and they were in the negative. Now, the public documents are here ; they are parts of the public property of the country ; and it is not a question of veracity between Mr. Goldie, Mr. Massey, Mr. Rosamond and others and myself ; it is a question of veracity between these gentlemen and the public documents of this country, which hon. gentlemen have in their hands ; and the position the hon. gentleman has got those gentlemen in is this, that he has—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should not argue. It is quite within his right to make a statement, but I think to argue it is going a little too far.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, if I should be hampered too much, I shall have to ask some one to move an adjournment, but I do not wish to detain the House ; but when the hon. gentleman says he has telegrams from gentlemen of standing in the country stating that what I said with reference to them is not true, I cannot afford to let that pass.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not propose to check the hon. gentleman in making his explanation at all. It is quite within his right.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman says he telegraphed to Mr. Massey, among others, and that he has a telegram from Mr. Massey saying that what I stated was not correct. The hon. gentleman says in reference to that telegram :

"I also telegraphed Mr. Massey of Toronto. The reply I got was : 'I certainly do not favor unrestricted reciprocity to National Policy.'"

Well, what did I say with reference to Mr. Massey ?

"The Massey Manufacturing Company were not able to come here before the committee, but they sent a letter. They are known to be one of the largest firms we have in Canada, and they sent the following letter :—

"GENTLEMEN,—In reply to a communication received this day from the Clerk of Commons, would say : We are engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements and farm machinery. Our average trade is about \$100,000 per annum, and this season we are increasing the business about 20 per cent., and with very fair prospects. During the past season we did a foreign trade in Germany to the extent of some \$8,000 or \$10,000, and we anticipate a continuation of that trade. We may also add that the existing tariff is satisfactory to us, and is sufficient protection ; perhaps even a little less would also be. A still further advance in the tariff would certainly prove adverse to our interests."

That is all I said with reference to the Massey firm. I simply read their letter. The hon. gentleman says he telegraphed to them among others to ask if what I said was correct, and that he had their answer, and it was in the negative. Their answer is :

"I certainly do not favor unrestricted reciprocity to National Policy."

Who said they did ? Certainly it was not I. The hon. gentleman tells us that he telegraphed to those gentlemen stating what I had said, and asking for an answer, and that they had virtually stated that what I said was not true. Then he said he telegraphed to Mr. Gurney, and he read a letter from Mr. Gurney :

"This is an important letter coming from one's own town. I have here a letter from Mr. Gurney, of Hamilton, who has sent it to me unsolicited. It reads as follows:—

"I am informed this morning that I have been quoted as a manufacturer in favor of reciprocity with the United States. To this I would give a most unequivocal denial. Were I called upon to say whether my individual business could compete with United States manufacturers, I should probably declare my belief that it could, but that is not the question, but would it be wise to readjust my whole business, involving the sacrifice of two-thirds of my plant, on the basis of a treaty with such neighbors as we have on our southern border, to which I reply it would be the greatest blunder ever advocated by a business man, and what applies to the individual is equally applicable to the whole manufacturing and mercantile community. I write this with some haste, as I leave immediately."

"That is the letter sent to me by Mr. Gurney, of Hamilton, without his being solicited for it or even spoken to."

There Mr. Gurney states that he had been informed that I had stated certain things. The hon. gentleman referred to that after recess, when he said:

"I read a letter from Mr. Gurney, of Hamilton, a gentleman whom I have never met, but who, having listened to the hon. member for South Brant in this House, for he had occupied a seat in the gallery during a part of the hon. gentleman's speech, voluntarily wrote me this letter in which he says that the statement of the hon. member for South Brant with reference to him was not correct."

"Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did he say that in his letter."

"Mr. RYKERT. You heard the letter read."

"Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Did he say that I made a statement that was not correct."

"Mr. RYKERT. He said he understood you had said so, and it was not correct."

Now, I have read the letter Mr. Gurney wrote, and I think you will admit that he does not there state that what I had said with reference to him was not correct. Mr. Gurney could not do it, none of those gentlemen could do it, because I read from the public documents; and it would not be a question of veracity as between me and those gentlemen, but it would be a question of veracity as between those gentlemen themselves and the public documents. The hon. gentleman quoted Mr. Rosamond as one to whom he had telegraphed in reference to this matter. He said:

"I have also a telegram from Mr. Rosamond, of Almonte, another gentleman quoted by the hon. member:

"Paterson's statement altogether incorrect. Am as much in favor of National Policy as I ever was. Totally opposed to any agreement with the United States that would interfere with Canada's right to regulate her own tariff."

I would like to know what telegram was sent to Mr. Rosamond so as to bring a reply such as that. The hon. gentleman is bound, in honor, to produce that telegram in order to verify to the House this statement that he had telegraphed this gentleman what I said and that he replied my statement was not correct. I will here read what I said in reference to Mr. Rosamond:

"B. Rosamond, woollen cloth factory, representing the tweed industry, the strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, and their candidate in the election—let me read what Mr. Rosamond says with reference to our woollen cloth industry, on page 208:

"Q. Is the present rate of duty satisfactory to you? A. Yes, under ordinary circumstances it would be. We are in an exceptional position, being alongside of a country which has a high tariff against us; but, under ordinary circumstances it would be satisfactory. The duty is certainly high enough; if we had a country alongside of us which was reasonable, as our people are disposed to be, we would have no difficulty."

"Q. You would be content to have reciprocity with the United States? A. Yes, I believe it would be for the benefit of everybody."

"That is the testimony of Mr. Rosamond, of the woollen mills. I am afraid I have wearied the House with these quotations, but I thought it would be worth while to place the views of this gentleman upon record in order to show that he and others, who were contending against the Americans when gold was 112 and when there was only a 17½ cents tariff here, were willing and able, under those circumstances, before they had acquired the strength they have now after many years' prosperity, they were willing then and anxious, 'they were ready to hold up both hands,' as some of them expressed it, for reciprocal free trade with the United States."

Those were my closing remarks. I state that those gentlemen, at that time, declared they were ready to have reciprocal free trade with the United States; and evidently the hon. member for Lincoln, judging by the telegrams

which he received from these gentlemen, telegraphed them—he can set himself right by producing the messages he sent—not what I said, but that I said these gentlemen were in favor of commercial reciprocity or commercial union, or something of that kind, and in this way got the answers from them which he read. He placed those replies before the House, thinking he would thus weaken the statement I had just made. I was called to order when I interrupted the hon. gentleman, but when a direct misstatement, a positive misstatement, was made, when a statement which, it seems to me, the hon. gentleman must have known was a misstatement, was made by him, I conceived it to be my duty to do as I did, to nail the misstatement at the time, so that when the hon. gentleman's speech went to the country, the denial would go with it. The hon. gentleman did not mend matters after dinner for Mr. Rosamond, because evidently he had taken a little alarm at the questions put to him in the afternoon, and during recess sent another telegram:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman's object is to put himself right; he has no right to put anybody else wrong.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) This is what the hon. gentleman said after recess:

"Since my observations, this afternoon, I caused a telegram to be sent to Mr. Rosamond, to which the hon. gentleman will probably not take any exception. Why did the hon. gentleman quote Mr. Rosamond and Mr. Gurney and all those manufacturers, if not to show that they were in favor of the resolution; if not to show that they were opposed to ordinary reciprocity, but were in favor of this resolution. This telegram was sent to Mr. Rosamond:

"When you stated, in 1876, before the Depression Committee that reciprocity would be of benefit to everybody, did you mean unrestricted reciprocity or a renewal of the old reciprocity treaty?"

"The answer is:

"The old reciprocity treaty, certainly."

That, we are told, is the telegram the hon. gentleman received. Of course it is not signed here, and I have to take the hon. member's word that he received that telegram. Let us see if what it contains is what Mr. Rosamond did really say. I have read already the question put to him:

"Q. You will be content to have reciprocity with the United States? A. Yes, I believe it would be for the benefit of everybody."

But there were further questions put to Mr. Rosamond bearing upon this last question which the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) put to him by telegram:

"Q. In what way would reciprocity prevent the competition from English goods of which you complain? A. It would not prevent it. That has always been a difficulty, but so long as the country was prosperous we did not feel very much inconvenienced by it."

If that was the old reciprocity treaty, what had it to do with English goods?

"Mr. Platt asked: You would have a larger field if you had reciprocity with the United States? A. Yes."

And this is the gentleman whom the hon. member gets to telegraph here that when he gave that evidence it was the old Reciprocity Treaty he meant, although the answers I have read show that he was questioned with reference to the effect it would have on his own business. The hon. member has brought these gentlemen to disprove statements which I have made, but they have utterly failed, and all he succeeded in doing was to show that he must have sent telegrams to them which did not give, with accuracy, the purport of my remarks. He has endeavored to get these gentlemen to make a public denial of their own statements, which are set down in the public records of the country, but they are not so much to blame, as they have evidently been misled by the telegrams sent them by the hon. member. I desired to say this much, and I repeat I would not have taken the trouble that I have, had it been a simple question of veracity between the hon. gentleman and myself, but when he assumes to bring forward gentlemen like Mr. Mas-

sey, Mr. Rosamond, Mr. Gurney and others, to say that what I stated was not correct, I thought it due to myself to make the explanations I have made.

Mr. RYKERT. I claim the indulgence of the House for a few moments, while I reply to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman has said that I refused to produce the telegrams that I sent. But I did not refuse to do so. I had not the telegrams that I sent, and therefore could not produce them, but I told the hon. gentleman the contents of the telegrams, namely, that the hon. gentleman had argued that these people were in favor of commercial union or commercial reciprocity. That was the purport and the contents of the telegrams which I sent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then you said what was not correct.

Mr. RYKERT. I was induced to send those telegrams in consequence of a letter which I had received from Mr. Gurney, a gentleman whom I never knew, and who sent me this letter unsolicited. I read the letter to this House, and it was as follows:—

"I am informed this morning that I have been quoted as a manufacturer in favor of reciprocity with the United States. To this I give the most emphatic and unequivocal denial."

In consequence of the receipt of that letter, I thought I would telegraph to the other gentlemen whose names were mentioned. I was also told that Mr. Gurney had been in the gallery. Whether he was there the whole time or not I cannot possibly say. But I pointed that out in my speech last night, and also that the hon. member for South Brant had argued that these gentlemen were in favor of reciprocity still. Otherwise why did he quote them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No, I did not argue that.

Mr. RYKERT. Then why did the hon. gentleman quote them?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have read you why.

Mr. RYKERT. And that was the very reason why I referred to the matter. If the hon. gentleman did not argue that these gentlemen were in favor of reciprocity now, what object had he in quoting them? His quotations had no meaning whatever. The hon. gentleman read the report on depression. What is the evidence he brings? For what purpose was this testimony used, if not to prove or show that they were in favor of the resolution which is now before the House? If it were not for that purpose, for what reason was it? In consequence of that, I telegraphed to those gentlemen and I got the answers. The hon. gentleman says I suppressed the telegrams; I will give him the authority to get the telegrams if he likes?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You said you telegraphed what I said.

Mr. RYKERT. There was no use in his using the evidence of those gentlemen at all, unless it were to show that they were in favor of this resolution. He calls my veracity in question. I have told the House what I said. I told them that Mr. Paterson had led the House to believe that they were in favor of this resolution, and I asked each of them: Are you in favor of it or are you not? Was I right or was I wrong?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am glad that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has introduced this resolution. It is only a continuation of the policy of the Liberal party for many many years. The Liberal party has always advocated the greatest freedom that can be obtained for trade and commerce. This is only a continuance of the doctrines that have been proclaimed by them ever since the formation of the Liberal party, and, as one who believes in Liberal principles and in freedom of trade and commerce, I naturally hail this resolution of the hon.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant),

member for South Oxford with a great deal of pleasure. The amendment moved by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is quite antagonistic, as I would expect it would be, to the resolution of the member for South Oxford. It proposes a very different basis from that which is laid down by the hon. member for South Oxford, and now we have before the country two distinct issues. We have the old and liberal platform of the Liberal party as enunciated in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, and we have the contracted trade resolution contained in the amendment of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. These are two distinct issues before the people. We appeal to the people on these issues, and we ask the people to say whether they are prepared to have greater freedom of trade, to open up negotiations for a larger market for their produce, or whether they are not? Since this discussion commenced, since the discussion of the principle and the details of the resolution have been discussed, we have lost a valued member of this House. The late member for Missisquoi has passed away. He was a man who stood high in the feelings of the members of this House, who stood high in the opinions of his friends, and who was not very much opposed by those on the other side. He has passed away, but, I think, before his death the hon. member for South Oxford had introduced this resolution. He died, the writ was issued by the Speaker, and an election was held in the constituency of Missisquoi, where it was said that this distinguished man, this able man, Mr. Claves, by his personal popularity, had been able to wrest a constituency which has been almost always during its history a Tory constituency. At that time there were three candidates in the field, two of them on the Tory side, while Mr. Claves was the candidate of the Liberal party. Now, an election has been held in the constituency to-day, and the candidate favoring unrestricted reciprocity has been returned by a majority of 216. The people, on the first occasion on which they have had the opportunity, have pronounced in no uncertain way in regard to the measure that we now have before the House. I understand that, during the campaign, this was the only measure discussed before the people in that constituency, that it was the question upon which Mr. Meigs, the candidate of the Liberal party, took issue with Mr. Baker, who opposed this measure, who favored the shutting up and closing of our markets, and allowing no exit to the producers of this country, and who was opposed to greater freedom of trade such as it proposed by the resolution now before the House. I will now, for a few moments, allude to some of the speeches delivered on the other side of the House, and I wish to do so in such a manner as not to give offence to any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. I know they are a very thin-skinned set of individuals, and I want to conduct this discussion in a proper manner, in a business-like manner, in a spirit of fair play. The member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) told us that, during the time that Mr. Mackenzie was in power, there was scarcely an industry in Montreal existing except the soup kitchen, that the country was being ruined and going to the dogs, that there were no manufactures, that all the furnaces were closed and all the blasts had gone out. Is it not rather singular that, when that hon. gentleman made that statement in this House as a responsible representative of the people, we find that, in the year 1878, there was an export of manufactured goods of something like \$2,000,000 more than there was in 1887? He speaks of this great policy that was initiated after the defeat of Mr. Mackenzie, and he says that laborers were idle, that people were unemployed, notwithstanding that they were enabled to export to foreign countries \$5,730,000, whereas last year we only exported a little over \$3,000,000. What can be thought, in a deliberative assembly such as this, of an hon. gentleman rising in this

House, and making such a statement, when all the facts and all the history are against him? At that time the country was flourishing, the exports and the imports were large, and the price paid for grain in this country is an indication that we were then flourishing. The only industry that was struggling at that time was that of the Tory politicians who were then sitting on this side of the House, and they never lost an opportunity to decry the prosperity of this country at that time. Born as I was in Canada, and professing to be loyal to Canada and to the mother country, I have sat here many a time and hung my head to think that there could be men found in this country, representing the people of Canada, and giving utterances to sentiments so unworthy of them, and so much at variance with the truth at that time. The hon. gentleman spoke about Ireland and said that free trade had been the ruin of Ireland. Does he not know, has he not studied the history of Ireland sufficiently to know, that that history proclaims that it was the condition of Ireland that converted Sir Robert Peel from the doctrine of protection to the doctrine of free trade, and induced him to open the ports of Ireland and to give to the struggling people of that country relief by getting in foreign grain? The hon. gentleman must know, if he had given any attention to the history of Ireland, that this was the condition of affairs, and that this was the reason why this measure of relief was afforded to the Irish people. I was glad to hear the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) state to-day, that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) occupies such a high place in the affections of the people he represents. Until I heard that statement, I really thought that, politically speaking, the sands of that hon. gentleman's hour-glass were giving out; but I am glad to have it on the authority of the hon. member for Welland, that that gentleman enjoys the confidence of his people, and that, by means of a Franchise Act, and by means of a Gerrymander Act, he is able to boast in this House of his majority in his constituency. The hon. member for Lincoln did something which I consider he should not have done.

Mr. RYKERT. Does the hon. gentleman refer to me as being gerrymandered?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Certainly I do.

Mr. RYKERT. How?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will explain it to you.

Mr. RYKERT. You had better. I had a majority of 500.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, that is but a detail. Now, the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) objected to Canada having her middlemen in New York instead of Montreal, Quebec and Toronto. Why, that sentiment finds an echo in the bosom of every hon. gentleman on this side of the House. That is what we contend for, and it is the policy of this Government that has driven our exportation to New York instead of to England; it is the discriminating tendency of the policy of this Government that has driven our trade from England to the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hon. gentlemen laugh, but they have not studied the Trade and Navigation Returns, because if they had they would set to work and endeavor to devise something that would show to this country in louder terms than their words, the genuineness of their allegiance to Britain, by not submitting a policy that was discriminating against the mother country and in favor of the United States. In 1878, we exported of farm produce to the United States \$25,244,893; in 1887, we exported to the United States \$37,660,199, an increase to the United States in that period of \$12,415,301. Now, look at the difference between the exports of the United States and

those to Britain, the mother land, the land that we boast of, from which we are proud of having descended, on this side of the House, at least—and we show our loyalty by protesting whenever an injustice is done to the mother land, and we endeavor to secure an amendment to their policy so that the mother country may not be discriminated against. Now, in 1878, we exported to the mother country, \$45,941,539; in 1887, under the policy of the hon. gentlemen, under the policy of these loyal gentlemen, we exported to Great Britain, \$44,571,846, a decrease of exports in that period, of \$1,329,692. Now, Sir, I gladly welcome the hon. member for Welland to this side of the House in that sentiment. I gladly take him by the hand in wishing that this policy may be changed so that our middlemen may not go to New York, driven there by a policy which discriminates against the mother country. I am sorry the hon. member for Welland is not in his seat. He could hardly go with us in every policy of our party, but he goes with us that far. But then he had to have a fling at gentlemen on this side of the House, about having, at some period of their public career, said something in favor of Dakota. Well, now, that hon. gentleman comes here and boasts of his loyalty, and he deprecates anything being said indicating that the prosperity of Dakota is greater than the prosperity of Canada. Now, I do not wish to do the hon. gentleman any injustice, nor would I do any hon. gentleman in this House an injustice if I knew it. I will, therefore, quote what he said in the matter in a speech which he delivered in this House in 1884. The hon. gentleman at that time was speaking in reference to a loan for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and here is what he said:

"We find, Sir, in the State of Kansas—with its miasmatic fevers and the pestilence that follows, without a solitary drop of water that is fit to drink, without a solitary bit of material for the construction of buildings, in that State, which has, I am told, been lauded highly by hon. gentlemen of the Opposition in days gone by—in that State, where people have to live in dug-outs, the population has increased from 417,659 in 1870, to 1,080,000 in 1880."

That is the hon. gentleman who would not say a word in favor of Dakota, and that is the hon. gentleman who lectures us on this side of the House for having said, at any time, that the settlement of those new States was more rapid than that of our own country. There is a reason for this. The land regulations in those new States were much more liberal than the regulations made by hon. gentlemen opposite; there is no doubt about that. Our country is a better country than theirs, our land is better and more fertile than theirs, and if it were not for the stupidity—I use the word in a political sense—of our Government, there would not be very much difference between those States and our own country, indeed I believe we would have had the larger settlement. I can speak from personal knowledge. I can give the names of a number of people who went to our own Canadian North-West to buy land, where they might make homes for themselves, and I know that by the land regulations of this Government they were deprived of that privilege, as I will show later on. Now, the hon. member for Welland on the same occasion said:

"Yet with all these drawbacks, the population of Dakota has increased from 14,181 in 1870, to no less than 135,137 in 1880. Why, it has almost multiplied its population by ten in the short period of ten years."

Now, I think that is all I will read from the speech of the hon. member for Welland. He boasted of the success of the Government policy in the last election. Well, I declare that if I were sitting on that side of the House, that is the very last thing I would boast of. When the Government went to the people, did they go on the same basis or appeal to the same electorate that they did before? No. They carried an Act through this House that was unjust in almost every provision of it. They did that, I fully believe, with the purpose of strengthening themselves in power. They did not take

a bold British course on that occasion, I do not know what course you might choose to term it, but I say it was a course unworthy of a great party, unworthy of the Conservative party; for the Conservative party is a great party, there are many great and good men in that party, and I am surprised that there are so many of these good men who would lend themselves to such an infamous measure as the Franchise Act. Now, I will give a little attention to the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth). He made a very calm and moderate speech, and I consider, for a Tory, he made a pretty truthful speech. I do not know but that that speech does him a great deal of credit. To those of us who have sat on this side of the House for some time, it is somewhat refreshing to see an hon. gentleman get up and speak plainly and honestly as the hon. member for South Victoria has done. He says—I do not like the sentiment, but it is the Tory sentiment, nevertheless—that education and accomplishments are not appreciated in this country, and the people who possess them go to the United States. The hon. gentleman gave instances from his own riding, and he tells us that he would not do anything that would weaken the bond that binds us to the mother country, and yet, he makes that utterance which I believe is as severe a stab against the people of Canada as can possibly be pronounced. He tells us that Scotchmen go to London and Canadians go to the United States. There is the difference. He says that Scotchmen only continue in the mother country while our people go and live under a hostile flag and in a foreign land. If our people leave Toronto and go to reside in Montreal, Halifax, Quebec, Winnipeg, the North-West Territories or Victoria, then we should be glad of it, but the hon. gentleman was honest enough to admit that there is an exodus going on, and that the prices of farm lands and other lands have not improved as they should have improved. I have here a statement in regard to the assessed value of the town of Lindsay down to 1886, prepared by the treasurer. While hon. gentlemen opposite boast of the success of the National Policy, we have only to take the assessed value of property to find out how hollow are the claims put forward on behalf of that policy. The people know it, and hon. members in this House, if they would honestly admit it, know that the National Policy has proved a failure as a means of relieving our depression, that it has no power to build up industries, and if we are going to become great, this policy must be changed or otherwise the country must continue to suffer. I will now take the assessed value of the town of Lindsay: it is a beautiful town, it is a lively town, it has been a progressive town, but its prosperity has diminished within the past few years. In 1873, at the time hon. gentlemen opposite went out of power, the assessed value of the town was \$862,971. In 1878 what was the assessed value? This was the time when soup kitchens were abroad in the land, when all the people had gone to the States, when there was no one at home, according to the loyal utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite. The assessed value of the town in that year was \$1,403,217. Since then we have had five years of the National Policy. In 1881 the average value was \$1,397,731; 1883, \$1,379,119; 1886, \$1,435,462. During the five years when Mr. Mackenzie was in power, when there were soup kitchens in the land according to hon. gentlemen opposite, the increase in the assessment of Lindsay was 65 per cent. while during the last five years, when we have had the full fruition of the National Policy, the increase has only been three per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that this policy has done a great deal to build up the country, but the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth) was honest enough to tell us that the progress of the town in which he lived, although it is a beautiful town, is not what he would like to see it, and it is not what I would like to see also. From 1873 to 1878

Mr. LANDERKIN,

Lindsay sprang up with remarkable rapidity. It appeared to receive a stimulus from the change of Government in 1873 which appears to have been taken away since 1878. The town has stood almost still during the last few years, the increase during the last five years of the National Policy being only 3 per cent. while during the five years of the Mackenzie régime the increase was 65 per cent. It was the hon. member for South Victoria who told us about the soup kitchens. I think when we remember the remarkable progress made by this town while the Mackenzie Government was in power, it comes with bad grace from the mouth of the hon. gentleman, who otherwise spoke so honestly, but he allowed his partisan feelings to carry him away in this matter. He said we must expect an exodus, and we have had an exodus. I will occupy the time of the House for a few moments in discussing the exodus. We were told that so soon as we had completed the Canadian Pacific Railway, the people would flow into Manitoba and the North-West and that country would soon become the home of millions of people. Well, we on this side of the House, sincerely desiring to see that state of things brought about, were willing to do everything in our power to promote such a desirable end. Last year the Government took a census of Manitoba, and what do we find? In Manitoba there are about 108,640 people, in the North-West Territories 48,362, deducting 20,117 Indians leaves the white population of the North-West Territories 28,192. Ten years of Tory administration of North-West affairs has brought about this result. Will any hon. gentleman tell me that, when we consider the fertility of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, the desirable climate there, that there has not been bungling in our North-West policy, that we have not adopted a suicidal policy, a policy that has tended to retard settlement, and at present population is not going in there as we would like to see it. As to the exodus, we know, everybody knows; we do not need to be told that we are disloyal because we know that people are leaving that country. The hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Hudspeth) may possibly be branded as disloyal because he says people have left this country. If everybody is to be branded for saying that people have left this country, what will be thought of the Premier in 1878? I will read what he said. Speaking of the United States, he says:

"Yet with all their depression, with all their bad trade, and with all their strikes, the people of that country are successfully competing in the English markets, and not only so, but in all the markets to which England has access, beating England out of the field despite those disasters."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who said that?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Sir John A. Macdonald in 1878.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Impossible.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, he is the gentleman who would not decry the country; he is the gentleman that would not talk of blue ruin; yet he says again:

"True, they have suffered as this country has suffered. But there is this difference. We have no manufactures here. We have no work-people, our work-people have gone off to the United States. They are to be found employed in the western States, in Pittsburg and in fact in every place where manufactures are going on. These Canadian artisans are adding to the strength, to the power, and to the wealth of a foreign nation instead of adding to ours. Our work-people in this country, on the other hand, are suffering for want of employment. Have not their cries risen to Heaven?"

He was pious then,—

"Has not the Premier been surrounded and besieged even in his own department, and on his way to his daily duties, by suffering artisans who keep crying out: We are not beggars, we only want an opportunity of helping to support ourselves and our families."

That is the language of the Premier of this country. He complains that we had no manufacturers in this country while that year we exported two million dollars worth more of manufactured goods than we did last year. It is a well

known fact that there has been a great deal of money spent in trying to encourage immigration to this country, and it is also a very well known fact that that money might as well, for all practical purposes, have been thrown away. The only object it served was to keep camp followers of the Government in situations, and to keep languishing industries of that character from starvation. It is told us on the highest authority of fiscal matters in this country, and by the highest authority on fiscal matters in this House, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) that of every four emigrants they have being brought into this country, three have left it again and only stayed here for a short time, and having got the advantage of the trip across the ocean they cleared out of the country. This policy gave employment to, I do not know how many cormorants, and it enabled the Government to subsidise a great many journalists. But it did good in that respect, because those journalists told how great and how good and how honest the Government was which brought emigrants across the ocean, who came and stayed in Canada over night and then skipped to the United States. The American consul at Toronto a short time ago reports that he gave certificates to 577 families in the district of Toronto last year who went to the States, and he further reports that those people took capital out of the country to the extent of \$1,500,000. The American consul at Ottawa reports that during last year 600 families have left the Ottawa district and settled in the States, probably taking another \$1,570,000 capital with them. I made somewhat of an investigation of the exodus, and of the number of people going from the county I have the honor to represent, some years ago. I made this enquiry from public men and I received the following replies. On 9th April, 1886:

"*Markdale*—Exodus to United States in past six years from this section—80 families, 220 persons.

" Wm. BROWN."

"*Flasherton*—Exodus from this section—55 families, 200 persons.

" JOHN GORDON,
" THORPE WRIGHT,
" J. HERD,
" Wm. STRAIN."

" 200 have gone from Glenelg and settled in the States since 1879.

" J. H. HUNTER."

Mr. Hunter is a gentleman who has lived long in that riding;—

" Over 30 families have left Normanby and settled in the States since 1879.

" W. H. RYAN."

Mr. Ryan is township treasurer and has been a public officer for a great many years;—

" 72 families have left Bentinck and settled in the States since 1879.

" D. McNICHOL."

Mr. McNichol has been reeve of the township and warden of the county for a number of years, and is a worthy and reliable authority;—

" Over 40 families have left Egremont and settled in the States since 1879.

" J. MURDOCK."

Mr. Murdoch was reeve of the township and warden of the county. Those, Sir, are reliable figures as far as my own personal knowledge goes, and they are to be depended upon. I shall mention to you some cases which came under my own notice as to why our people did not settle in the North-West. I shall mention the case of Mr. Adams. He was an old settler down there and had a flour mill and a saw mill; he had an idea that he would settle in the North-West and he went there and he spent nearly a month there, but when he found land that would please him to settle upon, and when he went to the office to take up that land he found it was owned by some corporation, some colonisation company, some railway company, or some other speculator and he could not get it to settle on. After staying there a month

he went across the line and settled in Dakota. I know the case of Mr. Hillis, a large farmer who lived in Normanby and who told me exactly the same story. He went there and he found the influence of monopoly so strong, he found those charges against the land regulations so true, that he had to go across and settle in Dakota. Mr. Fussey told me last year the very same thing. He went to Manitoba, but he found it was so much under the power of monopolies, and of corporations, and colonisation companies, that he also went over. Mr. Grant, of Bentinck, also told me the same story, and he left and went to the States. In those four families there are about 40 persons, with a large amount of capital, who were induced to leave our own country and settle in Dakota. I shall now speak for a few minutes on the resolution before the House, and I would call the attention of the House to a resolution placed before Parliament when the fiscal policy was changed in 1878. There was a resolution introduced into this House at that time, and it is known as the "National Policy resolution." I will read it for the benefit of the House. It was introduced by Sir John Macdonald, the present Premier, and reads:

" That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that this House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which by a judicious readjustment of the tariff will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade."

Now, gentlemen, you have none of this "blue ruin" in the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford that you have in this resolution. From one end of the country it was a wail to the other, and do you know that the Conservative party in this House at that time took up this wail? They were willing to vote for this resolution, and they formally declared from their seats in Parliament that there was distress, and that people were leaving the country, when there was not one out of every twenty-five as many going to the States as there are going now. The Conservative members were prepared to vote for that which they knew to be almost if not entirely untrue, and this they did with a view of finally getting reciprocity of trade. If there are any of these gentlemen in the House now, to be honest they would have to support the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, because in the resolution they submitted at that time they indicated that that was the object. It was a sharp remedy, they stated, to compel the Americans to give us reciprocity, and that was one of the reasons they held out to those who doubted the wisdom of the course they were taking in order to get a larger support for it than they would otherwise have got. They did not state that they were going to increase the taxation of the people thirteen or fourteen million dollars. When asked by a prominent supporter in St. John if they intended to increase the taxes, the Premier replied that they did not, that they only intended to readjust them. They have not fulfilled the pledges they made in this resolution; but instead of readjusting, they have added to the burdens of the people of this country something like \$14,000,000 on the annual expenditure. The Liberal party in this House at that time stood up for the people, as they always stand up for the people. They were not prepared to see the people burdened with any more taxes than they could bear. The Liberal party took the stand then that they are taking now, that the people had enough burdens to bear, and it would not be consistent with the policy of the Liberal party to put any more burdens upon them. Mr. Mackenzie fell while he was fighting for the people of

this country, and many of his supporters fell with him. But the day has come, and it would have come before this if it had not been for the Gerrymander and the Franchise Acts. The people would have supported the men who then stood by them, and we would have had a large majority in this House. These gentlemen at that time professed great loyalty; they were ready almost to die for their country; they were sorry to see the struggling industries of this country sinking to ruin and the country going to the dogs. Although Mr. Mackenzie had not added to the burdens of the people, he had two or three Provinces to govern more than his opponents had, and he governed them better than they did; he stilled the tumults that went on in British Columbia, and Quebec and Manitoba; he extinguished the Indian titles in the North-West, and while he stood fighting for the people in the tumult raised by hon. gentlemen opposite, in a moment of forgetfulness the people turned him out of power. Then the other party came in, and the famine in the old country increased the prices of grain, and they said: "We go for a Government that gives us better prices." In a couple of years prices fell, and they said: "What has the Government to do with the prices of grain?" In Mr. Mackenzie's time, when hon. gentlemen told us that the people were leaving the country, the farmers never got less than a dollar a bushel for their wheat, What are they getting to-day? Let the farmers in the House and the country answer. Well, that resolution was defeated in this House, and it ought to be defeated in any British assembly, because the tone of that resolution was not of a character to elevate Canada in the eyes of the world. Imagine the hon. member for South Oxford putting a resolution of that kind on the journals of this House. Why, the hon. member for South Oxford is too loyal to do any thing of that kind; he would not submit to it, and if he did he would find that those who sit behind him would not support him. There were 77 members in this House, however, who voted for it. I say it to the shame of Canada; I say it to the lasting disgrace of the 77 members who voted for the resolution; it was an infamous resolution to introduce into this House. Now I will show you the patriotism of those who voted for it. They were men who complained that the country was going to ruin, that the hum of industry was not heard in the land, and that we had nothing but soup-kitchens then. We will see how these patriots fared afterwards. Out of the 77, 11 of them have since become Cabinet Ministers, 9 have become senators, 8 have become judges, 22 have got public offices, and 8 are private members of the House. I do not know what offices they have got; but I notice some of them have offices. Among private members there is Mr. Haggart, of North Lanark, who has got an office of prominence and great value; I believe it was the only office the Premier had to give him; he made of him a director of the *Empire* newspaper. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirpatrick), was one of those who became Speaker in this House, but he has had to retire since, and he is now a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), I believe, is standing counsel for the Government in all their losses. There are three or four others. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Ferguson), made a very interesting speech on one occasion on silica and white clay after he had come from a trip through the North-West, where he had been driving over the country on a buckboard. There is no doubt that he has not served the country so well without being rewarded. There are only 12 of those 77 that have been unprovided for; I believe they are all farmers, and I hope in the interest of the farming community the hon. the Minister of Public Works will see that some position is found for them in the Department of Agriculture. I am glad the Minister of Agriculture is here, and I call on him to see that these patriots who voted

Mr. LANDERKIN.

for this resolution shall be rewarded before they die with offices on the experimental farms.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps they have got their timber limits.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh, yes. Well, he knows. Mr. Baby was made a Minister of the Crown with a salary of \$7,000 a year. Mr. Bowell, the member for North Hastings, became a Cabinet Minister; I believe it was necessary to get a good many deputations down here before he succeeded. Mr. Caron became a Cabinet Minister, and he was awarded knighthood also by Her Majesty on account of his distinguished services in the North-West or somewhere else.

Mr. TAYLOR. What has that to do with reciprocity?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will explain that further on, when I take up that barley question with you. Mr. Costigan became a Cabinet Minister; Sir Hector Langevin also became a Cabinet Minister; Sir John A. Macdonald became a Cabinet Minister; Mr. Masson became a Cabinet Minister; Mr. Mousseau became a Cabinet Minister; Mr. Pope became a Cabinet Minister; another Pope became a Cabinet Minister; Sir Charles Tupper became a Cabinet Minister and High Commissioner; Mr. Bolduc became a Senator; Mr. Gibbs was defeated by the people and became a Senator; Mr. Macdonald became a Senator; Mr. MacKay gave up his seat to the present Postmaster General and became a Senator; Mr. McCallum became a Senator; Mr. Masson, after leaving the gubernatorial chair, became a Senator; Mr. Plumb was defeated and afterwards became a Senator; Mr. Robitaille was made Lieutenant Governor and afterwards Senator; Mr. Schultz was defeated and he became a Senator—more of these patriots. Mr. Baby became a judge; Mr. Brooks became a judge; Mr. Cimon was made a judge; Mr. Gill was made a judge; Mr. McDougall became a judge—he gave up his seat to Sir Hector Langevin; Mr. Mousseau was made a judge; Mr. Palmer was made a judge; Mr. Ryan was made a judge. Then let us see who were appointed to public offices. Mr. Blanchet received a public office; Mr. Colby received a public office; Mr. Dewdney received a public office; Mr. Currier received a public office; Mr. Farrow received a public office; Mr. Fraser received a public office; Mr. Méthot received a public office; Mr. Orton received a public office; Mr. Robinson was made Lieutenant Governor of Ontario; Mr. Rouleau was made Deputy Clerk in the House; Mr. Stephenson was made Inspector of Colonisation Companies; Mr. Ouimet was made Speaker. Yes, Ouimet, the Rielite, was made Speaker; he who voted like myself, regretting the execution of Riel, and who, like myself, was branded as a renegade, and a coward, and a traitor, and a knave, and a fool, was made Speaker, I suppose, because of the persecution he had suffered. There were altogether 20 of them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have permitted a very long digression, and the hon. gentleman has diverged sufficiently far from the subject matter before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am very sorry you stopped me, Sir, for I have not finished on that point. We will look and see what the National Policy has done. We will take up the exports and imports of the Dominion for the last two years, and see what the National Policy has done. I have examined the blue-books very carefully, and, as one born in Canada, I must say they do not give me as much encouragement as I would like to derive from them. The hon. member for East Huron quoted from the blue-books of the Customs Department, and I was astonished to see the spectacled gentleman from Hamilton getting up and declaring that the blue-books of the Department of Customs were not reliable, but that he will quote from a report which was reliable

—the Trade and Commerce Returns of the United States. These are the loyal people who will not take their own blue-books; these are the honest representatives of the people who deny their own blue-books. Take the summary statement of our exports for the year 1877, the year when everything was going to the dogs. Our exports then were as follows :—

Products of the Mine.....	\$ 3,787,802
Fisheries.....	5,501,221
Forests.....	20,542,635
Animals.....	14,645,168
Agriculture.....	26,308,689
Manufactures.....	5,767,747
Miscellaneous.....	543,548
Total.....	\$77,096,810

Now, in 1887, when we had the National Policy in full vigor, what do the returns show? They show our exports as follows :—

Products of the Mine.....	\$3,805,959
Fisheries.....	6,875,810
Forests.....	20,484,746
Animals.....	24,246,937
Agriculture.....	18,826,235
Manufactures.....	3,079,972
Miscellaneous.....	644,361
Total.....	\$77,964,020

So that our exports of manufactures in the year of grace 1887—tell it not aloud, ye boasters of the success of your vaunted National Policy—were actually less than in 1877. Of these exports, we sent to Great Britain \$2,457,312 and to the United States \$34,658,275. Hon. gentlemen will see that, in 1877, when we had no manufacturing industries at all, according to the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, we exported of manufactured goods to the old country and to the United States \$5,767,747, while in 1887, we only exported \$3,079,972 worth, or a falling off of a little over \$2,500,000. But these hon. gentlemen will say there is more used at home, and that the farmers are better off and can buy more now. They can get 70 cents for their wheat now, but they got \$1.25 then. What is the use of talking nonsense like that to the farmers or to other people? But then hon. gentlemen opposite will say that we are importing more raw material which enter into manufactures, and that we have large manufacturing industries? Let us see if that is the case. Take the imports of wool for 1875 and 1878, and for 1884 and 1885. We find that in 1875 we imported of raw wool, 7,947,870 lbs., and in 1878 6,230,084 lbs., or a total of 14,170,693. In 1884, on the other hand, we imported 6,182,421 lbs., and in 1885, 7,759,554, or a total of 13,941,975 lbs., showing a falling off in 1884 and 1885 of 1,000,000 lbs. as compared with 1875 and 1878, when, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, they had nothing in Montreal but soup kitchens. I want to show you how the balance of trade has been against England. I want to show you how all those loyal people who say we are rebels and annexationists sit quietly in the House and allow this thing to continue without raising their loyal voices on behalf of old England, although they say they are prepared to shed every drop of their blood sooner than weaken the bonds that bind them to the mother land. Of goods in 1875 we imported as follows :—

From Great Britain, dutiable.....	\$14,239,519
From United States do.....	22,023,665
Free goods from Great Britain.....	11,167,963
Free goods from United States.....	28,779,234

Or a total from Great Britain of \$60,000,000, and from the United States of \$50,000,000. In 1885 how did it stand? We imported from Great Britain \$41,000,000, and from the United States \$47,000,000. In 1886, we imported \$41,407,777 from Great Britain, and \$47,151,201 from the United States. In 1887, we imported \$40,601,199 from Great Britain and \$44,858,039 from the United States. I want hon. gentlemen to pay attention to this. In 1886, we im-

ported from Great Britain over \$41,000,000, on which we collected a duty amounting to \$7,616,249, and on the larger amount which we imported from the United States of \$47,000,000, we only charged a duty of \$6,624,100. In 1887, we imported from Great Britain \$40,601,199, on which we charged a duty of \$7,817,357, and we imported from the United States \$44,858,039, on which we only charged a duty of \$6,769,384. The United States is the only market for a great deal of the products of the farmers. There is no interest in this country which is equal to the farming interest for its vast proportions, which gives employment to a greater number of people, which gives a home to a greater number of people, and, if the farming industry is not prosperous, if the farmers of Canada are not doing well, no other branch of industry is doing well; but, if the farmers are doing well, every other industry must do well; the manufacturing industry must thrive if the farming interest thrives, and that, I suppose, is the reason why we imported such a comparatively small quantity of manufacturing goods last year, because the farming interest was not prospering as we would like to see it. Now, take the exports of our farming products and what do we find? Last year we exported to Great Britain 329 horses, and to the United States 13,225 horses. Of horned cattle, we exported to Great Britain 63,622, and to the United States 45,765. We exported to Great Britain 68,545 sheep, and to the United States 363,046. We exported cheese to Great Britain amounting to 73,185,717 lbs., and to the United States 304,318 lbs. I may say, for the benefit of hon. members on the other side, that this is one industry which is not affected by the National Policy, and it has therefore grown to be a great industry in this country; and probably if they had left other industries alone, as they have the cheese industry, they would probably have flourished in the same way. Last year we exported butter to Great Britain to the amount of 4,076,365 lbs., and to the United States to the amount of 100,895 lbs. The United States is the best market for our eggs. Last year we exported to the United States 12,907,956 dozens of eggs, of the value of \$1,821,361. I see that, under the National Policy, there was a provision made, which was considered to be a very wise provision by the promoters of the National Policy, in regard to some of the articles which were the produce of the farm, that, as soon as the United States remitted the duty on those articles, the Government here took the power to remit the duty on them when they were imported into this country. I see that the United States have removed the duty on several of these articles, and that this Government have failed to carry out the understanding which they agreed to by this Act of Parliament, and have refused to do it unless every article which is enumerated in that Act is put on the free list by the United States; and, by what I see in the *Free Press* of this city, it is rumoured in Washington that they are going to retaliate, and that, if this Government do not keep faith according to the provisions of the Act of Parliament which was passed here, retaliation will be adopted against the people of Canada. If the United States retaliate, and I put a duty on eggs, what would become of our egg business? And the same may be said of other articles which are the produce of the farm. It is to be hoped that the Government will look into this matter, and see that the faith to which they are pledged by an Act of Parliament is kept with the United States and with this Parliament. I see that there is one industry which has grown amazingly under the National Policy. It was very insignificant when Mr. Mackenzie was in power, but it has grown wonderfully since,—I refer to the importation of rags. I find that in 1877, we only imported \$92,179 worth of rags, but, under the benign influence of the National Policy and the development of the country and of manufactures which has taken place, last year we imported \$193,029 worth of rags. That I suppose is an indi-

cation of the revival of the industries of the country. You would almost imagine that, since the National Policy was brought about, nothing was brought into this country, because they promoted it under a promise that nothing should be brought into competition either with our farmers or with our manufacturers. While they told our farmers that they were going to protect them, and particularly in the article of wool, still they have allowed wool to come into the country to as great an extent as ever, and, although they have taxed many things which our farmers bring into the country from the other side, they have not prevented the importation of wool. For these and other reasons, I favor the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. I believe it will be in the best interests of this country if that resolution passes this House and becomes effective with the United States, if we can get a larger market for our farmers, for our manufacturers, and for every other class of people. I do not believe that it is going to injure any of the industries of this country, but I do believe that it will make our farmers so much richer, and that they will therefore consume so much more of the manufactured articles of the country than they do now. I do not believe that it is in the interest of this country to keep up manufacturing industries at a high tariff for the purpose of putting money into the pockets of the manufacturers, by enabling them to charge higher prices than the consumer ought to pay. I am in favor of the manufacturers, I would like to see them prosper, but I believe there are many in this country which if they do not get a larger market must evidently go to the wall. Now, about the slaughter market. They used to tell us how the manufactured goods of this country had to enter into competition with the American goods that were sold here at slaughter prices, and they told us that this would be all done away with under the National Policy. Well, now, last year we bought of manufactured goods from abroad \$9,914,824, and in the year 1877, the total importation of manufactured goods reached \$4,606,944, or a slaughter market established to the tune of over \$5,000,000 more than we had then. Our imports do not indicate that we are improving, or that the country is growing as rapidly as it should. The total imports in 1877 were \$99,000,000; in 1878, \$93,000,000; in 1875, \$123,000,000; in 1887, \$112,000,000. So that our importations are not as great now as they were 10 years ago. That is not a satisfactory state of things for this country. Now, Sir, I am very glad that we have a clear and distinct issue before the people. The Liberal party takes its stand upon this question, as it did at its organisation, for greater liberty and greater freedom of every description so long as it conduces to the well-being of the country. We believe in giving a larger market to our farmers, and to our manufacturers, and to all other classes of the people, and we do not believe in under-rating the power, and the ability, and the worth of the Canadian people. We hear hon. gentlemen opposite telling us that they are afraid of the United States people, that our own people are powerless to keep pace in the race of progress with the United States. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, sitting here as a native Canadian, that I believe, as a true Briton, and I feel that I am a British subject in every sense of the word, and I hurl back to the hon. gentlemen their epithet and the insult that they apply to the native-born Canadians in this country, when they tell us that man for man, in a fair field and without any favor, the people of Canada are not the peers of any people on the face of God's footstool. I have listened with a considerable amount of indignation at the statement, at the disloyal utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite, towards the people of Canada, to see them stand up in this House and tell us that the Canadians, the English, the Irish, the Scotch, the Germans, and the French, who have settled in this country, are not able to compete with the Americans in a fair field. Why, I do not think that anything more disloyal can be said by hon. gentleman on the other side,

Mr. LANDERKIN.

and I hope that they will have sufficient respect for my feelings, if not for themselves, not to repeat it again in this House. Well, what are we going to do if this resolution should carry and unrestricted reciprocity become a fact between the United States and Canada? What would happen? We would lose revenue, but that can be easily made up. We have statesmen on this side of the House who can grapple with that question.

Mr. HESSON. How?

Mr. LANDERKIN. We will show you when we get a chance. It is a very simple problem, but it would be a very difficult problem for the hon. gentlemen in power, because they do not understand the principles of economy. They never practice economy, it is foreign to their nature. They have accumulated such a debt, and the expenditure of this country has advanced so rapidly, that it would be almost impossible for this country to retrieve itself unless a check is put on. Well, you might save nearly half a million by knocking out that cruel and unjust Franchise Act. You might strike off the Superannuation Fund.

Mr. O'BRIEN. We heard all this before.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, but you must have line upon line, and precept upon precept. You don't like to hear it, because I believe there is a little honesty about you if you only had courage enough to assert it, and I believe you would, but the party will not allow you. I think, perhaps, we could dispense with the Senate; I think that there might be more life infused into those dry bones at a less price than we have to pay. Now, there was another matter which cost this country a good deal, and I told the Government at the time that it was an improper expense. I refer to the expense for the Liquor License Act. It was brought in by the Premier himself, and I think that the Premier after he introduced it, very soon began to see that there was something shaky about it, and he did not like to injure his reputation by continuing to father the measure, and so he transferred it to his standing counsel, the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and it became known as the McCarthy Act. It passed this House, and it cost this country over \$300,000. What for? So that they could get their heels on the neck of the liquor interest in this country, so that they could make them turn in and vote for the Government. Well, there are many things just like that, that we all know could be done away with, and yet the public interest of this country would not suffer at all, and the service of the country would be just as efficiently performed. Now, there is another matter I would like to refer to before I sit down. I think it was the Minister of Marine who stated that this country pronounced unmistakably in favor of the Government at the last election. You would imagine, when you heard that statement, that the people almost unanimously pronounced in favor of the Government, and you would think that the representation in the House would bear some comparison with the vote that was polled. Now, I took the trouble the other day to compute the number of votes that were polled in those elections, 198, and I just want to show the Minister of Marine, when he makes that statement in future, that he should consider how it has been brought about, and how it is that the Government in this House have so large a majority. The total Tory vote polled at the last election was 332,481, the total Liberal vote was 326,967, the total majority in the 198 elections being 5,518. A change of 2,700 votes would give the Liberal party a majority, and while hon. gentlemen talk of British fair play and British loyalty and denounce us as being disloyal, they are willing to sit in this House in proportion of about 130 or 137 to 75 members, when they have polled scarcely any more votes than the Liberal party in this country. The Liberal party to-day with a fair field would

wipe out this Government, so that it would never recover, and it would be the best thing that ever happened to Canada. A change of 15 votes in each of those constituencies would humble hon. gentlemen who now boast of their strength and would place the Liberals in power, if the representation was just. The representation is not just, it is far from being fair, manly and British, and this country has a right to expect that there should be fair play between parties. If there is not fair play between political parties, where should we expect fair play to be found? It is the duty of the Government and the Opposition to show an example of fair play and manly square dealing. I should think hon. gentlemen opposite would blush for shame when they came here with only a very small majority—and yet possessed such a large proportionate number of members—and at the same time boast that the country has pronounced so strongly in their favor. I do not believe the country is much in their favor, and I am quite sure if we could get a fair and unbiased expression of their opinion with the ridings unchanged we would carry the country. When Mr. Mackenzie went out to the country he did not carve up the constituencies, but he went to the constituencies on the same bases as he had been elected on—he was manly enough to do that; and if we are going to make of Canada a nation of which we and our children should feel proud we should do nothing to bring the blush of shame to the face of any Canadian or British subject, or allow any blot to remain that was unfair, ungenerous and un-British in any particular. I have reason to expect that this resolution will carry. I expect that fifteen of those patriots who voted for the National Policy will every one vote for reciprocity, and I expect those few hon. members who are not in the Ministry will vote for the resolution. I expect that the Minister of Finance will vote for it. The Minister of Finance was in favor of reciprocity then, and he said:

“We believe that reciprocity, which has been advocated by all parties and classes in the country, is clearly identified with the policy we have pursued and that we propose to pursue.”

Again he said:

“When capital is driven away, the people of Canada go after that capital, and where employment is furnished them; and this is what the hon. gentleman's policy has resulted in.”

The exodus is now going on; I have shown that to be the case. The hon. gentleman said further:

“Now I say if you want to knit this whole country together from end to end, you must knit it together commercially.”

He further said:

“Now, there is another reason why we should have a different tariff with the United States. I have said before that, as far as England is concerned, while we are most anxious to preserve her institutions and adopt her policy, as far as they are adapted to our own country, we feel as Canadians that we must look at the position in which we stand in relation to the fiscal policy of the great nation alongside of us.”

The hon. gentleman could not be content unless he had a little wail. The hon. gentleman spoke of good crops, but he complained that prices were very low, only \$1.50 a bushel for wheat. The hon. gentleman also said:

“Well, Sir, what has the hon. gentleman to propose in the present disastrous state of affairs? What has he to propose in view of the suffering industries of this country? What has the hon. gentleman to propose by which the present depressed state of things in this country may be changed or the people inspired with the slightest hope for the better. He has nothing. If I were Beagough, if I had the power to caricature as he has, I would portray the hon. gentleman as General Distress giving to the people the word of command ‘starve.’”

That was said by the present Finance Minister in this House, by the hon. gentleman who now has charge to a very large extent of the destinies of this country, and who pretends to be loyal, and who will come before us in this House and try and make us out annexationists because we tell the country the exact position of affairs. There is not an hon. member in this House or a man outside of it support-

ing the Liberal party who has not always promoted everything calculated to promote the welfare of Canada. In everything we have said we have been actuated by a sincere desire to remedy the trouble that exists and point out if possible where the remedy is to be found, and we believe that the remedy we propose will go largely to bring about that prosperity which we all desire to see prevailing in this country, and we believe that a policy of greater freedom of trade introduced in this resolution will bring about that very much desired result. I hope that Canada may become great. She has great resources, she has illimitable mines, she has vast agricultural resources, she has great fishing industries, she has all those sources of wealth, and if she only had an enlightened liberal policy controlling the trade of the country we might expect to see Canada flourish to a very much greater degree than she is doing at the present time.

Mr. HICKEY. I cannot allow this debate to close without making a few remarks giving my opinions regarding the motives which I think have inspired this resolution and the consequences which I think are involved in it. I have been much pleased with the gentleman from the South Riding of Grey (Mr. Landerkin) who has just taken his seat, for the pleasant way in which he has addressed the House, and especially the way in which he has closely hedged himself by the statement that he is a loyal man, and that his party also are all loyal men. That must be gratifying to every person in this country. This resolution has, I think, one single virtue and that virtue is this: that it seems to be the camping ground of the Grit party. It is the camping ground, into which they say they will follow their leader and on which they have planted their stakes just now. But it will soon be like many other camping grounds they have occupied. It will soon be deserted like the camping ground of commercial union which was vacated lately by the member for West Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), and from this new camping ground they will fold up their tents like the Arabs and silently steal away. Now the gentlemen opposite must be perfectly well aware that the success of this agitation, and the result of the full development of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity will be annexation. It is just as sure as that the child is father of the man, that annexation must be the development of this “fad” which they are agitating throughout the country to-day. I think the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in this debate assumed that “commercial union” was “unrestricted reciprocity,” and when he was corrected by his leader he was willing to adopt either term. We can show, I think, from the literature disseminated and the views expounded in this House and in the country on this subject that commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity are one and the same thing. Why they want to deny that is a queer thing to me. I think I will be able to show that the people outside of this House, whether they be the friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite or not, look upon this movement as commercial union. Commercial union is undoubtedly the essence of this matter, and hon. gentlemen will find that it will be so interpreted in the country. While I felt pleasure in complimenting my old friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), on his closing sentiments, I believe that there are possibly members in this House, and I am sure there are a respectable few, at least, of the Reform party in the country who will not be found following those gentlemen in this uncalled for agitation. I think they can justly calculate upon the great majority of the Grit party of the country following them; but they will find, at least, that there are a few people who will not follow the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartright) in the gloomy wail he sent up about this country. He and his party have played the doggish game of grasping at the shadow

for the bone. We had a right to expect that after ten years of the National Policy those gentlemen would have learned by the philosophy of experience that the people of this country were not disposed to be led away by any such side issue. They should have, at least, learned that the Canadian people were determined to keep this country as their inheritance, and as they have inherited it from their loyal ancestors, so they are determined to hand it down, untarnished by traitorous hands, unsullied by disloyalty:

"A heritage, it seems to me,
Worth being loyal
To hold in fee."

Their policy reminds me of one of Victor Hugo's characters who was constantly mistaking weather-cocks for the flag of his country; and that is the fact with those gentlemen. That this is an important question no one will deny, because it involves the life, welfare and end of this country, and it has been said that the end of any nation is its perfection; but how in the world can it be perfection if we take a step by which we lose our identity in the first place, and merely give our future to add to the great country that those gentlemen propose to annex us to. They have counted without their host, because the people of this country have no sympathy with the movement they are engaged in. If this policy were carried out to its legitimate end, any one who exercises a little logic in this matter will see that Canadian nationality by this proposal would be wiped out altogether. That would undoubtedly be the case, although gentlemen on the opposite side pretend to say that it would not. I am led to believe that those gentlemen can scarcely be sincere in their professions of abiding loyalty to Canada. They have merely sugar-coated the pill of unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union; but, Sir, the "sugar coating" is too thin, and within it is the nauseous drug which will not be acceptable to the people of Canada. I think, Sir, we must admit that it is a capitulation of hope and faith in Canada, and an acknowledgment of our inability to look after our own country, when we go, as is proposed in this resolution, to seek help from a foreign country. Let me say here, Mr. Speaker, that we owe respect, at least, to the leader of this "fad." Mr. Wiman, unlike hon. gentlemen opposite, does not seek to detract from this country, but, on the contrary, he has endeavored at all times to speak in glowing terms of our wealth, progress, prosperity and hopes. He has represented Canada as something worth annexing to the States, while the gentlemen opposite have represented Canada as being too poor almost to give away. They must not wonder if we in this House have to tax them for speaking lightly of Canada, and that we speak of them as being disloyal, because we can only judge them by their language, and their language sounds traitorous and is disloyal in tone. We must suppose, therefore, that it comes from the heart as it does from the tongue. They tell us that this close union with the United States would not injure our relations with Great Britain, and the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) told us that it would be a great blessing if we could unite ourselves with the States and make a great Anglo-Saxon union in this western world, where Great Britain would find a resting place in her old age and a place of safety. Bah! upon such a sickly wail. I can tell the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that while his spirit and soul are hovering over the State of Michigan, his body and breeches are a poor ornament for this Chamber, which should be sacred to honor and loyalty and not to disloyalty and hypocrisy. This may not sound very pleasant to the hon. gentleman, but I want to declare that Great Britain does not ask any wails from men whose patriotism is of the same kind as his. I would remind him in the words of Henry Ward Beecher:

Mr. HICKEY.

"That England is the finest country in the world, and take her up one side and down the other she has more virtues, more liberty, and more freedom than any country in the world."

If the hon. gentleman does not like to hear this I like to say it. Now, Sir, free trade with the United States means of necessity that we must separate our existence from Great Britain with whom we have gone hand in hand in the steady march of prosperity and strength, and if hon. gentlemen opposite think that our union with a foreign country would be taken in a quiet way by the people of Great Britain they at least do not know what the sentiment between the two countries is. If there is anything in this union at all the essence of it is that money gain is the consideration, that the thirty pieces of silver are to be considered, and that if we are to sell this country it is for a money consideration. If that is ever done one result of it will be to destroy the sentiment and feeling which exists between this country and Great Britain, and at the end leave us to be swallowed up by the United States. A great deal has been said about the progress of Canada and it has been stated that we have not progressed as well as we ought. We need only look and scan the scenes around us to be satisfied that our march to prosperity has been onward and upward and that our achievements in the past can fairly be taken as indices of our future. Our population, we have been told, has been leaving us on account of the National Policy, but the gentleman who undertook to explain this exodus goes back to years before the National Policy and tells us that 2,000,000 of people have left Canada. If he had prosecuted his enquiries further he would have found that 7,500,000 people have left the United States, and he had better hunt them up and find where they are. It is true we have had an exodus from this country; some have left us and some more could very well go for the good of the country. Some are remaining here to sow the seeds of discord and foment the spirit of discontent among our people, and if they left too, I think Canada would be happier and better, because no human mind can comprehend the destructive results that must follow an agitation of this kind at this period of our country's growth. It tells the world that the Canadian people are still adrift, that they are not satisfied with their country, that they know not whither they are drifting, and are willing to take up any fad and leave their loyal homes to go to a country that has been inimical in every way it could in its trade relations with us. Some hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House have said that the annexation sentiment has been increasing in this country. If it has, who have been the fathers of that sentiment? These very gentlemen are the preachers of annexation. We do not find any annexation sentiment being taught in the Conservative ranks of this country; but these gentlemen get up here, with all the audacity that is peculiar to their politics, and tell us that this sentiment is increasing. They are the authors of it, and they must feel the opprobrium that is attached to it. They tell us in as many words that our country is poor. When they wish to hurl a dart at the Government they say the country is going to the dogs, and that it is poor; but if they once forget the Government of the day and think of their country, they can honestly dilate on Canada's wealth and on the great future it is likely to have. I say this is just the time when Canadian hearts ought to be strong and cheerful, because the sinews of this country have just become developed; the foundations of this nation have just become solidified; we have made our expenditures, we have sown the seeds of prosperity, and are just about to reap the results, in a nation that will be second to none in this world. For these reasons, I think that if these gentlemen would sound a word or two that would be consistent with the real position of the country, instead of decrying it, they would do much better. But they say our policy has ruined this country. Well, if the National Policy

has ruined this country, what in the name of common sense do they expect to give us when they get us connected with a nation where a National Policy exists in its perfection? If there is one fault that I have found with our National Policy, it has been that it was too limited; it did not go far enough, the protection was not great enough. So you see the utterly nonsensical position these gentlemen occupy, with not a bit of regard to logic or the interests of this country. If there is any evil in this country, it must be in their own bosoms. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) had a good deal to say against the Government for the evil way in which they are conducting the affairs of this country and bribing one Province after another. Hon. gentlemen who have read the newspapers must be sure of this fact that that hon. gentleman with his silvery tongue and his insincerity, or I should say, his big hopes in himself and his party, bribed the people of Prince Edward Island by telling them that his party were going into power and the Tories were going out, and that they would then get all they would ask for. Instead of our party being the bribers, that gentleman with all his smooth ways was the arch-briber. But before I forget it, I want to give some outside opinions as to what these gentlemen are fighting for, and to show them that the people of the United States regard it in the light of commercial union and annexation. In the first place, what does Mr. Wiman say in reply to Mr. Edgar about unrestricted reciprocity? He says:

"Almost everything that commercial union in its fullest sense could accomplish would be achieved by this plan."

That is Mr. Wiman's view of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity. In opening this debate the hon. member for South Oxford was very irritable over the idea that commercial union could be tacked on to his resolution of unrestricted reciprocity. That resolution contains a very nice word, reciprocity in trade. We all believe in reciprocity in trade with the United States so far as it is consistent with the interests of Canada, and no further. Here is what the *Boston Advertiser* says on this subject:

"The members of the Opposition party in Canada have come out without reservation in favor of free trade between Canada and the United States. Sir Richard Cartwright, who is the recognised leader of the minority in Parliament, has made a set speech, in which he has declared expressly, with the unanimous approval of his party, in favor of a commercial union with the United States. He goes to the extent of saying that if it is necessary, in order to accomplish this result, Canada must adopt the tariff which the United States imposes upon English goods or shut out English manufactures from Canadian markets in preference to allowing the existing condition of things to go on, which impoverishes Canada and makes it a political tributary of Great Britain, while it should naturally be a commercial ally of the United States. The *Montreal Herald*, the leading Liberal paper in that city, declares in favor of breaking down all tariff barriers along our border, and defiantly declares its independence of the complaints of British manufacturers. * * * As Sir Richard Cartwright pointed out, the right to enter our markets free is the only commercial privilege which can make Canada prosperous, and without it she can never be so."

Do hon. gentlemen wonder now why we think they are disloyal in the sentiments they are propounding from day to day in this House? Senator Frye, who has been a warm friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, gives his opinion on the subject:

"Senator Frye, who has given this subject more careful study than any other member of our Congress, has expressed it as his opinion that it is simply a question of time when at least the Maritime Provinces of Canada will be forced to ally themselves to the United States on whatever basis they can obtain, with this provision of a free market thrown in. He believes Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, at least, will be forced by the necessities of the case to demand of Great Britain a peaceful separation from Canada on condition that they may be annexed to this country. It may be that this result may not happen directly, but the whole tendency of public discussion in those Provinces looks in that direction, and while it would be a severe blow at English Imperial pride to give up these Provinces to this country, and to sacrifice the splendid harbor of Halifax, which for more than a century has been the headquarters of the British naval force in this hemisphere, yet we believe that the necessities of the case are so great that a large party in Canada prefers free trade with us to any consideration of national pride."

That is the opinion of an outside critic, a citizen of the country which the Opposition wish us to join. He looks upon the agitation as one for annexation, and these gentlemen must know that that would be the natural end of such a union. The paper goes on to say:

"It will then become a serious problem for our statesmen to consider on what basis reciprocity with Canada can be entertained. So long as we maintain our present tariff, the first preliminary must undoubtedly be the same tariff for imports into Canada as we raise on our own borders, thus throwing Canadian markets open to our manufactures, we in turn buying at will all the products of Canada in the form of grains, potatoes, fish and coal. It is easily seen that it would be impossible to maintain a political union with Great Britain under these circumstances and a commercial unity with this country."

"The unrest in Canada on these lines is sufficient reason for the anxiety which England has shown to bring out of this fishery dispute some method of opening our markets to Canadian productions. It also explains why England countenanced the unjustifiable conduct of Canadian cruisers to our fishermen. But as the United States has refused to be forced out of its proper policy thus far, the two countries are brought face to face with the more interesting problem of what step Canada will next take to meet her increasing debts, the growing discontent of her people and the unavailing statesmanship of her leaders, bringing into striking prominence the dependence of Canada upon closer relations with us for her future prosperity."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if anything more were wanted to show the exact meaning of unrestricted reciprocity, it could readily be found in the numerous utterances of United States' public men and newspapers. A great deal has been said about the great markets of the United States. The hon. Minister of the Interior and other hon. gentlemen on this side have abundantly shown that the markets in Canada are as good as those in the United States, and in many cases better, because they are at our own doors and subject to our own control. In this connection we have heard a good deal about horses. Now, what are the facts? Take the American trade returns and we find that the average price for horses in the United States is \$73.70, while in Canada it is \$113. In many of the States the average price of horses is \$60, \$70 and \$80, much less than the average price in our Canadian market. This was in 1886. From 1876 to 1885 the exports of cattle to Great Britain amounted to \$28,150,000, and the exports to the United States to \$7,934,000, or three and a half times greater export to Great Britain than to the United States, and the average price of every animal exported to Great Britain was \$77, while the average price of those exported to the United States was \$36. The average price of cattle in the United States for those years was \$35.97, a little less than the average price of the Canadian cattle exported to that country during these ten years. We must also bear in consideration the fact mentioned by the hon. member for South Leeds, that if we were united to the United States, we would lose the English market, because our cattle would be scheduled and could not be shipped to Great Britain at all. Besides that, we know that the market in the United States is a fickle market, while that of Great Britain is a steady market, with a constant and increasing demand for our cattle. This is shown in a striking manner by the fact that in the aggregate value of farm animals, in the United States, comparing the year 1885 with 1884, we find a decrease of over \$100,000,000, while the number of animals shows an increase with the exception of sheep; yet in Canada during the same years, we find both the number and value have increased, except as regards the number of sheep and pigs, the value having increased to the amount of \$1,250,000, or about \$2 per head of the population, while the decrease in the price of animals in the United States was \$1.60 per head of the population. You see, therefore, that the market of Great Britain is of paramount importance to us, while that of the United States is more flickering and changeable than our own, and, therefore, not a desirable market. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in his strictures of the people of Canada, said that money was much cheaper in the United States than here; he said you could get

money at from 6 to 7 per cent. in Michigan. Well, I can tell the hon. gentleman that you can borrow money anywhere in this country at 6, 6½ and 7 per cent. The hon. gentleman will have us believe that the people were laboring under a heavy mortgage debt from which they could not possibly get any relief. But what do you find, Sir? You find that in that great country, where that hon. gentleman loves to dwell, where his soul is at peace and where his spirit seems to have its fullness—especially in that part of it known as Michigan—you find in that country, to repeat the figures given by the hon. member who moved the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and which are very pertinent to this debate, that the mortgages on farms in the United States are as follows:—

In Ohio.....	\$ 701,000,000
Indiana.....	398,000,000
Illinois.....	620,000,000
Wisconsin.....	250,000,000
Michigan.....	350,000,000
Minnesota.....	175,000,000
Iowa.....	351,000,000
Nebraska.....	140,000,000
Kansas.....	200,000,000
Missouri.....	257,000,000
Total farm mortgages.....	\$3,422,000,000

And the actual value of all farms in these ten States is about \$13,931,000,000. Now the *New York Times* sent out a commissioner to investigate the matter, and he reports as follows:—

“The greater portion of the money represented by the faces of these mortgages has not been expended in improving farms, because the larger portion of the farms were equipped with buildings before the mortgages were laid. The money has been spent to enable the farmers to live.”

Of Michigan, the commissioner says:

“In Michigan the number of mortgaged farms has recently been closely ascertained. Practically one-half of the farms of that great State which is justly famous for the production of wheat, oats, barley, corn, fruit, vegetables, lumber, iron ore and copper are mortgaged. In 1880, the assessed value of Michigan farms was \$499,000,000. Their assessed value to-day is about \$700,000,000, which shows an actual value of \$1,400,000,000. One-half of them are mortgaged, and the older the community and the more valuable the land the more numerous are the mortgages—(so the recent investigation shows).”

Thus \$700,000,000 worth of Michigan farming land, or one-half the whole value is encumbered. Farm mortgages are always negotiated on the real value of the land. Thus the total amount of money represented by the faces of Michigan farm mortgages, is at least \$350,000,000. As it is in Michigan, so it is in the ten great agricultural States which lie in the Mississippi valley. In Dakota, there is a population of 600,000, and the mortgages are \$45,000,000, for which interest is paid at the rate of 10 per cent. The commissioner further says:

“I here wish to say to investors, that all talk relative to this vast sum of money ever being paid, is utter folly.

“The profit derived from American agriculture is now so small as to be unworthy of the slightest consideration. To illustrate this fact, the interest money drawn annually from the ten States listed, if they pay 7 per cent., only amounts to \$239,000,000. The total value of the agricultural products of these ten States was, in 1879, \$839,000,000. In 1885, the total value of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, buckwheat, potatoes, hay, tobacco and cotton, was \$754,600,000. Allowing \$250,000,000 for other products of the farm, we have a total annual value of \$1,000,000,000. Half the farms being mortgaged, the produce they yield is \$500,000,000, \$239,000,000 of this goes to pay interest, leaving \$261,000,000 of produce to support 886,000 farmers and their families, or \$294 to each farmer.”

“Out of this sum,” says the commissioner,

“They must pay labor, taxes, supply seed, buy tools, &c. The sum is entirely inadequate. It is not possible for these mortgaged farmers as a class, ever to lift their mortgages.”

And this is the country to which these hon. gentlemen point in such ecstasy, when they are chagrined over their own country and lament her miserable condition. Would they wish to reduce Canadian farmers to that low level of prosperity, to that hopeless condition of inability to
Mr. HICKEY.

extricate themselves from the burden of debt which is upon them? I think not. If they were sincere they would show up all the facts to the public. This is not Canadian literature that I have quoted or literature gathered from Canadian books, but it is a report of the views of the people themselves who have invested in lands in these States. Take this same comparison and what will we find? We find that in Canada, that is, in Ontario and Quebec, the total mortgage debt does not exceed \$200,000,000, on an estimated value of \$800,000,000. Mr. Blue gives it as \$600,000,000, but we may add 25 per cent. to that. The crop of Ontario is valued at \$121,000,000. Taking \$14,000,000 for interest, we have left \$108,000,000 to be divided among 182,000 farmers holding more than ten acres each, or \$600 a piece from agricultural products. This is 100 per cent. more than in the ten States to which the commissioner directed his attention. And yet, the hon. gentleman would cajole these farmers of Ontario to unite their fortunes with those of the depressed farmers of the United States. In 1874, we find that the default on mortgages was equal to 2½ per cent.; in 1879, it was 5 per cent.; in 1886, it was 4 per cent. Notwithstanding the blue ruin they have been stating has overtaken the farmers, though certainly the defaults are more in 1886 than they were in 1874, still they are only 4 per cent., and, when the hon. gentlemen left power, they were 7 per cent. This is a very valuable showing when you compare it with the statements which they made. Here is another report. In the course of a recent discussion in the Congress of the United States, Mr. Weaver, of Iowa, said that:

“During the summer he had traversed the country from western New York through Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas and Nebraska, and the best testimony he could procure showed that two-thirds of all the farm land of the United States was under mortgage. In Iowa it would be an accident if a man travelling through the State got upon a farm that was not mortgaged.”

That is the testimony of the people of the United States in reference to the condition of their farmers, and these are the farmers who are held out to the people of Canada as occupying the green fields of prosperity in order to induce them to unite themselves to the people of the United States. It is well known that far off fields are green, and so these would be found if we were ever so thoughtless as to betray our trust and unite our existence with the United States instead of remaining in our present prosperous condition, a condition of which I think any man might be proud as a citizen of Canada, and which I hope will continue. We have a great country, and, if the United States were removed to the antipodes to-morrow, we could go on and flourish in spite of it. In their 4th of July orations the people of the United States are proud to say that their country is God's country; and so is this country God's country. We have all the materials of wealth, we have all the means of maintaining a prosperous nationality, and we can as well live without the United States as they could live without us in proportion to our numbers. The products of our fields, of our mines, of our forests, and of everything we have are abundant and are handy to the industrious Canadian, who, the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was very emphatic in stating was worth any six immigrants to this country. With all the wealth of Canada, I say we ought to look upon Canada as God's country. It is full of everything calculated to make men happy and prosperous, and I say that an unworthy compromise such as this would be—and an unworthy compromise is always looked upon as a certain avenue to national destruction—ought not to be made, because our position with Great Britain has been one of honor, faithfulness and strength, and that was never exhibited to the world more than it was during the fishery negotiations that have taken place recently in the United States. The United States Congress a short time ago passed a non-intercourse Bill, but

they found that they could not put it in force against Canada without putting it in force against Great Britain and all her colonies, and they at once commenced to estimate the cost of that course. What would Canada be in such a case without such a friend, at a time of weakness such as we had in regard to this question. Investigate this matter as much as you like, and the firmer you will find our position in this matter. Let us keep our fidelity and remember that what is right is safe. If it is right to look after our interest, then the preservation of our present position is the best and the safest thing for us to do. We have the desire and ability to promote our own prosperity. I see Canada drifting down the stream of time, with all its interests growing greater and grander as the times go by, and I believe that she will inscribe upon her banner in the future as she has in the past the motto "*Dieu et mon droit.*"

Mr. McINTYRE. I understand that there is a general desire for the adjournment of the debate, as the hour is growing late, and, if the Government are of that opinion, I will move the adjournment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Go on.

Mr. McINTYRE. Before this debate comes to a close, I desire to say a few words in reference to the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). The question of unrestricted reciprocity, or of reciprocity of some kind, is one that overshadows all other considerations of that kind, with us down by the sea, and this is especially the case in the Province from which I come. We have been lectured by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in regard to the manner in which we treat this question. They say we should treat it from a national standpoint. That is all very well for hon. gentlemen from Ontario who make use of us down by the sea as their footstool. In fact, there is a gentleman in this House—I think it was the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson)—who stated that, if we obtained unrestricted reciprocity, we would be made hewers of wood and drawers of water for the people of the United States. Well, we had reciprocity with the United States before, and I do not think we were made hewers of wood and drawers of water at that time. In fact, with us down by the sea, we were not inclined to be made hewers of wood and drawers of water under the old Reciprocity Treaty. Our people in Prince Edward Island, and in the Maritime Provinces generally, but more especially in the Island from which I come, have had ample experience of the immense advantages and benefits which accrued to them under the old Reciprocity Treaty, and for that reason they have always been looking forward to the renewal of that treaty, or to something even better. While that treaty was in force, our merchants, our farmers, and our fishermen were in the highest degree of prosperity. It was a time when the American vessels came down to our ports and into our rivers and took away from us all our surplus produce—in fact they took away everything we had to spare, and paid for it in cash. It was a time when all our people enjoyed the highest degree of prosperity, and consequently of contentment, because people are generally content when their pockets are lined with the needful, and not otherwise. In order to show that what I have said is true, and that I am not drawing upon my imagination, I will just illustrate by two small rows of figures. In 1854, which was the year the Reciprocity Treaty was inaugurated, but it was not a full year, our exports to the United States only amounted to \$81,782; in 1865, which was the last full year of the Reciprocity Treaty, they amounted to \$604,642; in other words, an increase of \$523,960 in the space of twelve years, or something over 400 per cent. The contrast between that time and now is certainly very marked, so far as the Island is concerned. To-day we are hemmed in by two

Chinese walls. If we send our produce to the American side we are met by an enormous tariff, but in spite of this, we have to force our products in there and take whatever we can get for them, and bring back the money in order to pay for goods imported from Ontario and Quebec; and if we bring back American goods we are met by our own Government with another Chinese wall, in the shape of an enormous protective duty. Now, Sir, it is the general feeling down in that section of the country that so far as tariffs are concerned, it is utterly impossible for us to be ever a prosperous people. Under the existing state of affairs we are forced to buy from Ontario and Quebec, which do not require any of the articles which the Island produces; therefore we are forced to go into a hostile market to obtain money in order to pay the goods we buy from Ontario and Quebec. You might just as well expect water to run up hill as to expect that there ever can be any community of sympathy or sentiment between the western Provinces and the eastern, so long as this condition of affairs exists. The Americans, of course, are our neighbors, they are nearest to us, they are the people with whom we have always dealt more or less, they are the people amongst whom our friends live because a large number of our friends go to the United States, and we are at all times anxious to see them besides trading with them. Again, our rates of freight to the United States are much cheaper, because they are water rates as against railway rates with the western Provinces. In order to show the difference which exists between the old reciprocity period and the present, I will quote some more figures. In 1887, our exports to the United States only amounted to \$663,627; and as I said before, in 1865, the last year of the Reciprocity Treaty, our exports amounted to \$604,642; so that in the space of 22 years, they only increased by \$58,985; whereas, in the 12 years of the Reciprocity Treaty, they increased by \$523,960. I think these figures speak for themselves, and more eloquently than anything I can say, or any person else. As I said before, in the last full year of the treaty, our exports amounted to \$604,642, and the first year after the abrogation of the treaty they fell to \$108,166. This is an enormous fall in a very short space of time, and goes to show what an advantage it would be to us to have a reciprocal trade with the United States in preference to the existing state of affairs. Whilst I am on this point, I wish to refer to a statement made by the Minister of Marine in reference to the savings banks argument that he used. He said it was an indication of our wealth that we had so much money in the savings banks at Charlottetown. Well, Sir, I thought we had heard the last of that during the late campaign, but I find it is made to do service over and over again. Now, if that is an argument that we are wealthy, it shows that we are even more wealthy than the great commercial city of the west, Toronto, because we have, in proportion to the population, double the amount of money in the savings banks at Charlottetown than they have in the city of Toronto. I think this fact proves the very reverse; it proves that if we had any remunerative business in which this money could be invested it would be placed there, for any person who receives 5 or 6 per cent. for his money would never leave it lying in the savings banks at 4 per cent. We are expected to be happy down by the sea, but when we consider the inducements which are supposed to make us happy they are really extraordinary. Take the present price of produce for example. We find people starting for market before daylight, in the fall of the year, and with mud up to the hubs of their waggons, to bring oats to market with which to purchase goods, and they receive twenty-five or twenty-six cents a bushel. They bring their potatoes to market for sixteen cents a bushel, which is the ordinary price in the fall of the year in Prince Edward Island. They were a little higher last fall on account of the American

demand, and it is only when there is an American demand, or when there has been a short crop in the United States, that there is any demand at all, scarcely, for potatoes in Prince Edward Island. Then, again, so far as real estate is concerned, it is falling in value every year in consequence of the low prices of produce—in fact it is almost impossible for a man who wants to leave for the United States now, to sell his farm, except at a ruinous rate. This was not so in former years; because I remember myself that during the terrible years of the Mackenzie Administration of which we have heard so much, real estate was booming in that Province. As a natural consequence of all these things, our people are leaving the country. I do not deny that there is always a certain amount of emigration, as there always will be from a country like the Maritime Provinces, but within the last three, or four, or five years, emigration has assumed alarming proportions. It is not only our young men who are leaving us, but also our young women. In every section of the United States, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, people from Prince Edward Island are to be found. I know myself that from nearly every house which I can recall to memory, one, two, three and sometimes four, persons have left and gone to the United States. They have not gone there to come back again but to stay. Our young men go into the fishing business, or the mercantile business, or whatever they can get to do; and it is the same with our young women, who marry and settle down in the United States. I am very sorry that I have to make such a statement as this, because if it were in my power to do otherwise I would be very willing to do it, no matter who would be the gainers thereby, even if it was the Government. Then, again, in Prince Edward Island in former years, we had a magnificent industry in the shape of shipbuilding. The industry of shipbuilding has entirely disappeared from the Island. In former years it gave employment to our mechanics, it assisted our farmers so far that they could sell the timber off their land, and in fact it saved many a bushel of grain when they could bring a few sticks of timber to the shipyard and obtain their necessaries, while to-day they have to give their grain for everything. In order to show the great depression that has taken place in this industry, I will read a few statistics to the House. In 1875 we built 26,041 tons of shipping; in 1876 we built 21,194 tons; in 1878 we built 16,486 tons. As I said before, those were the years of which we have heard so much with respect to the Mackenzie Administration; but to us they were not disastrous years but years of prosperity, a return of which we anxiously look for. Then we come down to succeeding years. In 1886 shipbuilding had declined to 1,244 tons, and to 1,686 tons in 1887. In 1873, the year in which we entered the Confederacy, we owned 280 vessels, equal to a tonnage of 38,918; in 1886 we owned only 225 vessels, with a tonnage of 30,658, or a decrease in fifteen years of 55 vessels and 8,260 tons. I think those figures speak for themselves. They show that ever since we entered Confederation the shipbuilding industry has been declining steadily every day. It has been stated that the reason of the decline in shipbuilding is due to the fact of the place of ships being taken by steamers; but if that were true the tonnage ought to show it, but it does not. I believe that every person conversant with the old state of affairs, under the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, will believe that if we had unrestricted reciprocity, it would prove much more advantageous to us than the old Reciprocity Treaty, the value of our farms would nearly double in a year or two. Then again it would give a chance to capitalists of the United States to come down and establish fisheries amongst us as they did under the old Reciprocity Treaty. This gave encouragement to our young men to stay at home, and they did so during those years. If a reciprocal treaty was in operation, which we earnestly hope will be the case, there

Mr. McINTYRE.

is no doubt in my mind and no doubt in the minds of nine-tenths of the people of Prince Edward Island, but that there will be a renewal of the good old times that prevailed under the old Reciprocity Treaty, and even better times. Our farmers would find some encouragement for continuing in the business of agriculture. We have in the Island some of the finest horses to be found in the whole Dominion of Canada, and our horses are famed all over the Maritime Provinces and the eastern States. Then again we raise large numbers of sheep, and it is a fact that the mutton of the Island is regarded as of first-class quality, and a large number of sheep even under present circumstances are sent yearly to the States. Of course, I need scarcely say that we produce large quantities of potatoes, butter and eggs. We sent in 1877 to the United States horses to the value of \$61,524; sheep to the value of \$16,279; potatoes, 792,426 bushels, to the value of \$168,366; eggs to the number of 1,668,539 dozens, to the value of \$202,737. Then by the Trade and Navigation Returns I find that we are the largest exporters of eggs of any Province in the Dominion with the exception of Ontario. We also sent of mackerel 14,764 barrels, to the value of \$93,936; canned mackerel, 501,320 pounds, to the value of \$32,421, or a total of \$126,360. All this produce has been sent to the United States and the money brought back goes to pay for goods from Ontario. If we had a reciprocity treaty with the United States, I have no doubt but that these exports would be quadrupled in a very short time. Some of the objections raised by hon. gentlemen opposite against unrestricted reciprocity appear to me to be very frivolous, one of which is that it is going to impair our loyalty. It appears to me that this is the most silly objection that could possibly be raised. We had reciprocity before, and I do not think it impaired our loyalty in the slightest degree. I think myself that when the people are prosperous they are content, and when they are contented there is no room for disloyalty. There is no disloyalty without a cause, and in this case there would be no cause. Then, again, we are told that unrestricted reciprocity would involve direct taxation. It did not involve direct taxation before and it would not involve it now. We are told that it would cut off \$7,000,000 from our revenue. It is very easy to make up that deficiency if proper methods were adopted, and there are several means which might be adopted. There has been an enormous and useless expenditure going on in this Dominion for many years, a large number of which might be cut away with benefit to the Provinces and benefit to the Dominion. If we would stop purchasing constituencies by railway subsidies, there would be an immense saving effected. Of course I do not object to railway subsidies where they are really required, but when they are spent merely for the purpose of purchasing constituencies they are objectionable. Then, again, there is another enormous item of expenditure, and that is with reference to newspapers. Newspaper support is purchased by means of the emigration funds. That is an enormous leakage year after year, which might very easily be stopped. Then, again, if the Government would accord to us universal suffrage we might easily dispense with that expensive Franchise Act. Another objection raised by supporters of the Government is that we cannot obtain reciprocity with the United States and that it is useless to be looking for it. I think that since the abrogation of the old Reciprocity Treaty there never was a brighter prospect than there is to-day—there never was such a disposition manifested by public men in the United States for reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada. Within the last two years we have had the Butterworth Bill, which goes in for a large measure of reciprocal trade; then again we have the Hitt Bill, which not long ago was recommended from the Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously; and more recently still, we have the expression of Mr. Secretary

Bayard, in which he says in his letter to Sir Charles Tupper of 31st May, 1887:

"I am confident we both seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement, and there is but one way to procure it, and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations between the two countries."

I think, Sir, since the abrogation of the old treaty we have never had such a universal expression from the people of the United States in favor of reciprocal trade as we have had within the last year or two, and that not only by the statement of the United States, but by the large meetings which have been convened for the purpose of discussing this question, and which were nearly all unanimous in favor of more extended relations. It has been quoted in the Government papers that, during the Fishery Commission, certain propositions were made by the British commissioners in the direction of reciprocal trade with the United States, and those papers say they were rejected immediately by the United States Commissioners. This is not putting the matter in a fair light, because the United States Fishery Commissioners rejected those proposals for the reasons that they were not authorised to treat in regard to trade. All they were authorised to do was to settle the matter in reference to the fisheries. I am glad, Sir, that this question has been brought so prominently to the attention of the people of this Dominion, and I trust that at no distant date we will see a triumph not so much in the interests of party as in the interests of the whole country.

Mr. FREEMAN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned until Tuesday next at 8 p.m.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman means to meet to-morrow, I suppose.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does he propose to take up or to do?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With the consent of the House our intention is to go on with the questions put by members, and take the Private Bills. We will have five Private Bills to consider from Ontario, and if we can get through those Bills they would be sent to the Senate. Then we can take the Notices of Motion, selecting the unopposed motions. This, I think, will take us up to six o'clock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very well.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12:30 a.m. (Wednesday.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 28th March, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL DEBATES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved:

That the second report of the Select Committee to supervise the publication of the Debates of the House be adopted.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to be kind enough not to insist on that motion to-day, as it will take some time to discuss it.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I would then ask to let it stand as a notice of motion for Wednesday next. The report has been several days on the Table.

Mr. LAURIER. I would ask the hon. gentleman to let it stand until the present debate is concluded.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It is only a recommendation for some increases of salaries.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Keystone Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Tobique, Gypsum and Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. Burns.)

Bill (No. 80) to wind up the Bank of London in Canada.—(Mr. Mills, Bothwell.)

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Ontario, Manitoba and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Annapolis and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

Bill (No. 83) to amend the Act to incorporate the Moncton Harbor Improvement Company.—(Mr. Wood, Westmoreland.)

Bill (No. 84) to incorporate the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Emerson and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Watson.)

Bill (No. 86) to authorise the construction of Bridges over the Assiniboine River at Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie for railway and passenger purposes.—(Mr. Watson.)

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are read, I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter that I consider of very considerable importance to this country. It will be recollected that in 1878, when the Government was changed from that of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) to that of the right hon. gentleman opposite, some very eloquent speeches were delivered throughout this country in favor of what was claimed then to be a National Policy—not a protective policy, but a National Policy—and to which I had the honor, in all good faith, of giving what little support I could. The right hon. gentleman, at the head of the Government, carrying out in good faith what he proposed, placed on the Statute-book of 1879 the following clause in the Customs Act:—

"Any or all of the following things, that is to say, animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal and flour and meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted or smoked) and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada."

I see in the *Free Press* some very important communications from Washington upon that subject, which, with the permission of the House, I will read:

"Washington, March 27.—Much feeling has been aroused against Canada in congressional circles here owing to the neglect of the Dominion Government to place on the free list those articles of natural produce which are now admitted free into the United States. Some years ago the Canadian Parliament passed an Act authorising or directing the Dominion Executive to place on the free list certain articles of natural produce, including trees and shrubs, green fruit, coal and coke, fish, &c., whenever the United States Government agreed to admit such articles free. It was expected that by this means complete reciprocity of trade in the natural produce of the two countries would gradually be brought

about. In 1883 Congress placed on the free list a number of the articles mentioned in the Canadian Act, but up to the present the Canadian authorities have refused to reciprocate or to take any steps towards bringing about a free exchange in the natural products. After the new parcel post system came in operation the nurserymen of this country were placed at a great disadvantage as compared with their Canadian competitors, as all trees and shrubs exported from Canada to this country came in duty free, while American nursery stock is dutiable when sent into Canada. Steps were lately taken to ascertain what the policy of the Canadian Government was in regard to the free exchange of natural products, and the information received is to the effect that the Dominion Government has decided that they are not called upon to put their standing offer of reciprocity in natural products into operation until each and all the articles referred to in the statute are admitted free by the United States. The course of the Canadian Government in refusing to adhere by their own engagement to place on their free list articles of natural produce now admitted free by this country, is likely to strengthen the hands of the opponents of the Fisheries Treaty and to lead to retaliation. A congressman from New York State announces that it is his intention to present at once in the House of Representatives a bill removing from the free to the dutiable list, for customs purposes, all articles of Canadian growth now admitted free. The bill will not include only trees, shrubs and green fruits, but oysters, fresh fish and eggs, of which immense quantities are imported into this country every year from Canada. The proposed duty on eggs, he says, will be about 4 cents per dozen and on other articles the same rates of duty now levied and collected by the Canadian Government.

Washington, March 27. — A New York representative has prepared a bill for early presentation in the House of Representatives which places all articles now in the free list of the United States and not embraced in the free list of Canada, into the duty list at the same rates of duty now imposed by the Canadian tariff.

These articles are principally green and dried fruits, nursery stock and seeds of all kinds, fresh fish, &c.

Other articles which have long been on the free list will also be included for duty, such as eggs, 4 cents per dozen, fresh fish, &c.

Great indignation exists here at the total indifference and bad faith of the Canadian Government in their disregard of Secs. 3 and 9 of the Canadian Customs Act, and the spirit and principle embodied in Sec. 10.

There is a good deal more upon the same subject here with reference to the determination on the part of the United States to propose retaliation, and I am certainly not very much surprised at it. We have heard various rumors about this matter. It is stated in these despatches that the Canadian Government have received communications from the American Government on this subject with the view of getting reciprocity in those articles in which, by the statute, this Government have declared their readiness to reciprocate. What I would like to know is this: whether any, and if so, what correspondence has passed between the two Governments in relation to this subject, and whether the Canadian Government have taken any action with the view of meeting the American Government in their endeavor to meet the statutory enactments of our Government regarding reciprocity in natural products? This is a matter of the greatest importance. To my constituents it is especially of great importance. Hundreds of tons of fresh fish, during certain weeks of the winter, leave one single station, Chatham, in my county, for the markets of the United States; and if this retaliatory policy of the United States should be carried out, if there is any just ground for its being carried out, the people of this country will have good reason to find fault with the right hon. gentleman and the gentlemen behind him. They will have good ground of complaint if the Government have taken no steps to try and meet the advances of the American Government and prevent a system of retaliation growing up between the two countries. This is a matter of vital importance, not only to the constituency I represent, but to the whole of Canada. It affects almost all agricultural products, it affects flour and meal and corn and everything of that kind, and, if the American people are met at the outset of this reciprocity question by a refusal to admit these things which they have made free, I think it is a breach of faith in regard to the inducements which were held out by the right hon. gentleman in 1878-79. I know that the policy of the Government has changed since 1879. The National Policy was adopted then as a means to an end, as a means to bring about reciprocity. That was the argument used by which myself and others were

Mr. MITCHELL.

induced to support it, but now it is a policy of protection. I want to find out whether the people of this country — my constituents, for instance, in the matter of fresh fish — are to be driven into a position where they will have the tax placed upon them when they go into the United States? This is a matter of vital importance to the people of this country. I think the right hon. gentleman ought to inform the House whether negotiations had been going on in reference to it, and whether the Government have refused to meet the just claims of the United States in regard to reciprocity in those articles which they have put upon the free list. I am told that the matter has been under discussion in the Cabinet. We cannot tell, of course, what takes place there. It is one of the secret places, unless the *Herald* happens to get at them now and then, but generally they keep their secrets to themselves. We ought to know whether the articles which have been named, of fish, coal, fruit, eggs, and so on, which the Americans have made free, are to be made free on our side? There is a little error in the statement which has come from Washington, and that is in regard to coal. Anthracite coal has been made free in the interests of Ontario, which the right hon. gentleman represents, but the coal of our country has not been made free and the people I represent have still to submit to a tax of 60 cents a ton on all soft coal, and that is the coal which is generally used in the eastern Provinces. Now, I want the hon. gentleman to give a positive answer to my enquiry, whether advances have been made by the United States, complaining of the breach of faith which has occurred, or whether negotiations have taken place in which they have offered to extend the system of reciprocity, and whether or not any answer has been returned to them, and what the attitude of the Government is upon the question to-day?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that this is exactly the time to answer the question, but I may say that no applications have been made by the American Government upon the subject which the hon. gentleman speaks of.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want to go a little further, and I want to see why the Government have not carried out the pledge which they made in section 16 of the Act of 1879, and have not put these articles on the free list which the Americans have made free?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, when the question comes up in such a form as it can be discussed, and not in the form of an enquiry, the hon. gentleman will get a full and satisfactory answer.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may get a full answer, but I do not think I will get a satisfactory one. I want to ask another question.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I want to ask whether the United States consul has not made representations as to the breach of faith of this Government in relation to section 16 of the Act of 1879?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the first place, I repudiate altogether, on behalf of the Government, the insinuation that we have been guilty of any breach of faith.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, of course; you will repudiate anything if it suits your purpose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has no right to use that insolent and unparliamentary language.

Mr. MITCHELL. I can tell the hon. gentleman —

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I shall have to call for the protection of this House against such an unparliamentary course as the hon. gentleman is pursuing, and I have no doubt that this House will give me protection, as it would give any other member protection, against such coarse and unparliamentary language. I repudiate the statement that there has been any breach of faith on the part of the Canadian Government, and further, Mr. Speaker, I say that there have been reports made on behalf of the American seedsmen desiring that this provision should be carried out, but we have seedsmen on the Canadian side of the border also, and we have to consider their interest as well as the American interest. However, that subject, having been brought forward in the interests of the American seedsmen, is now engaging the attention of the Government, but there has been no official statement even from the Consul.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, Sir,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to move the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You cannot.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will some hon. gentleman move the adjournment?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I ought to say that the hon. gentleman knows that he came to me and asked permission to put these questions. I asked him not to make a speech and not to be too long, and it was understood that the adjournment of the debate would not be moved, and I think the House will sustain me in saying that the hon. gentleman ought to relinquish this subject now.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to make an explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Mr. MITCHELL. You may "haw" as much as you like. I wish to correct His Honor the Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not go to the Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. Excuse me. Hear what I have to say first. I did not go to the Speaker to ask permission to make these statements, but to tell him that I was going to do it, and it was in the interests of my constituents—

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that the hon. gentleman asked me if he might be allowed to ask these questions in order that he might not be obliged to move the adjournment of the debate. I said: That is all right so long as you do not go too far in the way of a speech. I am sorry now that I did not enforce the Rule of the House at once and stop the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, Sir,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I merely rise to put myself right in regard to what the Speaker has said.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have a perfect right to set myself right, even when the Speaker himself is concerned. I went to the Speaker to state, as a matter of courtesy, that I was going to bring up this question. When the hon. gentleman says he can appeal to the House, I tell him that he can do it as soon as he likes. I am not afraid of the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think the language of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was such as to

warrant the remarks which have been made by the right hon. the Premier. If the Premier had answered the question at first as he did afterwards, my hon. friend would have been satisfied. All he wanted to know was what communications had been made to the Government in relation to this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We had none, and I said so.

Mr. LAURIER. The answer which the hon. gentleman gave afterwards was not that which he gave at first.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did give it.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think he gave the answer at first in such a fair manner as he did just now. I only desire to make one remark. This is not a case which requires any communications between the two Governments, as we have a standing offer upon our Statute-book, that, as soon as such a thing is done by the United States, we will reciprocate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes.

Mr. LAURIER. If it is not so, I can only say that it ought to be so, and, further, that it was understood that it was so in the first instance.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Looking at the wording of the section—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. member moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not hear anyone do so.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What I was going to say was that the hon. gentleman has induced Parliament to put upon the Statute-book a certain Act. By that Act, he declares that the Parliament of Canada are ready at any time to permit articles to come from the United States into Canada free of duty, in so far as the Americans do the same thing with regard to articles going from Canada to the United States. The words used are "any or all." Now, all the articles which are named in that Act have not been admitted free into the United States by Act of Congress, but a considerable number of them have been. I was calling the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. gentleman, in not proposing to take those articles off the dutiable list and put them on the free list, is setting at defiance an Act of Parliament that he himself asked the House to put upon the Statute-book. That is the position of things. It is not a matter of discretion with the hon. gentleman; the hon. gentleman has parted with his discretion; he has asked Parliament to tie up the Government to a certain proposition, and that proposition is that the moment the Americans put upon the free list certain articles, those same articles shall be put upon the free list by the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. BOWELL. No such thing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has no discretion. The hon. gentleman cannot put his opinions and his views as to public policy, at this moment, above the law, and that is what the hon. gentleman has just declared to the House that it is his intention to do. Now, I say that these words are clear and distinct, that there is no discretion left to the Government, and their duty is to put those articles upon the free list that have been put upon the free list by the Congress of the United States; and if the hon. gentleman thinks that is not good policy, then he should propose to amend the law that is at this moment upon the Statute-book.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only say that the hon. gentleman has not read the clause, else he would not make that statement. It is permissive altogether, it is not obligatory. The language is explicit: "Any or all of the following things," &c.—reciting them—"may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided for by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council." It is perfectly in the discretion of the Government. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but he did not read the clause, or he would not have made that statement. It is perfectly permissive.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will point it out, although this irregular discussion is really interrupting the business of this House. I say to this House that if the hon. gentleman will look over our free list and the United States free list, he will find that there is an infinitely greater number of articles allowed to come into Canada on the free list of the United States than are allowed on the American free list from Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL. That has nothing to do with it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An infinitely greater number. But I will point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that we have got the interests of our own people to look after as well as the interest of the people of the United States. And, Mr. Speaker, if time permits, and a debate comes up, we will be able to show that it would be in the highest degree improvident in us to take some single article which will be specially for the benefit of the United States, and especially injurious to an industry in Canada, and put it on the free list, while they refuse to take any of the others in which there could be anything like reciprocity or interchange between Canada and the United States; I say they take out some articles the manufacture of which they think they can crush in Canada, and keep up their tariff on all other articles, except one particular article, when they think that they have got the advantage. That is not the way which we, as a Canadian Government, think best to carry on the affairs of this country, and I have no doubt that the majority of this House, and the majority of the people of Canada, will think with us.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I submit that the argument that the hon. gentleman has just used is altogether wide of the mark. He stated just now that the Government, in their discretion, looking to the interest of certain seedsmen, did not see fit to comply with the plain words of an Act of Parliament. The hon. member for Bothwell pointed out to him that he had no discretion at present, that the proper construction of the Act demanded that when all or any other of these articles should be admitted free of duty by the United States, then, by Order in Council, the same article should be admitted into this country free of duty.

Mr. THOMPSON. No.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman says the question is one of the construction of an Act of Parliament, and no one knows better than the First Minister, and the Minister of Justice who interrupts me, that the word "may" is the proper word to use in respect to actions to be taken by the Crown. Parliament does not use the imperative "shall,"—the Crown "shall" do this or "shall" do that. Parliament always uses the word "may," but the intention and spirit of that section is perfectly plain and perfectly clear. It was not so understood when it was passed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman knows well that not once, but twenty times, since that statute was passed, it has been declared in this House by responsible Ministers of

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

the Crown, and by their supporters, that we have a statutory offer which, if the United States acted upon it, would enable their products to be admitted into this country, and ours to be admitted into theirs, just to the extent to which they acted upon our offer.

Mr. BOWELL. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIES. Now, Mr. Speaker, the United States have expressed not only their desire but their determination that certain of those articles which we have specified shall be admitted free into their country, on the assumption that we would act in good faith in the offer that we put on our Statute-book. I say that while, technically, if that section was used with reference to private companies, the hon. gentleman's construction might be correct, when those words are used with reference to the Crown, and looking at the spirit of the offer, the hon. gentleman is flying directly in the face of Parliament.

Mr. THOMPSON. Since the hon. gentleman has referred to my interruption, I may explain to him and to the House in what sense my interruption was made. It was not made with reference to any construction which the hon. gentleman chooses to argue should be put on the statute at all, but it was made with reference to a statement of his that the language of the Act was that the proclamation shall issue as soon as these articles are declared free from duty in the United States, and in that respect I am correct. My interruption was not intended to be offensive, but to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that his quotation was not correct. The section is:

"Any or all of the following, that is to say"—

Mentioning the things enumerated by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell):

"—may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty."

Then the hon. member, with the view of giving this Act a certain construction, says that "may" is always the word used in reference to the Crown. Precisely so; seldom is the word "shall" used if at all, but never is the discretion of the Crown taken away by Parliament, and it is only when the matter is left discretionary and subject to the action of the Executive, that the Crown is vested with the right of bringing the Act into force, and therefore —

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Will the hon. gentleman permit me? Does he mean to put that construction upon an offer made by one great nation to another, and to say that if the other nation accepts the offer, it is contended in a case like this, this Government can turn round and say: We will not do it, we were only fooling?

Mr. THOMPSON. I mean to say that there is no offer in the question at all. The hon. gentleman has addressed the House upon the question of the interpretation of one of our own statutes, and I say that my view of the matter is that whenever a proceeding is left open to the Crown to do it is left to the discretion of the Crown, and is to be done on the advice of the responsible Ministers of the Crown, and that is the reason why the word "may" is always used instead of "shall," to imply that the discretion rests in the Crown. It was in that sense that I made the interruption of which the hon. gentleman complains. Now, the hon. gentleman has spoken of this as being a statutory offer, an offer on the part of this Parliament which involves a breach of faith if this Government should fail to carry it out to the full extent. Does the hon. gentleman mean to contend—because his argument goes that far—that this statutory offer—not only including the clause which has been brought to the notice of the House, because what is called the statutory offer embraces half-a-dozen other offers, and

looks to the admission of free fish, coal and various other products into the United States—does the hon. gentleman mean to contend that it is a breach of faith on the part of the Government of Canada, even as to that part of the statutory offer, to decline to allow the United States to say: "You have made that offer; we will take portions of it, and accept those which please us, and which appear favorable to our people, and we will shut the door in the faces of your people in respect to all the other portions"? I can only say that, in my humble judgment, if the Crown, having discretion, uses it in that way, it would use it to betray the interests of the people of Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. It may be very true that the discretion of the Crown cannot be interfered with by statute and that the word "may" is permissive and not mandatory; but it certainly is an unfortunate thing that there should be standing on our Statute-book now, and it has been there for the last nine years, a clause like this, which seems to provide that any or all of certain articles named may be admitted to this country free of duty on the United States taking steps to admit similar articles there free of duty. It was understood by all, beyond question, that on the United States admitting free any of those articles named there would be corresponding action on the part of the Canadian Government, and if this was not the intention of the clause, then it has been left on the Statute-book to work mischief, as it is doing on this occasion. It invites retaliation, if we fail to place upon the free list such articles as are placed upon the free list in the United States; and if it does not mean what it absolutely says it ought not to be there, it ought not to have been put on the Statute-book in 1879 and continued there, and if the Government do not intend to comply with the obvious language of the clause they had better expunge it from the Statute-book with all possible haste. Of course, the view that will be taken by the American Government is that Canada has been acting in bad faith. They find this language on our Statute-book, and will believe that it meant just what it said. We have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite that we have a standing offer of reciprocity to the United States, according to the language of this clause, in any or all of the articles named. It is thus the Americans understood this offer. Now, if understanding this offer, as they obviously did, as being one to admit free certain articles which they have placed upon their free list, if necessary action is not taken on our part, and they resort to retaliation, as is threatened, a great injury to this country will result. Take the single article of eggs. It is true they were on the free list of the United States before this clause was put on our Statute-book, but if we take the article of eggs, and if the Americans were to impose a duty of four cents per dozen on them, as they threaten to do, it would involve a loss to this country of between \$400,000 and \$500,000 per annum on that one article alone. Take the article of fish; if a duty was imposed on our fresh fish entering the United States, as is threatened, it would involve a loss of great magnitude to Canada. Now, the matter involved is not one of very great importance. It is true, I am willing to concede, that the Americans have selected certain articles and placed them on the free list, of which we buy a considerable quantity and sell but a little, but we are placed in this unfortunate position: that here is the plain language on our Statute-book, and we are not complying with a voluntary offer made and it will be urged in the United States that we are simply shirking what they believe to be a *bonâ fide* promise, because it is not advantageous to us to fulfil it. That is the view they will take. I believe, in view of the circumstances of the case, in view of the language of the clause on the Statute-book—although I admit there is great force in the statement of the First Minister, that it is a per-

missive clause and not a mandatory one, and one in regard to which the Government may or may not act—notwithstanding this is probably true, I believe under the circumstances it will be better to act in accordance with the implied promise embodied in this clause respecting those articles being placed on the free list, because we are inviting retaliation, and retaliation in a line that would prove very injurious to the interests of this country. If we were acting as the American Government believe it would have an injurious effect on the relations of the two Governments, and might weaken our present friendly relations; and, in my opinion, as the interests involved in the present case are not of great magnitude, we should consider whether we could not with advantage, and especially in view of the small cost involved, admit those articles to the free list.

Mr. CASEY. I am not a lawyer and I do not pretend to argue this question from a legal point of view, but it is quite as necessary that those who are not lawyers should understand what the laws on the Statute-book mean, at least in general terms, as that lawyers should understand them. I desire to obtain a correct understanding of the interpretation of this statute given by the Minister of Justice. I understood him to say that the word "may" is always used when directions are to be given in regard to the exercise of the executive power of the Governor General, that when proclamations are directed to be issued in all cases the word "may" is always used instead of the imperative word "shall," because, in theory at least, the discretion of the Crown cannot be limited. If that be so,—I do not know whether that is so in all cases—if the Minister's statement be exactly correct, it follows that, for instance, in the case of the Scott Act, or any other Act under which the Governor General is directed to issue a proclamation under certain circumstances, the word "may" is the word used, and therefore the Governor, advised by his responsible advisers, is at liberty to issue that proclamation or not. That is the only meaning I find in the Minister's words. Am I mistaken in that? If not, I hope the hon. Minister will correct me, and it is important that the country should know it. We were always under the impression that a statutory enactment is binding, that whenever the Legislature used the words "may" or "shall," the statute had to be carried out when the circumstances arose. Certainly in regard to this particular statute, that impression prevailed and does prevail, not only here, but in the United States. The United States, being a nation of sensible people, believe that when we pass a statute declaring that a certain proclamation should be issued under certain circumstances, the statute means that it should be issued under those circumstances, and not merely that the Government are at liberty to advise the issue of that proclamation if they see fit. Again, the Minister said that the prerogative of the Crown in regard to the issue of a proclamation can be exercised only on the advice of the responsible Ministers, and it is by their advice His Excellency has not issued a proclamation under present circumstances. Why is it the Ministers did not so advise him? The Minister of Justice says it is because the United States have chosen to put only a portion of the articles on the free list. Well, what is the wording of the statute? The statute says: "Any or all of the following articles." Why did the Government, and remember it was this present Government, this present set of advisers, place the words "any or all" on the Statute-book if they did not mean to accept reciprocity in regard to some of them, but would only agree to reciprocity in regard to the whole number? If they did not mean at that time to offer reciprocity in regard to some of those articles, but would require the whole number to be placed on the free list, they have changed

their minds, and they have to explain to the House and the country the reason of this change of policy. Remember that those hon. gentlemen are the same advisers now, with few exceptions, the Minister of Justice being among them, and, at all events, with the same Premier at the head of the Government, who is responsible for the advice given by any of his colleagues, as those who formed the Government who placed on the Statute-book the words "any or all of the following articles." The hon. the Minister of Justice, at least, has given no explanation whatever as to why they have gone back upon the distinct wording of the statute. Now, Sir, this is a distinct change of policy, no doubt. In 1879 I am quite satisfied the Government did intend to make this offer of partial or full reciprocity in natural products, as we learn from the discussion at the time and from the use made since in the country of this portion of the statute. The reason of the change of policy is this: The hon. gentleman sees that if he allowed even reciprocity in certain articles of natural products he would be giving up his whole case in favor of the National Policy, and he would be admitting that the National Policy did not protect and foster all those industries in Canada. In order to save his beloved National Policy and his beloved friends—the few of them who make money under the National Policy—he insists upon violating the offer which was formerly made by his own advice to the United States when the National Policy was introduced. That is the reason of this change of policy, and that is the only interpretation the country can put upon it. It would be clear to everybody if he agreed that there should be reciprocity in those articles, that the whole pretence of the National Policy having benefited the country in the past was a humbug. The hon. gentleman does not like to acknowledge that he has been a humbug in the past—he does not like to acknowledge it, at all events—and for that reason a change of policy has taken place. The possibly serious consequences that may follow from this breach of faith—for it is nothing else—on the part of the Government would take too long to discuss here. We may probably hear something about that before the end of the Session. If the United States have that respect for themselves which they have always shown, it is highly probable that the consequences will be very serious to our trade, and the right hon. gentleman will then feel the responsibility of what he has done.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has invited us to look at the statements that were made at the time that the National Policy, so called, was introduced, and when this resolution upon which that clause in the statute was before the House. I find that Sir Leonard Tilley, in introducing that measure, made these remarks:

"I have this to say to our American friends: In 1865 they abrogated the Reciprocity Treaty, and from that day to the present a large portion of the imports from that country into the Dominion have been admitted free. We have hoped, but hoped in vain, that by the adoption of that policy we would lead our American friends to treat us in a more liberal spirit with regard to the same articles. Well, after having waited twelve years for the consideration of this subject, the Government, requiring more revenue, have determined to ask this House to impose upon the products of the United States that have been free, such a duty as may seem consistent with our position. But the Government couple with the proposal, in order to show that we approach this question with no unfriendly spirit, a resolution that will be laid on the Table containing a proposition to this effect: that as to articles named, which are the natural products of the country, including lumber, if the United States take off the duties in part or in whole we are prepared to meet them with equal concessions."

That was the proposition, and that has been crystallised into an Act of Parliament. The words of the Act being "any or all" of those articles.

Motion for adjournment withdrawn.

Mr. CASEY.

ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that when the Speaker leaves the chair at six o'clock this day, that this House stands adjourned until Tuesday next, at eight o'clock p.m., in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

REPRESENTATION OF KENT.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, before you proceed to the Orders of the Day, I wish to question the Government as a matter of privilege. A day or two ago this House passed a motion ordering the issue of a writ for the county of Kent, in Ontario. I understand that up to this time no writ has been received. I would like to know whether the Government have appointed a returning officer and whether the writ has issued from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the officer so appointed. In this matter, Sir, the Crown has no discretion whatever. The officer is the servant of the House and his duty is to obey the Order of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Two or three days ago information was conveyed to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery that Mr. Speaker had issued his warrant. The Government will, in a day or two, select a returning officer for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Up to this time the Government have not appointed any returning officer?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have not appointed one.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). And so the Order of the House is disobeyed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has not been disobeyed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The word "may" is not there in that case.

COST OF RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, What has been the cost of the Railway Commission to the present date, and what amount is estimated will be the whole cost?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$26,415.71. There may be a few outstanding accounts, but they will certainly not exceed \$1,000 additional, and may not reach that amount.

COST OF LABOR COMMISSION.

Mr. WELDON (St. John) asked, What has been the cost of the Labor Commission to the present date, and what is the estimate of the whole cost of the commission?

Mr. BOWELL. The cost of the Labor Commission to the 19th March, the date on which the accounts were last made up, as they are sent in every month, was \$24,137.05. The whole cost will depend upon the length of time that the Commission will occupy, and consequently it would be impossible to state it now.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. PERLEY (Assiniboia) asked, Whether, under the terms of the contract made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, all lands paid them on said contract are not liable to be taxed so soon as the Company sells the hay of said land, or in any other way receives a rental for said land?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That question involves a question of law which the Government cannot well answer. The hon. gentleman can take the best legal advice to get an answer to that question.

MR. HENRY SMYTH.

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. LISTER) asked, Has Henry Smyth, at any time during the past year, been in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity, and at what salary? How much has he been paid? Is he still in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity? If not, when were his services dispensed with?

Mr. CARLING. I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to Henry Smyth, ex-member of this House?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes.

Mr. CARLING. Mr. Smyth was employed last year in the immigration service in the North-West and also in Dakota and Minnesota. He was paid at the rate of \$100 a month, with an allowance for actual travelling expenses. The total amount paid to him was \$1,850.50. His employment by the Department ceased on November 15th last at the termination of the specific duties for which he was appointed.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, How many persons are now employed by the Government of Canada in every branch of the public service, and receive public money in consideration of said service?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman would do better to put that in the shape of a motion for a return. It is impossible to answer it in reply to a question.

INSOLVENCY LEGISLATION.

Mr. WELDON, St. John (for Mr. EDGAR), asked, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce an Insolvent Act during the present Session, or any legislation in that direction?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. WATSON asked, Is it the intention of the Government to establish, and bring into active operation, experimental farms in the Province of Manitoba during the coming season?

Mr. CARLING. The matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

PAYMENTS TO IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Have any sums of money been expended by the Government, in payments of any sort, to persons in Dakota, to induce them to remove to Manitoba?

Mr. CARLING. No money has been paid whatever.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF OTTAWA COUNTY.

Mr. WRIGHT asked, Whether the Government intend to cause such a geological survey to be made in the county of Ottawa as will afford all necessary information with regard to the mineral and phosphate interests of that section of country?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The work of the Geological Survey in Ottawa county was commenced last year, and

it will be continued this year with special reference to the subject the hon. gentleman refers to.

HARBOR OF PAPINEAUVILLE.

Mr. WRIGHT asked, Is it the intention of the Government to send a dredge, at the opening of navigation, to Papineauville, to remove all obstructions from that harbor?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is the intention to send a dredge to work in that direction.

SURVEY OF CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. DOYON asked, 1. Whether the survey of the Indian Reserve of Caughnawaga, entrusted to Mr. Lea Walbank, has been completed? 2. If so, whether it is the intention of the Government to lay his report before the House, and when? 3. What is the total amount paid to Mr. Walbank, to date, and what amount remains due to him?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The field work connected with the survey has been completed. The returns of the survey have not yet been received, but they are promised in the course of a few days. As to whether the report will be laid on the Table, if Parliament asks for it I presume it will be brought down, as I see no objection to that being done. The total amount paid to Mr. Walbank and his staff up to date, on account of the survey of the Caughnawaga reserve, is \$18,000. The cost of this survey has been very heavy, but it has been occasioned by the intricacies connected with the work, owing to the Indians having taken up and cultivated irregular pieces of land within the reserve, and their respective rights having to be clearly defined by survey of the boundaries of these pieces of land, with a view to determine what those rights were, and making a valuation of the land individually improved by them.

GRAZING LEASES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. WELDON, St. John (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, How many acres of land in the district of Alberta, North-West Territories, are held under lease for grazing purposes, and on which no settler is allowed a homestead entry without first obtaining the permission of the leaseholder?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The number of acres of land leased for grazing purposes in the district of Alberta altogether is 4,466,844. Of this 1,718,640 acres are held under old leases, and the land is not open for homestead and pre-emption. I may say, however, that we are doing our best to get that particular provision released, and in the Calgary and McLeod districts we have succeeded very largely. Several of the old leases have been cancelled for non-fulfilment of the conditions. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will answer a question put to me the other day by Sir Richard Cartwright, which I was then unable to answer in full. He asked what amount of money had been received from the sale of lands in the North-West, from the 1st January to the 1st March. I have ascertained that the amount is \$100,068.04.

BRITISH COLUMBIA AND ALASKA BOUNDARY.

Mr. REID (for Mr. PRIOR) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a Commission to accurately define the boundary between British Columbia and Alaska, and if so, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Diplomatic correspondence is now going on between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States, in which the

Canadian Government is consulted, with reference to a survey either jointly or separately by the two Governments.

SECTION "A" WELLAND CANAL.

Mr. WELDON, St. John (for Mr. EDGAR) asked, 1. To whom was the work of deepening section "A" of the Welland Canal originally awarded? 2. Were new tenders called for when the work was taken off the hands of the first contractors? 3. If not, then to whom was the work awarded?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The work was awarded to R. P. Cooke and Chilton Jones for \$145,299, they being the lowest tenderers. The work later on having been taken off the hands of this firm, new tenders were called for, and the lowest tender was accepted, namely, that of Murray & Cleveland, for \$173,945.

PAMPHLET ON SCIENTIFIC DAIRY PRACTICE.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Is it the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to publish in the German language Mr. Lynch's pamphlet on scientific dairy practice?

Mr. CARLING. It is not the intention.

SALES OF CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. WELDON, St. John (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, 1. Whether the Government have obtained from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, a statement of the lands sold by them to private individuals or corporations? 2. Whether, if they have not obtained such statement, the Government intend to take any steps to secure such statement?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That return was laid on the Table about a fortnight ago.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) to incorporate the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Western Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Ward.)

Bill (No. 34) respecting the South Norfolk Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

BILL IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT COMPANY.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved second reading of Bill (No. 20) relating to the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company.

Mr. HAGGART. Before that Bill obtains its second reading, I would call the attention of the Government to the peculiar nature of the Bill. It virtually gives to this company the control of the navigation of the river from the Des Joachims rapids up to the Quinze. They have at present the control of the Ottawa as far as towage is concerned and the passage of logs from the Des Joachims down to Ottawa River, and this gives them the further control from the rapids up to the Quinze. Perhaps it is not objectionable that the control should be given to them, so far as regards the present members of the company, who are principally the owners of the mills around Ottawa and the principal persons interested in it, but I desire to draw the
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

attention of the Government to the fact that at some time or other it is contemplated that the canal system may be extended up the Ottawa river to the Georgian Bay, and the control of this company might pass into other hands by the sale of stock or otherwise, and might not be worked so much in the interests of the people if it were in other hands. Besides, I think that, in regard to a large river like the Ottawa, it is objectionable that the slides and other improvements in connection with navigation should be in the hands of a private company at all. Many of the improvements on the different large streams as well as on the Ottawa river are in the hands of the Government, and they pay well, in fact they pay a handsome dividend. I think it is objectionable for a company as at present constituted to have control of the river from Des Joachims to Ottawa. It may be very objectionable, and it may, at some future time, cost the Government a large sum of money when they may be compelled to assume these works again. I believe that this company is composed, principally, of the same persons who are interested in this work, and are desirous of obtaining the Government works—I do not know whether there are any between the Des Joachims and Quinze, but there are on the Madawaska River. I enter my protest on behalf of the parties interested in that section of the river in lumbering and driving logs down that stream. I say these improvements ought not to pass into the hands of any company. We believe that there is at present a control by the Government, and that it is in the best interest of the country, and the best interest of the trade, that it should remain so. I simply state these objections for the purpose of drawing the attention of the Government to the enormous scope of this Bill, in which Parliament is asked to give control of the navigation from the city of Ottawa to the Quinze Rapids. It is simply objectionable that any company should have the power which this company propose to assume under this Bill.

Mr. BRYSON. In rising to protest against the passing of this Bill, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I do it with a great deal of reluctance, as I feel that the promoters of this Bill, being Chaudière lumbermen, are entitled to fair consideration in making improvements. They have operated on the Ottawa River for a distance of 140 miles, as their charter of 1875 gives them power to do. But they are now asking for further powers beside driving powers, and on a river which has been declared by this Legislature to be a navigable stream. I believe the Ottawa River improvements should be controlled entirely by the Government. They not only ask control of the river for 350 miles, but they virtually ask control of the entire towage of logs and timber as well, which, to my mind, as a practical lumberman, would prove very detrimental to the private interests of the minor proprietors on the Ottawa River, which I do not believe is the intention of this Government. I proposed at one time to discuss this Bill clause by clause, as it is to my mind exceedingly objectionable, but as the time of the House is very limited to-day, I will not go into the details, but will merely say that I protest against any company acquiring such right as they ask for in this Bill. It is true that the company are willing to adopt certain amendments in this Bill. I have met them and have discussed the Bill clause by clause. It is now before the House, and the company are willing to make certain concessions in order to get the Bill through, but I believe that even with the concessions which they are willing to make, it is not in the public interest that the Government should allow this Bill to pass. I ask the Government, during recess, to give it their serious consideration, and after the reassembling of Parliament, I think, the Government should take over the improvements now held by the Ottawa River Improvement Company, instead of giving these men further power to control the river for 350 miles.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am quite sure the two hon. gentlemen who are opposing this Bill are doing it with proper intentions. Let me say, however, that the question is not a new one. The gentlemen who are now asking for an extension of rights and powers that they already possess in regard to a portion of the Ottawa River have possessed and enjoyed those rights over a certain portion of the Ottawa River since 1875. It is not correct, as stated by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) that these gentlemen, the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company, have any rights as regards the navigation of the Ottawa, or that they control the navigation of the Ottawa in any respect. They have a right to locate and construct certain improvements to facilitate the descent of timber down the Ottawa River. When they obtained their Act of incorporation in 1875, it was believed by them that the point to which they then proposed to go, Des Joachims, was sufficiently distant and northerly upon the Ottawa to suit all their purposes. As the timber has become cut away along the Ottawa, and as it is necessary for the lumbermen to go further into the interior, it is found necessary for them to construct certain works and to have driving powers over a further extent of river, and that is the reason they are here to-day asking for the powers mentioned in this Bill. I say they have no powers for controlling the navigation of the river. The whole object of this company, first, in getting incorporated in 1875, and getting certain powers as far as Des Joachims, and now asking to have these powers to Lake Temiscamingue, is for the purpose of facilitating the descent of timber to the mills at Ottawa, and for cheapening the cost of its transport. They are asking for no new powers, as I have already said, and the powers that they have possessed under the Act of 1875 were carefully guarded by the House at that time, as I propose the House shall carefully guard the powers granted under this Bill, if they allow it to pass. Let me say, Sir, that the gentlemen who are asking for this Bill, and who obtained the Act of incorporation in 1875, were not particularly desirous of constructing these improvements. It required a considerable outlay of capital at their hands, which they would very much rather not have undertaken, and if the Government had been willing then, or if they were willing now, to undertake the construction of these improvements for the purpose of facilitating the descent of timber, I am quite sure that the gentlemen interested in this company would be quite willing to withdraw this Bill and to transfer their works to the Government, as the hon. member for South Lanark has said, for the acknowledged cost of the work as constructed by them. Let me point out this further circumstance in regard to what has fallen from the hon. member for South Lanark, respecting the canalling of the Ottawa River. In the Act of incorporation of 1875, it was specially provided, and I have no doubt that provision will be incorporated in this Act also, that the company should remove any of these works at any time that the Government might require them to be removed to facilitate navigation. Now, as regards the objections offered by my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Bryson), he says that it is proposed by this Bill to give to this company control of all the towing upon the Ottawa River. I think this House will agree with me that that would be utterly impossible. You cannot take away the river, you cannot grant any franchise upon the river that will prevent anybody else from putting a steamer there for the purpose of towing or doing any other work. All this company asks with regard to towing is this: that if they are unable to make a contract with a towing company, or with any steamboat company, or if they are unable to secure the towing of their logs at reasonable rates, they should have power to construct and run steamboats themselves. It is not necessary to come to this Parliament to get that power. They already have it. That company organised in 1875

under the Joint Stock Companies Act, and obtained letters patent to enable them to do what this Act will enable them to do in respect to towing logs down the Ottawa. I repeat again that all that is asked by this Bill is to enable these people to construct improvements under the strict supervision of the Government, and to locate them where the Government may determine, for the purpose of facilitating the descent of timber down the Ottawa. And let me say this further, if I thought a single public interest or the right of a single private individual would be interfered with by this Bill, I would not have brought it before the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Bill has already received the attention of certain members of the Government, and especially of myself, as chairman of the Railway Committee, to which this Bill will most likely be referred, and I must say that after reading the Bill I found that it certainly required considerable amendment before it should be allowed to pass, provided the principle of the Bill was admitted. Therefore, in allowing now—so far as the Government are concerned—the Bill to be sent to the committee, we do not pledge ourselves to the principle of the Bill, but we wish it to be well considered by the committee to which, of course, these measures must be referred. When the Bill comes back from the committee it will, I have no doubt, be in such a form that it will receive the best consideration of this House. There were a number of omissions from the Bill which its promoters promised to remedy. There were certain sections, one or two referred to by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Bryson), which, of course, must disappear, or be very much modified. Under these circumstances, and as these modifications and amendments cannot be made in this House but must be made in the committee, I think the best course to follow is to allow this Bill to receive the second reading and be referred to the committee.

Mr. HAGGART. With the permission of the House I desire to reply to an observation made by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) in which he stated that I said the Bill gave exclusive control of the river to this company in regard to navigation. I said it virtually does so. If a party has a railway round the rapids on a stream, which is navigable above and below, and has sole control of that railway, or has slides for the passage of logs, that party can make their tolls and towage so excessive over that particular portion of it as to compel parties coming down the stream to use their towage above and below that railway or improvement. This Bill virtually gives control of navigation, so far as regards the passage of logs and timber down that stream.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The best answer to that remark is the fact that you cannot give the control of the navigation of a stream to anybody. No company can possess any franchise giving right to navigate any stream.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Detroit River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 46) to amend the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Scarth.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Federal Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 52) to amend the Act to incorporate the Maskinongé and Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. Coulombe.)

Bill (No. 53) to make further provision respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Grenville International Bridge Company.—(Mr. Shanly.)

Bill (No. 63) to amend the Acts relating to the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Perley, Assiniboia.)

Bill (No. 64) To incorporate the Chatham Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return of the Report made by Professor Saunders on the question of location of the Experimental Farm in the North-West, with all letters, documents and papers referring to the several proposed locations and his recommendations in connection therewith.—(Mr. McMullen)

Return showing the number of Colonisation Companies now in existence in Manitoba and the North-West, the number of settlers they have put on their lands during the years 1885-86-87, the amount of money paid by the several companies on account of lands purchased from the Crown during the same period, the amount of money paid to the Crown on account of purchase of land from the Crown by all other parties during the same years.—(Mr. McMullen.)

A copy of Mr. Parmelee's report to the Honorable Minister of Customs regarding the desirability of making Kamloops an Outport of Entry.—(Mr. Mara.)

Return of the proceedings of the inquest held at Ste. Flavie, on 23rd September, 1887, on the body of William L. Duncan, killed on the Intercolonial Railway on the previous day, with the evidence taken at such inquest; also, any report of any investigation of the accident made by the railway authorities, or any report in connection with such accident made to the Department of Railways and Canals; and also, any correspondence had with said department relating to this matter.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Return showing the total amount of money disbursed by the Government in consequence of the North-West rebellion.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Return showing the total amount of money paid out by the Government in connection with the Liquor License Act.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Return of all reports, correspondence, petitions or documents relating to the proposed permanent building of a post office and custom house at Strathroy, including any recommendations made regarding its location, character, cost, &c.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return giving:—1. The names of all the leaseholders in the District of Alberta, North-West Territories. The number of cattle each have on their lease. The date of each latest return, showing the number. 2. Showing whether any are in arrears for rent. 3. Whether the land under the lease is good agricultural land. 4. What, if any, return has been made of the loss and suffering of cattle during the winter of 1886-87 in this district.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Return of all correspondence, petitions and reports respecting the Chippawa and Ottawa Nation Indians' claim to certain islands in Lake Erie and the Detroit River.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 3rd April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eight o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE AND AUDIT ACT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 87) to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, chapter twenty-nine of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: This Bill is for the purpose of increasing the remuneration allowed to the Auditor General and

for an amendment to the Act. When it becomes my duty to move the resolutions, I will explain more fully what reasons the Government have for introducing this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would suggest to hon. gentlemen opposite, if they would think well of it, to send some business up to the Upper House, by taking up the private Bills, of which there are seven in a position to be sent there.

Mr. EDGAR. Only unopposed Bills.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 33) to amend the Act incorporating the Hereford Branch Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Hereford Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

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

Bill (No. 35) to enable the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to run a ferry between Beecher Bay, in British Columbia, to a point on the Straits of Fuca, within the United States of America.—(Mr. Baker.)

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 43) to amend the Act incorporating the Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

Bill (No. 44) respecting bonds on branch lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Montreal Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

Bill (No. 74) to amend the Act to incorporate the Kin-cardine and Teeswater Railway Company.—(Mr. Rowand.)

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Keystone Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 80) to wind up the Bank of London in Canada.—(Mr. Mills, Bothwell.)

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Ontario, Manitoba and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

Bill (No. 83) to amend the Act to incorporate the Moncton Harbor Improvement Company.—(Mr. Wood, Westmoreland.)

THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to-morrow to consider the following resolution:—

That the salary of the Auditor General of Canada shall be four thousand dollars per annum, and that he shall be subject to the provisions of the "Civil Service Superannuation Act."

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to-morrow to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to amend the Customs Act, and to provide that the expression "value" as respects any penalty or forfeiture shall mean the duty paid value of the goods or articles at the time the offence was committed; that in cases of under-valuation of ten per cent. or more an additional duty proportionate to the percentage of under-valuation shall be collected; that no allowance shall be made for damage to sugar or other saccharine product, when the duty is computed by the polariscopic test, except that an allowance in respect of damage by salt water may be made; that when no reliable means exist by which the value of goods for duty can be ascertained, the Minister may determine the value for duty; that the system of taking bonds for the payment of duty on goods warehoused or entered for exportation, transportation or removal, or transferred from one owner to another without payment of duty, shall be abolished, and that in lieu thereof the owner of any such goods in respect whereof any infraction of the Customs laws is committed, shall, in addition to any other penalty, be liable to a penalty equal to double the duty chargeable on such goods.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

Report of the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police for the year 1887.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

WRITS FOR ELECTIONS.

Mr. LAURIER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to enquire if the writ for the election in the county of Russell has been issued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it has not.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it to be issued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be issued immediately.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that mean to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I do not like to say to-morrow.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask whether the writ for the Kent election has been issued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe it has been.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). To whom has it been addressed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think, to the last returning officer, the sheriff.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending Trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and

manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. FREEMAN. I am quite aware that before the adjournment of the House there was a feeling of impatience among the members for the conclusion of this debate. I do not know what effect the recess has had, but I am very much disposed to believe that it has not changed that feeling very much; and as I am quite in sympathy with it, I will endeavor to-night to make the few remarks I intend to make in as short a time as it is possible for me to make them. The proposition before the House I understand to be something like this, that it is not only desirable but necessary, in order to save this country from ruin, that there should be a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity made with the United States, and that the extravagant expenses of the Government should be stayed; and inasmuch as these extravagant expenses are a part of the National Policy, in order to get rid of that and the other burdens that rest upon the people, it is not merely important, but absolutely necessary, if any good is to be accomplished, that the gentlemen on the other side of the House should be put in power and the present Government displaced. While the resolution does not set this out fully, the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite have expressed it very boldly, very clearly and very distinctly. The National Policy has been the stone of stumbling, the rock of offence to hon. gentlemen on the other side. Against it they have hurled their artillery of misrepresentation, their artillery of ridicule, their artillery of every description. Indeed, no language was lacking on their part to bring that policy into discredit; and now, Sir, when seeming failure is at hand, when all the predictions of the hon. member for South Oxford seem to have failed, when all their hope is gone, they find an ally; they strike hands with a gentleman who represents himself as a Canadian. Well, Sir, he may be a Canadian born, but my experience, and it is not a very short one, leads me to this conclusion, that of all Americans, the one that this country should keep clear of is an Americanised Canadian. There are no greater enemies to this country than the men who settle down in the United States, and make, as they express it over there, their "pile," and who then come over here and treat us as if we were a poor, ignorant set of men who were unable to find our own way through the world, and who need assistance, not to make our "pile" like themselves, but to be tools by which they can accomplish their purposes. I need not remind this House of the condition of this country between the years 1873 and 1878. When hon. gentlemen opposite came into power they found a full treasury, they found the country prosperous, as they themselves acknowledge, and they found everything in a gratifying condition. What was the condition of the country in 1878? Every source of national life was obstructed, the sinews of trade and all avenues from which flows the life of the nation were obstructed or cut off, and the captain of the ship,—and I desire to remind hon. gentlemen that I come from near the salt water, where I was born and brought up, and if I use nautical expressions I hope they will pardon me—the captain of the ship, as the storm clouds gathered, indicating a storm, stood with his hands behind him helpless, with nothing to offer the people of the country but—hope. Hope is, doubtless, a very excellent thing, but my experience would lead me to this conclusion, that when you see a storm coming you must have something besides hope, for with that alone the storm will burst on the ship and captain and crew will find themselves in a terrible predicament. It was a dark day, the

year 1878, for this Dominion. I have said something in regard to it, but there was one sign that perhaps more than anything else showed the condition of the country in 1878, and that was the number of bankruptcies. No less than \$29,000,000 was, I think, the amount for which people were bankrupt that year, and during the years previous there had been bankruptcies for like amounts, and there was the same tale of bankruptcies, bankruptcies! Yes, the nation was bankrupt, she was congested at the heart, and relief had to come from somewhere. In that dark cloud, as it hung over the horizon, came a rift; and sailors are delighted when they see a rift in the cloud, for they have hope then, and there is something upon which they can found hope. That rift gave promise of a bright sky beneath. To the front came the leader of the Opposition, the old, tried friend of this country. He, with his wise statesmanship, saw that the changed circumstances on the other side of the border necessitated a change of policy and change of action here, and he said to the crew of the ship, I am ready to take charge if you are satisfied with the mode I intend to adopt to bring the vessel out of the storm safely. And the heart of the people turned to the old chieftain and they were ready to grasp his hand, and they put him at the head of the Government in 1878, and adopted the National Policy as the policy of this country. What did the National Policy do for this country? It first filled the treasury, and that is a most important thing in any country. The outlook is always dark when the purse is empty, and one of the signs of a good time coming is that the treasury becomes filled. The National Policy filled the treasury. It did very much more. It restored confidence; and what is a country without confidence, what is a man without confidence in himself, what is a community or a family or a nation without confidence? The National Policy restored confidence to the people of this country, and with confidence came prosperity. Factories started up, work was provided for the working classes, trade revived and the congestion of the heart of the nation was removed, and we stepped out with renewed prosperity—I say the heart of the nation, because I believe in the future we shall have a great nation on this side of the boundary line, a nation that will vie with the nation to the south, a nation built up on British institutions, with British principles, with British men. I say that this young nation has gone on from step to step in her prosperous career; and how do we stand to-day, notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen opposite have said? How does this Dominion stand to-day so far as regards wealth, prosperity and advancement? She stands better to-day than ever before, there is more prosperity in this country to-day than ever before, and it has been steadily advancing and gaining since the National Policy was introduced. Try this Dominion by every test which men experienced in banking, commerce and finance would apply, by those tests by which communities or individuals and great commercial corporations are tried, apply every test by which nations are tried by the men who hold the purse-strings of Europe, and under those tests this country stands to-day in a prosperous condition. We have the proof of it everywhere. There is something more the National Policy has done for us; I need not speak of the magnitude and importance of that great highway, that iron road which connects the Atlantic with the Pacific. Why, it is only a few years since the advocacy of a road across this continent would have exposed a man to the ridicule of the more sober, solid-going people of the country. I need not speak, I say, of the magnitude of this great highway or its importance not only to this country, but to the Empire; I need not speak of the herculean task which this country took upon itself when it determined to build that railway; I need not do more than quote one of the leaders of the party opposite, who said it would require the whole resources of the British Empire to build this road in ten years. Nothing

Mr. FREEMAN.

more than that statement is necessary to show the resources of this country and what it is able to do, when in less than ten years it has been able to carry out that great work, and to-day the credit of the Dominion is far higher than it was the day we determined to build the road. But hon. gentlemen opposite object to all this reasoning. They say that these are not tests satisfactory to apply. One hon. gentleman had the fortitude—I say fortitude, because I hardly know by what name to characterise it—to tell us that it was no sign of wealth when a man had money in the savings bank. I call that an extraordinary assertion and one of the most extraordinary that I have ever heard. It, Sir, is an extraordinary thing to tell men in this House that it is no sign of riches, wealth, or prosperity when a man has money in the savings bank. I contend, Sir, that it is one of the indications that this country is growing in wealth when the deposits of our people in the savings banks are larger than ever they were before, and when they have multiplied wonderfully during the last ten years. What is the wealth of a country but the savings of every individual in that country, and what are the savings of a man but what he has left after all his expenses are paid, and when he has his family supplied and everything provided for? Is it not a sign of prosperity, is it not a proof of some measure of wealth when a man can deposit a balance in the savings bank? I consider it is, Sir. We are some of us traders in this House, we understand the principles of commerce, and it is an extraordinary thing that any one should rise and tell us that we should not trust a man sooner when we knew he had money in the savings bank. Why, Sir, the idea of such a statement is preposterous. I maintain that from this the wealth of the country is manifest, but when we, on our side, boast of the wealth of the country, they tell us in opposition to that statement that we have not kept our people in the country. They say we are losing our people by emigration, that the National Policy has not put a stop to this, and that it has not brought back the million of Canadians who are in the United States. Well, Sir, the National Policy has not brought back that million of people, nor has it kept that portion of the people in the country who left since the National Policy was introduced. What did one hon. gentleman representing Prince Edward Island tell us here the other night, and in telling it, whether intentionally or not, he touched the very marrow of the question? He told us that the people were always going from Prince Edward Island to the United States, and that they would always continue to go. In that, Sir, lies the whole of the matter. People have always been going. There is not, in the memory of the oldest man in this House, a time when the people have not been going from this country to the United States. I remember forty years ago seeing in my own town, people boarding the sailing packets and going to Boston. They have been going steadily ever since, and I believe that they will continue to go, and that neither the National Policy nor any other policy will prevent them. We have been asked why they are going there. Well, Sir, they have a broader field there; but it is no reason why we should decry our country, or why we should have a poorer opinion of ourselves because there is a broader field in the United States. As well might a young man starting in business say that he could do nothing, or that he could not succeed because some person had been extensively in the business before him, or had probably been born in the business and had everything prospering around him. But that is not the stuff our young Canadians are made of. Our young men are plucky enough to say: "We will go in and we will take our share of what is going, and we will compete and contend with the older and richer men." The National Policy, while it has a tendency to restrain and keep back the people from going abroad, cannot be expected to accomplish very much in that line. The National Policy, I say,

is calculated to keep the people at home, because it provides labor for the people, and will continue more and more to give our people opportunities and advantages such as they possess abroad. In this way it will tend to keep our people at home. Now, Sir, we have also been told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we have not built up an inter-provincial trade. I suppose the object—or at least one object—which it was expected would be accomplished by the union of those Provinces was that there would be an inter-provincial trade built up between them. Statistics, Sir, are not wanting to prove that contention in this House, and I have not thought it necessary to provide myself with them, for we have had statistics here in great abundance to show just what provincial trade there is between the Provinces. I say, Sir, that if the inter-provincial trade between the Lower Provinces and these Upper Provinces is not so much as it might have been, we have to blame hon. gentlemen opposite for that. What is it that interferes most largely with inter-provincial trade, and the communication between the people of the Upper Provinces and the people of the Lower Provinces? Why, Sir, it is the continual efforts of the Liberal party to create ill feeling between the people of the Provinces below and the Provinces up here. They seem to regard it as a part of their duty, and as a part of their mission, that they shall, in as much as they possibly can, keep up a feeling of distrust and dislike between the people of Nova Scotia and the people of Ontario. They began this policy immediately after Confederation, they have been pursuing it ever since, they are pursuing it to-day, and they will continue to pursue it as long as this Dominion continues under the National Policy. I say again that it is to the gentlemen opposite and to the party opposite that we owe it, if there is not more inter-provincial trade and if there is not a better feeling of amity and friendship between the Province of Nova Scotia and the Upper Provinces than there is to-day. I will pass from that to what hon. gentlemen opposite have said with respect to the farmers of Ontario. They have told us that this National Policy has not prospered the farmers of Ontario. Well, Sir, I was very much surprised last Session when I sat in this House and listened to the doleful stories of hon. members opposite with regard to the poverty of the farmers of Ontario. Down in the Lower Provinces we were made to believe by those gentlemen who opposed the National Policy, and many did believe it, that the people up here were very rich, that they were fattening on the good things of the land and that we in Nova Scotia had to pay tribute to the farmers of Ontario for every barrel of flour that came from that Province. We were told, Sir, that the people of Ontario lived at the expense of the people of Nova Scotia. That is what they told us then, and I must say their stories had some effect on my mind, and I thought the people up here were all very wealthy, I thought they were rich and that we were poor, and when I listened to what hon. gentlemen told us about the poverty of the farmers of Ontario I was struck with amazement. I tried to call to mind some statements that I had read with regard to the prosperity of the people up here. I examined an author—or authors, as you may wish to call them, of considerable eminence and who are highly esteemed and regarded, I believe, by gentlemen opposite. I took the *Toronto Globe* of 1886 and I read in the *Globe* something that I will read to you now. It may have been read before, but it is so good that I will read it again. The following is from the *Toronto Globe* of December 18th, 1886:—

"There are many among ourselves who do not fully realize how broad is the domain they occupy, how advantageous its situation, how bountiful its resources, how fertile its fields, how favorable its climate, how substantial its progress, and how hopeful its future. . . . In extent Ontario extends over ten degrees of latitude and twenty degrees of longitude. From Lake Erie on the south to Hudson's Bay on the north, it has a breadth of seven hundred miles, and from the

Ottawa and the St. Lawrence Rivers on the east to the English River and Winnipeg on the west, it has a length of one thousand miles. Exclusive of its vast waters, which are nature's highways of commerce, it has an area of 200,000 square miles. It is larger than the six New England States, with New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Maryland, by 25,000 square miles, and larger than Great Britain and Ireland by 78,000 square miles. The portion of it south of Lake Nipissing, which is the best settled and best known, has a soil and climate not equalled by any other portion of the same area on this continent. . . . But we can allow for these and still possess a country large enough and rich enough in resources on which to develop and sustain a nation. In Upper and Lower Ontario we have room enough for a Great Britain. Its farm lands, its forests, its mines, its fisheries, its navigable waters, its innumerable water-powers—all these furnish conditions under which steady and substantial expansion is not only possible, but under which it is only to be escaped by the blunders, the crimes, or the stupidity of the people. It may be said that little progress can be hoped for in the settlement of our northern districts until communication is opened up—until highways and railways are built, over which traffic may pass, and settlers and traders come and go. That is true, but with the wealth and resources of this Province there is nothing formidable in the building of roads and railways. We have only to look back at what has been done during the past fourteen years, to be satisfied that the Government and the people of Ontario are equal to any such enterprise, and to be satisfied also that they could not make a more desirable investment of the public funds. To-day there is hardly one important section in the older districts of the Province without its railway line; the total length in operation, exclusive of the Canadian Pacific main line, from Pembroke westward, is about 4,500 miles; and towns and villages, with their local markets, have sprung into existence or have been nurtured into importance all over the country. In 1873 we had in Ontario 123 incorporated villages, towns and cities, with a population, as enumerated by the assessors, of 374,854; in the present year we have 206, with a population of 675,489. The number of townships with municipal organisations in 1873 was 406, and the population as taken by assessors was 1,049,931; in the present year we have 445, with a population of 1,143,187.

"We should like to refer to the encouragement given to the great agricultural industry of the Province, by grants of public moneys given to Agricultural Societies, to Dairymen's Societies, to Fruit-growers' Societies, &c. We might show, for instance, how the number of cheese factories in the Province increased by 223 in ten years, and the value of their annual product by \$3,213,000, and how in four years following the decade, the number of factories increased by 200 and the value of their annual product by \$2,330,000. It is enough to say that its one Chamber system, with wise and able men at the head of its affairs, with a vigilant but grateful people industriously developing its resources, Ontario to-day is the wealthiest, the soundest, the most progressive, and the best-governed commonwealth in America."

Now, Sir, that is the record given by the *Toronto Globe*, and we know how the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite contrast with this record. I put this question to the House, and I put it to myself at the time, who tells the truth? Does the *Globe*, in this statement which it sends not only throughout America but over all Europe, tell the people the truth, does it tell the Government the truth, when it says that no better investment can be made than in the railways of Ontario? Does it tell the people the truth when it says that there is no wealthier or more prosperous commonwealth in America than the Province of Ontario? Does this paper tell the truth, or do hon. gentlemen opposite tell the truth? Both statements cannot be true. There is falsehood somewhere, and I leave you, Mr. Speaker, I leave this House to judge where it is. Now, while I am reading about Ontario, I will read something about Prince Edward Island, for I am speaking now rather of the Dominion than of a single Province. We remember what the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), said the other day about Prince Edward Island. He told us that the farmers were living without hope. I think those are just his words—I could refer to them, but I will not occupy the time of the House by doing so. I do not know whether he referred to only one class of the community, but he said that if it were not for the money sent home by their sons from the other side of the line, the people would really suffer want. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a hard description of a country. I trust it is not true. At all events, it is not fully correct, and it is contrary to my ideas of Prince Edward Island. Some of our people visit Prince Edward Island every year, and the reports that they bring back of the wealth of that Province are cheering and charming. We supposed it was a garden, a second paradise, where the people could live without much labor. I will read you what the *Prince Edward*

Island Agriculturist says of that Province. This paper is the organ of the farmers, and if it told what was not true the farmers would detect it immediately, and would not suffer its statements to go uncontradicted. This is what the *Prince Edward Island Agriculturist* says :

"Prominent among the many evidences of the rapidly increasing prosperity of our farmers that we have met in the course of our ramblings during the past summer, are the numerous buildings being erected in almost every section of the Province. It is safe to say that for a number of years past there has not been such activity in building, and never in one season, in the history of the Province, have so many buildings of a superior class—much in advance of those of former times—been put up by farmers. Many of the houses built during the summer would, in size, architecture, finish and general appearance, do credit to any city in the Maritime Provinces. We are glad to note that many farmers have had to enlarge their barns, or build new ones, and that in these improvements the majority of them have kept in view the great advance made in agriculture and stock raising, and modelled their farm buildings accordingly. Thus they are evidences not only of increasing prosperity, but of a fuller knowledge of the great science of farming. The people are not only making great strides in agriculture, but they are doing so as a result of getting out of the old ruts, and moving alone with the spirit of the age. Farming to-day is not such as it was fifteen or twenty years ago, for the old methods have been completely revolutionised. The people are better off, their farms are in better heart, their buildings are more adapted to their intended purposes, improved stock graze in their broad fields, they till the soil in a very intelligent manner, and with a higher conception of the important position they occupy in life. In short, the farmers of to-day are more comfortable, better educated, and more contented and happy, than were those who preceded them in the march of life. All over the island are thrifty, intelligent, hardy communities of steady-going farmers, whose families are contented, and whose homes are models of neatness, order and comfort. The men are 'strong of arm and stout of heart,' and the women are 'pious and sensible, good mothers, helpful daughters and honest folks.' The wail of 'hard times' is seldom heard among the farmers of Prince Edward Island."

Now, Sir, I ask which of these stories is the true one? Are we to take the wail of hon. gentlemen opposite as well founded? Or are we to accept the statement of this paper, which is largely circulated among the farmers, that there is no such thing as the wail described by the hon. gentleman opposite heard in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. WELSH. What is the date of that?

Mr. FREEMAN. I read the speech of the hon. gentleman for Queen's, Prince Edward Island. He told us that the condition of the farmers of Nova Scotia was about the same as that which he described of the farmers in Prince Edward Island. Let me tell the hon. gentleman this, that if he means to say there is a wail of discontent from, and that a want of hope exists among, our farmers in Nova Scotia, he is wholly incorrect. Let me tell him that such a statement lacks every element of truth. Our farmers, it is true, are not rich; we do not expect to see very rich farmers, especially in those portions of Nova Scotia where farming is not the chief industry, but if our farmers are not rich, they are fairly prosperous, they are hopeful, and they are in a large measure, contented. At all events, they are certainly not discontented in the manner in which the hon. gentleman would endeavor to persuade us they are. Speaking of mortgages on farms, I may say that, so far as the farmers in the northern part of my county are concerned—and that is the section in which there are a great many farmers—there is hardly such a thing known as a mortgage on a farm. Except in the case where a young man has bought a farm and has effected a mortgage on it, which he hopes by his industry to pay off, there has not been a mortgage taken on any farm in that section of my county during the last ten years; and our farmers there are prosperous and happy. I will say this also, that not only are our farmers honest and industrious, not only are their homes orderly, not only are their daughters the models of all the virtues and accomplishments that adorn society, but our farmers are a sober community. In the northern district of the county I have the honor to represent, the district in which the farmers are most numerous, there has not been a single licensed dram shop known for many years. Our farmers are in-

Mr. FREEMAN.

industrious and sober, and whatever side of politics they may take, whether they be Liberals or Conservatives, they are sensible, honest, progressive men, of whom any country might well be proud. I might make here some comparisons between our farming community and that of the United States, which hon. gentlemen opposite hold up to us as a model in everything. They want us, not only to model our tariff on theirs and our trade operations, but, I suppose, to model ourselves in every respect on the fashions set by the United States. I am sure we will hesitate before doing anything of the kind. I might give you quotations from different papers in the United States, which publish most doleful accounts of the condition of the farmers in the northern States, and these would show conclusively that when hon. gentlemen opposite tell us the farmers of this country are to prosper and succeed by allying themselves with our neighbors on the other side of the border, and when they point to the farmers of the northern portions of the United States as a sample of the success that is to be expected from a union with that country, they are merely trifling with us; they are not dealing honestly or fairly by the farmers of this country. Another charge which hon. gentlemen opposite make is that we have increased the debt of the country. Well, our debt is a pretty large one and some of our friends in the Lower Province, when they see the figures, say: Well, I wish we had a little of it; I would like very well to have a year's interest on it. It is a very heavy debt, no doubt, and I remember last Session our Ministers had a pretty hard time of it at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite, because, in some of the counties in our Province, they did not represent the debt at its full value but were some few millions below what these hon. gentlemen said it was, and what I believe it was. Hon. gentlemen opposite held up the Ministers as being unworthy of confidence, as having committed a great blunder, as having been guilty of a great sin, and it struck me they were going it a little too strong. It struck me they were forgetting their own conduct with regard to the debt. They charge this Government with saddling this country with \$220,000,000 debt, and they hold that the people must get rid of this Government which was so improvident. But how does this matter of the debt stand? Looking into it a little I find that it was not all incurred by the present Government. I find that, during the administration of these hon. gentlemen opposite—I examined the figures, and at first I could not believe it; I turned the book first one way and then the other way, and I said, is it possible that these gentlemen ever saddled the country with any debt; it was something that bothered me, but I found that it was actually true they actually brought this country \$40,000,000 in debt during their administration of five years. Why did they not tell this to the people? Why did they not tell the people of Nova Scotia: We involved you in debt to the extent of \$40,000,000; we expended \$40,000,000 during our term of office? Why did they not tell the people that, out of the whole debt, \$109,000,000 was incurred as the result of Confederation and of the transference of the debts of the Provinces to the Dominion? If they desired to be honest and straightforward, why did they not let the people understand this, why did they not tell the people the true amount for which the present Government should be blamed or condemned? Before charging dishonesty against members on this side of the House, those hon. gentlemen should first get their own skirts clean, and should see that they themselves are doing the honest and honorable thing. Now, there is a consideration in regard to this debt. As we hear it spoken of from platform and on the hustings, we imagine that it is something that might have been got rid of and that was not at all necessary. That is the idea which the people have in regard to it; but let me ask, what bearing does the debt of

the country have upon the prosperity of the country? I say that the debt of the country is intimately connected with the prosperity of the country, and, if the hon. gentlemen opposite object to this statement, I would ask them to point out or to put their fingers upon the public work which has been undertaken with the money for which this debt has been incurred, to tell us what public work they would not have engaged in, what railway they would not have built, what canal they would not have deepened, what public building they would not have erected? Let us know where they would have saved this money they speak of. But they tell us nothing about this. I suppose they would not have built the Pacific Railway. I suppose, if they were in power, they would not have built that road which has given us the position we have to-day of having this railway, bringing the products of Asia across the continent of America for shipment to Europe; enabling the people of Asia to shake hands across this continent with those of northern Europe. Would they have built that railway if they had continued in power, or what would they have done? I venture to say, when they make a full explanation in regard to this matter, it will not be satisfactory to the country. Now, there is a statistician, who I believe has some weight in Europe and in America, in this country and in Britain. I think he is a man who is relied upon by most people, I refer to Mr. Mulhall. He says:

"The expenditure in our colonies for railways, canals, harbors, drainage and other productive works has been most beneficial, the colonists borrowing at 4 and 5 per cent. and increasing the public wealth in a far greater degree."

Mr. Mundella, member of the British Parliament, an eminent political economist, said, in 1886:

"A debt incurred for the purpose of constructing reproductive works was a very different thing from a debt incurred for aggressive wars. There was no doubt it was an immense advantage to a new country to have an abundant means of transport. There was a tendency in England to undervalue the importance of railways in the colonies and to overestimate the colonial debts. He believed the money lent to our colonies was perfectly secure and well laid out. Every effort ought to be made to encourage the colonies to develop their magnificent resources."

That is what this gentleman says about the expenditure on railways, and there is much more to the same effect. I say that the debt for which this country is responsible is a debt which has been well incurred, a debt which has been incurred for works which are highly productive, and which have contributed largely to the welfare and prosperity of this country. These are some, but not all, of the objections that hon. gentlemen make to the National Policy, and the grounds upon which they condemn the National Policy. As a remedy, as they say, for the ills which afflict this country, they will have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Well, there seems to be a good deal of difference in what these hon. gentlemen understand by unrestricted reciprocity. Sometimes it is called commercial union and sometimes it is called unrestricted reciprocity, and, if the speeches of these hon. gentlemen are taken up and examined, you will find that they differ very widely in their understanding in regard to the matter. It is, however, the breaking down of the tariff wall between the two countries, according to whichever view you take, and they say that great wealth and great prosperity is to come to this country in consequence of our having the privilege of selling our products in the United States markets. As they contend, it is simply to obtain the benefit of selling our raw products to the United States, to sell to a country that produces everything which this country produces, which produces sufficient to sell a large quantity to foreign customers, and it is from this that great benefit is to accrue to us. They say that when this tariff wall is broken down the farmers are to save two millions of money, which they now pay into the United States treasury for the goods they send in there, and, at the

same time, they dwell upon the statement that we are to give dollar for dollar for all we get from the United States—that, while we are to get great results, great riches and great wealth in consequence of this unrestricted reciprocity, the United States are to have equal gain with us, dollar for dollar. They have not told us whether this is to be *per capita*, or whether the 60,000,000 of people on the other side are to receive one dollar for every dollar the 5,000,000 of people on this side get; but if it is to be *per capita*, I do not see where the money is to come from that is to so greatly increase the wealth of both countries? I thought I could see this shrewd, clever Mr. Wiman, who has gone about Wall-street, where money is made very easily, and generally out of some other people's losses—I thought I saw this shrewd Americanised Canadian reading the speech of the hon. gentleman, especially the part in which he says: We are not beholden to them; we are going to give dollar for dollar. I imagine Mr. Wiman chuckling, and saying to himself: "Did you ever know an American to give a dollar for anything less than a hundred cents?" Let me tell you, that in any treaty you make with the Americans they will take care to get a dollar and a half out of you for a dollar, instead of a hundred cents. Why did they abrogate the Treaty of 1854? Because they said they did not get the lion's share. This country contended at the time—at any rate, it was the feeling of the Maritime Provinces—that they were getting rather the better of that treaty, and I thought that was the universal opinion until I heard the contrary here. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been telling us how greatly the American people were wronged by that treaty, how much money we were making out of it, and what great fools the Americans would be if they would have anything to do with us on the same terms again. I believe they had the best of that treaty, and we have had it from their own mouths that the reason they refused to continue it was that they hoped to drive us into asking for political union with the United States. Now, let us suppose that this union is effected, and that we get this \$2,000,000 from the Americans for the benefit of the farmers of Ontario, how are we going to give that amount back? Remember, hon. gentlemen opposite say that we have to send our manufactures into their country, that for every dollar they displace in manufactured goods here we are to displace a dollar on the other side; and one hon. gentleman grew eloquent over the idea that Canadians could hold their own in that part of the world. As to that I dissent from that hon. gentleman. Just as he was getting up into the clouds with this grand idea of what Canadians were doing and could do abroad, he seemed to get paralysed, and he came down like some lofty bird under whose wing the marksman has shot a bullet, and said: "But when I come to my own business, I do not know whether I can hold my own or not." I think he might well say that. In manufactures this country can never hold its own with the Americans; it is ridiculous to suggest that we can. They would flood this country with manufactures, and if the people of this country, for the sake of getting their raw products into the United States, are willing to let the Americans come here and overwhelm and destroy our manufacturing industries, let us know it; but I believe they will never listen to any such suggestion. But some hon. gentlemen have spoken of the great wealth that lies under our soil, in our great mines. When one hon. gentleman was describing that wealth, I was reminded of a story I heard of a young man who had left his home in the country, and went abroad and saw great and marvellous things. When he returned home he was telling his brethren what he had seen. He found them very credulous listeners, and he soared higher and higher, and at last said: "Why, in the interior of one island I was on, there were mountains of silver and rivers of gold, and all you had to do was to go in and help

yourself." When the hon. gentleman was describing this country, I thought that he would come to the mountains of silver and rivers of gold; and it is this wealth, I presume that we are to give the Yankees. Let us suppose that it is, how are they to get the wealth? Is there any process by which either Canadians or Americans can take our mines and our lands, and remove them across to the other side of the line? I trow not. If the mines are to be worked, if the lands are to be cultivated, and if we are not developing our own resources, I suppose the Americans will have to come across and dig our mines and tickle our soil. If we have lost an immense sum of money, as we have been told, by the one million of people who have gone from us to the United States, what will the Americans lose if they send five millions of the people of the United States into this country in twenty-five years, as Mr. Wiman says they will? Why, Sir, the debit will be all the other way. We debit them with everything, and give them no credit for anything. How are they to reap any advantage? Simply by taking our minerals and produce to the United States and getting a commission by shipping them to foreign countries. Why, Sir, if we Canadians know our privileges, as intelligent, industrious and far-seeing people, as I think we are, we will develop our own mines and tickle our own lands and ship our produce to foreign lands ourselves. We will not ask these American to come in and be our factors and agents in this matter; we will let them stay and develop their own mines and tickle their own lands. There is something else involved in this question—there is a loss of revenue; and Mr. Wiman in his pamphlet says there is no question but that the manufactures of the United States will displace a very large quantity of manufactures that come here from England; and as he is the man who has originated all this wisdom, I suppose we should take his word. If that is the case, in addition to the \$7,000,000 that we have to provide for, there will be three or four or perhaps seven millions more, and how is this deficiency to be made up? Hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavored in a way of their own to show how this can be done, but they have dealt with it in generalities; they have not attempted to come down to hard pan, and as they attempted to grapple with it, I thought of a man with St. Vitus' dance among sharp-edged tools—he stood away off for fear of getting cut. In that way they were dealing with the manner in which this \$7,000,000 was to be made up—we say it will be nearer \$14,000,000. Only one hon. gentleman opposite really attempted to deal with this matter honestly. When, however, he came to touch upon direct taxation he was reminded by an hon. gentleman near him, that they would have none of that in his Province, and he dropped it just as he had dropped commercial union for unrestricted reciprocity on a hint given him by one of his friends. I say hon. gentlemen opposite have dealt with the question in generalities, and have not shown how they are going to provide the \$7,000,000 of deficit in the revenue. We have been told that increased trade will do it. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that we would spring into a better position in a day, and that our wealth would be increased. That reminds me of the old tale of Sinbad the Sailor. It will not do, however, to give us nothing but generalities in dealing with an important question of this kind, one affecting the very vitals of the country. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) after he was driven off the direct taxation remedy, jumped at the expenditure and said that by retrenching the expenditure they would be able to save millions. The hon. gentleman, also, told us how he was going to save. He was going to stop further public works. Here is very significant language used by the hon. gentleman:

"If we admit it is not possible to readjust our tariff, and that it is not possible to supplement that loss by increased revenue from other sources which undoubtedly it is possible to do, if we admit that for the

Mr. FREEMAN.

sake of argument, we are still warranted in saying that it is possible to go back to the expenditure of 1861 and that we would have revenue enough without any change in the tariff even with unrestricted reciprocity."

Then we are told very distinctly by the hon. member for South Oxford that this Government could not retrench. He believed the Government were in a position that it was impossible for them to retrench, they had run so far with extravagant expenditures, that they could not now retrench, and if the revenue was to be obtained there must be retrenchment, and if retrenchment was necessary it must be made by hon. gentlemen opposite, who must therefore come into power. That is just what those hon. gentlemen want,—there is the whole thing. They think Mr. Wiman will help them to that position; but Mr. Wiman, a keen Americanised Canadian will have them in a place where they will not have much to say about the matter, for he will be master of the situation. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says:

"Now, would it be possible for us to effect retrenchments? We who have run up our expenditure from \$13,486,000 in 1868 to \$36,000,000 in 1887; we who have increased our expenditure four times as fast every year as the population has increased, is it possible to retrench in this country? Well, Sir, if it is not possible to retrench, it is not possible to avert ruin; if it is not possible to retrench, the country has got to go to the dogs; if it is not possible to retrench in this country, we may as well give up the case—the whole case. Now, I hold that it is possible. I will tell you where you might effect some retrenchment. You might abolish that sum of all political villainies, the Franchise Act, and you would save \$400,000 at one stroke, and you would also save your character, and your consciences would be clearer."

The hon. gentlemen opposite talk as if we had no conscience. The party of purity has the conscience. I would express my dissent by using the old Scotch saying: "ma conscience." The hon. gentleman continued:

"You might get along with a little less expenditure on public works and buildings. I believe that in the United States, with all its wealth, there are about 80 cities only where they have public post offices. They only give post offices to large commercial cities such as New York and Buffalo."

So we are better off than the United States. The hon. gentleman will no doubt say it is all very well to build post offices in Toronto, but no post office buildings are required down by the sea. They can be placed in the corner of a house. He goes on to say:

"They do not go into the business of building little \$3,000 post offices as bribes to the people; they have not got so low in the scale of humanity as that."

Every public work in the Lower Provinces is called a bribe.

"Well, we might save very largely in the expenditure on public works and buildings; we might cut it all off, the whole thing, lock, stock and barrel."

The hon. gentleman was getting religious—and I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will not pick fun any longer at me on this account. If he intends to make this another-world matter he had better change his course a little, I think. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite this: members in the western part of the Dominion have got the Canadian Pacific Railway built, the canals enlarged, and a network of railways over the country, and they are not going to put us in Nova Scotia off by telling us that they are not going to allow any more subsidies to railways or other public works. What do they mean by telling us that they are going to save \$7,000,000 of revenue in order to give the farmers of Ontario two millions for their horses and barley? No, our Nova Scotian people will never listen to such an arrangement; and I think hon. gentlemen opposite have forgotten themselves a little, for they do not always speak so plainly as to what they intend to do when they get into power. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has told us that this sad, this union project, is going to help us in Nova Scotia, and particularly the fisher-

men. I do not wish to be considered discourteous, and I listened to the hon. gentleman's speech with a good deal of interest. I knew his long and successful experience in mercantile life, his long connection with the political party with which he is associated, the fact that he had held a seat in the Government, and his long experience in all matters connected with this country, and I therefore expected to gain a great deal of information from the hon. gentleman's speech, and that I would be ready to say "amen" to his speech. But I was astounded as I listened to his speech. I was not astonished that the hon. gentleman expressed great sympathy for the fishermen. I believe, Sir, that the fishermen are deserving of his sympathy. I believe, Sir, that there is no class of men in Nova Scotia who have brought more grist to his mill than have the fishermen, and I believe he owes them a very large share of sympathy. I am glad to see that he feels sympathy with the fishermen, and I hope, Sir, that all that sympathy has not some other object besides that of helping the fishermen. He told us, among other things, that the fishermen had but one market for their fish, while he said that we had no other place to ship our fat mackerel to. That was very true. I have no complaint to make about that, for any man who knows anything about the fish trade in the Provinces, will admit it. But he went further than that. He said it was the only market we had for our fish, that the fishermen would be vastly benefited if they had this free market, that consequently the fishermen were suffering from the lack of this market, and that they were unable to build any vessels, and that there was no encouragement for them to build vessels to fish in when they had no market for their fish. He described the fishing business in Nova Scotia as in something the same condition that the farming interest was represented to be in by the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies.) Now, Sir, I thought when I heard the hon. gentleman's speech that I had heard something different from him or "of him." I did not hear it "from him" but I heard something "of him," with regard to his views, on this fishery question, and I remembered that I thought his views as a statesman then were different from those he enunciated in this House so recently. They were made at a time when he hoped—I will not say "hoped," but expected—to occupy the position of Minister in this Dominion, and when upon him would devolve, to a very large extent, the mapping out of the policy of the Dominion with regard to the fisheries of Nova Scotia. I did not expect that his opinions as they were expressed at that time would be found to be different from those entertained by him now. What was the hon. gentleman's opinion in 1872? Let us hear what Mr. Jones, of Halifax, said—as his utterances are reported here in this book, which contains the parliamentary debates of this Dominion for 1872. Mr. Jones said, among other things:

"The last speaker had referred to the remarks of his colleague from Halifax respecting the advantage the treaty would have conferred upon the fishing trade of Nova Scotia had it been in operation last year. He stated that in that case Nova Scotia would have saved between \$500,000 and \$300,000 on the duties on herrings and mackerel which had been sent to the United States. He (Mr. Jones) held in his hand the Trade and Navigation Returns for the past year, which he presumed were tolerably accurate. He found from this document that the total amount of pickled fish, herring and mackerel and alewives—sent to the United States last year was 47,000 barrels, which at \$1 a barrel would be \$94,000 instead of \$300,000 as claimed by the hon. gentleman opposite."

Now, Sir, anyone will know that that small quantity of fish did not to any extent whatever represent the quantity of fish that was shipped from Nova Scotia, and therefore it overthrows the idea that the United States at that time, or any other time, was the only market that we had for our fish. The hon. gentleman also said:

An hon. MEMBER. Louder.

Mr. FREEMAN. The hon. gentleman if he cannot hear had better come over on this side. We will not mark you

too much if you come over. I think you want to be here. But to continue, the hon. gentleman for Halifax said:

"The hon. member for West Durham, the other night speaking on the point, had hit the nail on the head. He stated that the reason why American fishermen opposed the treaty was that Gen. Butler had gone to Gloucester and harangued them, telling them that now was their time to wrest from Congress what they had long wanted, namely, a system of bounties and the bonding of their supplies. That was the sole cause of their outcry against the treaty, and the Minister of Justice knew it very well and he (Mr. Jones) had grave apprehensions that such a policy would be adopted by Congress."

That was, that as soon as the Washington Treaty came into effect the Congress of the United States would give a bounty to the American fishermen in order to keep our fish out of the market, and which would be a direct disadvantage to the fishermen of Nova Scotia.

"Of course, they would not do so while the treaty was pending, but when this Parliament accepted the treaty then would be their time to grant bounties to their fishermen and to allow the bonding of their supplies. And they were right enough from their point of view, because they argued if you give those people the water they will soon own the land."

"If we give the Americans the water they will soon own the land." I beg the House to remember that, as the sentiment of the hon. gentleman; and if it was true in 1872 so it is true to-day. When they ask us to throw down the customs barriers between this country and the United States, when they ask us to throw down everything we have in this country at the feet of the Americans, and when the Americans have the trade of this country, as would be the case if they had the waters of Nova Scotia, they will very soon have the land, and they will very soon have the country as their own. But the hon. gentleman says more than that:

"Under those circumstances he felt as a representative of Nova Scotia that however anxious he might be for the establishment of reciprocal trade relations with the States on fair terms, he was not willing to give the United States everything that we had to offer as an inducement for reciprocity. If we gave them permission to fish in our waters we put them in competition with our own fishermen, and reduce the value of their fish. He stood here not to represent one country or one province, but the whole interests of the Dominion (hear, hear), and in that capacity he would feel it his duty to vote against the ratification of the treaty."

I might quote further remarks of the hon. gentleman all tending to the same thing. In one place he says:

"We will lose more by the competition of those American fishermen in our waters than we would gain by the reduction of the duty."

And to show the feeling of the party of which the hon. gentleman was a leader and in which he was a recognised authority, I will read to you what the *Chronicle* said on this subject. The *Chronicle*, as you will remember, is the leading organ of the Liberal party in Nova Scotia, and I claim that no one has any right to separate the principles of this party. There are only two parties in the Dominion, the Conservative and the Liberal party, and the Liberal party is the same thing in Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario and all over the Dominion, and what is said by it in one place should be said by it in other parts of the Dominion. This paper says:

"Sir John has peculiar claims upon England's gratitude. He has helped the Home Government to complete the national degradation by the Washington Treaty."

The Washington Treaty that gave us free markets for our fish was the degradation of the country, according to this paper. Then it says:

"It is the duty of the press to speak out boldly on the question, to separate itself from being a party organ, and to look at the Washington Treaty in its relation to the welfare of the country. The treaty, if carried out, will prove most disastrous to Canada, and will necessarily lead to annexation."

They feared annexation very much at that particular time,—

"There is nothing left for them (the Americans) to ask for except the cession of Canada. It is no wonder that, under these circumstances, the proclamation of the treaty by President Grant should have been made

part of the national celebration of the 4th of July. A traditional triumph of the United States over her old enemy, has added to it this year a substantial victory which gives her more advantages than she was able to secure by the war of 1812."

Now, Sir, there is a great deal more of just that kind of reading. It says:

"We are safe in saying that no measure has ever done so much to weaken the already frail tie of allegiance to the mother country on the part of the colonies, as the consummation of the Washington Treaty. We have been called upon before to-day, either through the selfishness of Downing-street or the stupidity of former commissioners, to make unnecessary and unjustifiable concessions to the Americans. * * * We should be unworthy of the name of British colonists and of the traditions of liberty which Britons are supposed to carry with them wherever they may pitch their tent, if the disregard shown to our constitutional rights and trade interests, had failed to arouse a spirit of resentment and indignation within our breast."

This is what that paper said about the Washington Treaty, because the Americans had the privilege of fishing in our waters. Now, under this treaty, we are to get great wealth, our fishermen are to prosper by letting the Americans come into our waters again. I contend that this is a change of base which I did not expect from the hon. gentleman, and I feel exceedingly sorry that he should have deemed it necessary, in the exigencies of his party, so to stultify himself, and so completely to renounce the opinions that he held at that time and to adopt principles exactly opposite. Now, I hold that the commercial union that is now proposed, this breaking down of tariff walls, would be most disastrous to Nova Scotia. I hold, just as the senior member for Halifax held, that we are going to lose far more than we could gain by having a free market in the United States, and allowing the American fishermen to come into our waters—we would lose double as much by that transaction as we could gain. The hon. gentleman knows well that instead of the American market being the only market for our fish, the West Indies are the market for our codfish. The fishermen of Nova Scotia are not all employed in catching mackerel and herring, very much the larger portion are employed in catching codfish, and they send codfish to the United States only when the catch falls short there. I remember seasons when the Americans sent us fish to Nova Scotia to be shipped to the West Indies, but the West Indies have been our market ever since the hon. gentleman and myself were young men, and Halifax is to-day the rich city that it is because of her fishery trade with that country. Now, with regard to the United States fish market, let me say that during the Reciprocity Treaty the average price of fish that we sold to the United States was lower than it has been since. The hon. gentleman told us of a schooner that went to the United States with a cargo, I think, of 800 barrels of mackerel, and he led us to suppose that in consequence of the duty, the fishermen got scarcely anything for their year's work; he told us that they got \$30 a-piece out of that cargo. Well, he does not tell us how many fishermen there were to share the money, and, therefore, you can make no estimate of what the fish really sold for. The prices taken from the Boston Fish Bureau at the time, probably, when that vessel was there, do not warrant any such statement as that, and we can only come to the conclusion that the fish he refers to were spoiled fish, certainly they were not No. 1 mackerel. Now, I find that the average price of mackerel from 1854 to 1866 was from \$12.84 to \$18.90—those were the years of the Reciprocity Treaty when our fish went into the Boston market free of duty. I find that from 1867 to 1873, when we had to pay duty, the price of No. 1 mackerel was from \$13.31 to \$23. You will see that a larger price was obtained between the Reciprocity Treaty and the Washington Treaty, notwithstanding that we paid the duty, than was obtained during reciprocity, or during the time of the Washington Treaty. The price of mackerel as given by this Bureau of Statistics, from 1874 to 1885,

Mr. FREEMAN,

was from \$9.29 to \$19.21, still lower than the years in which we paid a duty. I contend, therefore, that if the prices of past years are to be the criterion of what prices will be in the future, and they have been taken as the criterion throughout this discussion, then I hold that we gained in our prices for fish by having to pay a duty on it, and the last year carries out that idea. Last year the prices of mackerel in the United States were higher than they had been for a number of years. Now, Sir, I say that these facts lead me to believe that under unrestricted reciprocity the interests of our fishermen will be injured. Hon. gentlemen opposite must get into power in order to carry out this scheme of unrestricted reciprocity. Well, the people have a voice in that; the people have had something to say about it all along. In 1872 the Government appealed to the people to endorse the National Policy. Hon. gentlemen opposite prophesied during four years that the country would come to ruin under the National Policy. But when they came before the people with their prophecies, the people said to them: We think you had better stay where you were relegated in 1873, and let the present Government still carry out the National Policy. Again, in 1887, the people told them: While we commend your aspirations and ambitions, you had better remain on the Opposition benches a little while longer. And before these hon. gentlemen will be able to carry out their schemes of retrenchment, before they will be able to cut off our subsidies to railways and other public works, they must again go to the people. They told us that they had every reason to expect to be returned to power in 1887; and, considering that there was no effort possible to obtain power which they did not make, considering there was no scheme they did not work, considering they left nothing undone, which people who disregard their honor could possibly do, it is somewhat astonishing that they did not succeed. What did these hon. gentlemen do in Nova Scotia? What they did there must be ascribed to the whole party. They cannot escape responsibility by throwing the whole onus on the Nova Scotians, because the party, as a whole, is bound by its programme in each Province. In Nova Scotia they threw aside every principle that we suppose they formerly held as a Liberal party, for I pretend they had principles. I say it to the credit of the Liberals of my own Province that I believe they had principles, and that a large number of the people there who supported the Liberal party did so in the belief that the Liberal party had principles to which they vowed allegiance. But the Liberal leaders in 1887 cast aside their principles and adopted in each Province a different platform. In Nova Scotia they were repealers. There they said that the people of the Maritime Provinces were oppressed by the Ontario farmers. There they said that on every barrel of flour imported into those Provinces, the people had to pay a tax of 75 cents a barrel, or 15 cents a bushel on five bushels of wheat, which make up a barrel of flour. In that Province they were loud in abuse of the fathers of Confederation. Not even the late Hon. George Brown escaped. That hon. gentleman was held up as a man to be despised in company with every other man who had anything to do with establishing Confederation. In Ontario they told a different tale, and upheld Confederation. They trimmed their sails to every political breeze in the hope that in each Province they would catch a favoring wind. In Nova Scotia they said that Ontario was sucking the life blood out of that Province, while up here they said that Nova Scotia was living out of Ontario, and that all the breakwaters, all the public works built in the Maritime Provinces, were paid for by Ontario. What did they do in Quebec? There they erected their platform on a scaffold, and the leaders of this great Liberal party bowed low at the shrine of Riel. I have nothing to say against the sympathy that French Canadians might have for that unfortunate and mis-

guided man, but when the leaders of the party bowed down before him in order to traffic on race prejudices, they forfeited all claim to public respect and confidence. I was extremely sorry to hear an observation made respecting my Province and my countrymen. I was extremely sorry to hear it said that Nova Scotia offered herself to Mr. Blake, and that he would not buy her. I regretted exceedingly that that hon. gentleman, whom I have been taught for years to respect, whom I highly esteem—and I take the declarations of his party in reference to him and the statements of their papers, and I believe he is an honorable man—I was sorry that he was not in his place to tell us something about that offer, to tell us who offered Nova Scotia to him, to tell us how Nova Scotia was offered, and to give us some information more than the statement that Nova Scotia was offered to him. I do not know where that statement originated, I do not know at whose suggestion that insult was thrown upon us the other night, but I do not hesitate to say that I know what it was meant for, if I read what went before it, and if I read what followed after that statement. It was distinctly stated that Nova Scotia was got by corruption, by bribes from the Government, and it was meant that, if Mr. Blake had been a corruptionist, if he had been as corrupt as Nova Scotia, he would have bought Nova Scotia, and the members who now represent Nova Scotia here would not have been here. I think that is what was intended by the statement, and if that was meant, I say in behalf of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia and in behalf of the Liberal party also, that there is not one scintilla of truth in it; and, if I were not in the House of Parliament, I would describe it by some other word. I say that Nova Scotia never offered herself, and that no authorised agent of Nova Scotia offered that Province to Mr. Blake or to any other party, and the statement is an insult to Nova Scotia, and an insult that Nova Scotia will not forget, an insult that Nova Scotians, the descendants of honorable men, will a long time remember. Now, this fad would never suit this country. Germany had at one time a customs union. All the smaller States of Germany united with Prussia in a customs union, and before many years passed over the natural result came, and all the German States confederated with Prussia. Prussia swallowed them all up, and, instead of the smaller States being benefited by their commercial union with the larger State, the larger State absorbed the smaller. All the smaller States were absorbed, and had to succumb to the power of Prussia. I might give other instances, and they all go to show that, in cases of this kind, the smaller States are absorbed in the larger. There is no doubt that this is just what the Americans contemplate. Let us see what has been said by the Americans themselves in other days, when this question of reciprocal trade came up between the American and the British Governments. When the British North American commissioners went in 1866 to Washington to endeavor to secure the continuation of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, Mr. Morrell, of Vermont, who was the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, said:

"You want these commercial privileges that you talk about. Then take your seats here by the side of us and vote for them."

The Hon. Joseph Howe, at the Detroit convention, said:

"I know that it has been asserted by some, and I have heard it since I came into the convention, that if the Reciprocity Treaty is annulled, the British Provinces will be so cramped that they will be compelled to seek annexation to the United States."

These are the statements of these men, and we know perfectly well what the United States want. It wants a market for its productions. Its warehouses are overflowing with manufactured goods, and it wants the Canadian market in which to dispose of them, and under no other consideration than the opening of our market to American manufactured goods will the United States enter into a

commercial treaty with us. What did one of the leading newspapers of the United States say the other day in regard to Cuba? Discussing very fully the question of Cuba, it wound up by saying: Cuba is commercially ours now, and we are a nation of cowards or it would be wholly ours. That is the way in which they will talk about this country if this idea of commercial union is carried out. If there is a commercial union between Canada and the United States, they will say that they will be a nation of cowards, if Canada, being theirs commercially, is not theirs politically. Another feature is the fact that Mr. Wiman, who plans this whole thing, says that in twenty or twenty-five years he is going to put five millions of American people into this country. No one who has travelled over this country and has met the American propagandists can fail to know how they represent the beauties of the country on the other side of the line, the mountains of silver and rivers of gold which lie within their borders, and the great wealth which that country offers to immigrants and to anyone who will make that country his home. We know how they work upon the imaginations of the people. But, if so small a number of people can do so much, five millions of Americans in this country, who, of course, would have the right to vote—for that would be a part of the scheme—would have a much greater opportunity of influencing Canadians, and where then would be the loyal men of this country, where would they stand beside the five millions of Canadianised foreigners, agents of the American people, who could easily carry the day against us? And this would be particularly the case if Canadians manifested the same feeling which hon. gentlemen have manifested on the other side of the House. I have been astonished to hear those hon. gentlemen, in presenting this unrestricted union question to the House, talk about Great Britain and the United States in the way they have done. I have been astonished to hear them plead the cause of the United States against that of Great Britain. Mr. Wiman is a little ahead of these hon. gentlemen because he writes pamphlets, but, if instead of being loyal subjects of the Queen—as I presume they are, as they say they are, and as I have no reason to suppose they are not, except what I have heard them say in this House—if, instead of representing loyal Canadian constituencies, they were paid agents of the Americans, with American gold rattling in their pockets, they could not have represented American interests more strongly than these hon. gentlemen have in this debate. More than that, the manner in which they sneer at our loyalty, calling us sycophants and every other name of that kind they could hurl at us. If they have not done it in this House, they have had it done for them outside. They have represented us as everything that is mean and base, because we are loyal to our country, because we are loyal to Britain. Love, Sir, is one of its largest elements, if I understand loyalty; and would you condemn a man because he loved the knees on which he was dandled in infancy? Would you condemn a man because he loved the father who protected and shielded him in his growing days? If you would, then you may ask us not to love Britain. But, Sir, after Britain has nursed us in our infancy as a colony, and has stood with her fleets behind her, and has said to this great spread-eagle nation: "Hands off the little boy," are we to be twitted to-day because we love Britain? It is a new thing, Sir, that men should be twitted in this House of Commons of this loyal colony of Canada for professing their loyalty and their love for their mother country. It is a thing that will be marvelled at in other countries, and will be gloated over by the Americans who are seeking to annex this country to themselves. I am glad that this question has come up, and that the future of this country is to be decided. I hold, Sir, that when responsible government was granted to these

colonies, we put off our childhood as colonies; when Confederation was framed, the nucleus of a great nation was formed, and when this country adopted the National Policy, it was a formal declaration to the world that we had taken a great and important step towards nationhood to protect our own industries and our own labor. We have now gone on for nine years in the same direction, and if we are now to turn back, and go on our bellies, as one of the papers said the other day, and cringe to the United States, and tell them we shall go to ruin if they do not give us this treaty—I say if we are to do that, it is time that this question was put fairly before the people and settled. I am glad the question has come up, and I only hope hon. gentlemen opposite will not forget it as they did the National Policy which they espoused in 1887, when they told the manufacturers they had nothing to fear. When the hon. Minister of Finance declared that he was pleased to find that the hon. leader of the Opposition had been converted to the National Policy, hon. gentlemen opposite accepted that declaration, but they forgot it very quickly. I hope they will not forget this so quickly, and let us have the issue before the people, for I believe that in this Dominion there is an overwhelming majority of the people who will never consent to be absorbed into the United States. I believe there is an overwhelming majority of loyal people in this Dominion. I believe there is an overwhelming majority who will say with me: Let this right hand forget its cunning, let this tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if I forget thee, Oh, Britain, the home of my ancestors, under the temptation of this spread-eagle country!

Mr. BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has expressed his desire that this question should be submitted to the people, for their judgment upon it, as soon as possible. If we can judge the future by the present, I think the Liberal party will have nothing to fear. I have an announcement to make, which I know this House will hear with pleasure, that the election in L'Assomption has resulted in the return of Mr. Gauthier with an increased, or I might say, a quadrupled majority. He was elected last year by a majority of twenty-one, and this year by a majority of ninety-four. I would now ask the indulgence of the House while I make a few observations on the question under discussion. I feel as if it was my duty to congratulate hon. members who have preceded me upon the excellence of their speeches, which have been interesting and, in many cases, full of information. The resolution at present before the House is, I think, the most important that has ever been discussed since Confederation; it is so comprehensive in its character, so far-reaching in its effects, and involves so many questions that have puzzled the minds of the greatest financiers and statesmen, that I rise to speak upon it with some diffidence. It was not my intention, when the resolution was first proposed, to take any part in this debate, because I felt that the resolution was of such a character that it would meet with the acceptance of both sides of the House. It had been said on the introduction of the National Policy that it was a means to an end, that its purpose was to obtain reciprocity, and in discussing the National Policy upon public platforms, we were always met by our opponents with the remark: We are free traders whenever we can get anybody to free trade with us. In listening to the hon. member who has just taken his seat, if I were a spiritualist I would have almost thought that George Washington had returned in some sort of an angelic form; but when we come to examine the hon. gentleman's speech, we find that he was accusing members on this side of the House with sometimes suppressing truth, and who would have thought that this essence of purity would ever have forgotten and neglected the same duty himself? Why, Sir, in referring to the Provincial

Mr. FREEMAN,

debts which were assumed by the Dominion Government, he did not tell us anything about the assets which came along with the debts. He spoke of an increase of \$40,000,000 in the debt during the Mackenzie Administration, but he forgot to mention that out of the \$40,000,000 \$32,000,000 were contracted for by the Tory Administrations previous to the Mackenzie Government taking office. He also claims great effects from the National Policy, that it has done wonders for the country, and he intimates that public men and governments should not make any promises they are not able to fulfil. When we come to examine the promises made by hon. gentlemen opposite, with regard to the National Policy and their fulfilment, we find they are very wide of the mark. One of their promises was that the National Policy would check the exodus, which our opponents admitted to be going on; and, moreover, that it would be the means of bringing back those who had left the country. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), in speaking upon this question, intimated that had the National Policy been introduced ten years earlier, there would have been no exodus from Canada. I have taken the trouble to examine as to the true state of affairs in this connection. In 1870 there were in the United States 493,000 Canadians; in 1880, 717,157, or an annual increase of 22,000. In 1886 the number was 1,040,038 or an increase of 55,000 annually, being an increase of 150 per cent. as compared with the previous years under a revenue tariff. I notice that if hon. gentlemen opposite seek some good authority as to the resources of Canada they generally consult some commercial unionists. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) referred to and read part of a speech delivered by Mr. Ritchie, of Ohio. Had the hon. member completed the reading of that speech he would have found Mr. Ritchie's opinion with respect to this matter. Mr. Ritchie says:

"In 1854 a treaty of reciprocity was made between the United States and Canada, which, by its terms, was to run for a period of ten years or longer, unless terminated by either party upon a year's notice being given. The articles embraced in the schedule attached to this treaty were the products of the farm, forest, mine, and the sea. The operation of this treaty greatly stimulated the trade of both countries, whose present volume is largely due to the impetus given at that time or during that period."

The hon. gentleman also referred in somewhat complimentary terms to my esteemed opponent Mr. Wigle, in terms from which I do not dissent. He dwelt also on the loss the House had sustained by the absence of Mr. Wigle; but I think we may well say that what the House has lost the country has gained. The hon. gentleman was guilty of great ingratitude in resurrecting that old hackneyed speech and asking for a second judgment after its burial by the people of South Essex. I think at the same time he did Mr. Wigle an injustice from the fact that, if I do not mistake the resolution of which he was the seconder, Mr. Wigle has since repudiated the principles involved in that speech. At a meeting of the Conservative Association on the 12th September, 1887, he was the seconder of the following resolution:—

"This association is of the opinion that at the present time all channels of trade and commerce should be as free and unrestricted as possible, having due regard to the necessary revenues of the Government and the best interests of the Dominion, and that the freest possible commercial intercourse with all parts of the Empire, the United States and other nations would promote the best interests of the Dominion."

An hon. MEMBER. Who seconded the resolution?

Mr. BRIEN. Mr. Wigle. I thought I would refer to this matter as the hon. gentleman might have left a wrong impression on the minds of hon. members that Mr. Wigle was not in accord with advanced public opinion. The hon. gentleman also referred to the egg argument in somewhat amusing terms. I am sorry that he did not have that egg, for I am sure that if he was as apt with cracked eggs as

with disjointed arguments he would be tolerably skilful. As a representative of the people an hon. member of this House occupies, as it were, a dual character, especially when a new question comes before the House. He has to consider, first, its probable effect on his own locality, on the constituency he represents; and I will now briefly deal with that aspect of the question. I need not tell the people that in the section of the country I represent, South Essex, of the benefit that would accrue to them from the market of a city like Detroit, with a population of 150,000 people, being freely thrown open to them. Many of them have, no doubt, fresh in their memories the advantages that flowed to them from the old Reciprocity Treaty. It is no question whatever with the people in that section as to who pays the duty. Each man is well aware that if he has a horse to sell or any cattle, barley or any other produce he has to pay the duty, and instead of receiving \$100 for his horse he will receive only \$80. We have an opportunity of becoming conversant with those facts from having a personal knowledge of them. I have prepared an estimate, which I think is a very moderate one, as to the effect of unrestricted reciprocity on my locality, and the estimate will apply to the country generally. Take a farmer having a farm of 100 acres. Suppose he sold annually one span of horses worth \$200, he would profit to the extent of the duty, \$40; if he sold five head of cattle worth \$250 he would save \$50; ten tons of hay, save \$20; 300 bushels of barley, save \$20; 200 pounds of wool, save \$20, or an increase of profits amounting on the whole of the products of a hundred acre farm to the extent of \$150. There is in the county, a portion of which I represent, 430,000 acres of assessed farm land, which would give 4,300 farms of 100 acres each. Assuming that we had free trade with the United States, that would give for this county an increased profit of \$645,000 annually for farmers. In the Province generally there are 208,000 farms, and taking the increased profit it would reach \$31,200,000, which capitalised would amount to \$780,000,000. That is one class—the farmers. I need not say anything about the extent to which the fishermen and the lumbermen would be benefited, for they will be satisfied. As to the manufacturers in our section, I have a communication from a manufacturer in the town in which I live, which, with the permission of the House, I will read. He writes:

“ESSEX CENTRE, ONT., 24th March, 1888.

“DEAR SIR,—I am just in receipt of your telegram, ‘How would reciprocity affect my business.’ I have watched the debates on this question with a great deal of interest. Unrestricted reciprocity would be a boon to the manufacturing company here. We would then have the American States for our market. In fact, we have sold some as it is, because they considered the ploughs superior to their own make. If it were not for this duty line we could ship large quantities there and easily compete with the American manufacturers. We have to buy our steel in the States, because there is only one firm that makes plough steel plates, and they do not make an article to compare with the Pittsburgh make. The Nova Scotia plates are very inferior, and they charge just about as much as the Pittsburgh men, that is they add nearly as much as the duty, so that as far as they are concerned they make a harvest out of the duty business. Having to buy a good article to make good goods in Pittsburgh we have to pay the duty. Last year the Government committed the outrage of raising the duty from 12½ per cent. to 35 per cent. on plough steel plates. This was done after we had made the greater part of our contracts for the season and, therefore, could get no more for our ploughs sold. This difference ruined the business for the year. True, the Government, finding their mistake, reduced the duty to the old thing, 12 per cent., but they would not make any rebate for the money wrongfully taken from us during the year. Another point. There are about three ploughs made in Canada to one in the States, in proportion to the population of the two countries. Therefore, the competition has become so keen that the prices are cut very low, and in order to effect sales resort is had to giving long terms of credit, thus making the risks of bad debts much more. For our line of business, I would consider our institution worth 50 cents on the \$1 more than it is now if the Chinese wall was thrown down. Stand firm as a rock. The cause is right and in time must win. We are all well.

“MILNE.”

I have a telegram from the lumber firm of James Taylor & Son in my section of the country. They say:

“We think unrestricted reciprocity would be a great benefit to our business.”

I have now dealt with the farmer, the lumberman and the manufacturer as far as our section of the country is concerned and, I believe, so far as my judgment goes, and from what I have been able to find out, that it would be of great benefit to the fisherman as well. Now, as to its general effects upon the country, we all know that under the old Reciprocity Treaty that we had prosperity in this country such as we had not experienced before that treaty nor since. We know that our import and export trade increased from \$20,000,000 in 1853 to \$84,000,000 in the last year of the treaty. This is sufficient guarantee that it was a great benefit and that it was a success as far as the country was concerned. I do not wish to delay the House by going into a long list of figures in this matter as so many who have preceded me have given incontrovertible facts with regard to those things. We have had figures enough, and if we were only able to remember them I presume we would be all “figure-heads.” With your permission, Sir, I will read a report as to the progress of the country during the years between 1850 and 1860. It is written by Mr. Ward, an American, who made this report in 1862 in accordance with the desire of the United States Congress. He thoroughly investigated the resources and the progress that Canada had made and was making. In his report he says:

“During the interval between the last census and the preceding one (1850-1860), the decennial rate of increase of population in Canada exceeded that in the United States by nearly 5½ per cent.—Canada adding 40.87 per cent. to her population in 10 years while the United States added only 35.58 per cent. to theirs. She brought her wild lands into cultivation at a rate in nine years, exceeding the rate of increase of cultivated lands in the United States in ten years by nearly 8 per cent.—Canada in 1860 having added 50 acres of cultivated land to every 100 acres under cultivation in 1851, while the United States in 1860 had only added 14 acres to every 100 acres under cultivation in 1850. The value per cultivated acre of the farming lands in Canada in 1860 exceeded the value per cultivated acre of the farming lands of the United States—the average value per cultivated acre in Canada being \$20.87 and in the United States \$16.32. In Canada a larger capital was invested in agricultural implements, in proportion to the amount of land cultivated than in the United States—the average value of agricultural implements used on a farm having 100 cultivated acres being in Canada \$182 and in the United States \$150. In proportion to population, Canada in 1860 raised twice as much wheat as the United States—Canada in that year raising 11.2 bushels for each inhabitant while the United States raised only 5.50 bushels for each inhabitant. Bulking together eight leading staples of agriculture—wheat, corn, rye, barley, oats, buckwheat, peas and beans and potatoes,—Canada, between 1851 and 1860 increased her production of these articles from 57,000,000 to 123,000,000 of bushels—an increase of 113 per cent.; while the United States in ten years, from 1850 to 1860, increased their productions of the same articles only 45 per cent. In 1860, Canada raised of these articles 49.12 bushels for each inhabitant, against a production in the United States of 43.42 bushels for each inhabitant. Excluding Indian corn from the list, Canada raised of the remaining articles 48.07 bushels for each inhabitant, almost three times the rate of production in the United States, which was 16.74 bushels for each inhabitant. And as regards live stock and their products, Canada in 1860 in proportion to her population owned more horses and more cows, made more butter, kept more sheep, and had a greater yield of wool than the United States.”

Referring to this report the author, Sir Edward Watkin, the former president of the Grand Trunk Railway, a gentleman well known to hon. gentlemen in this House, says:

“Our British Government having thus allowed the treaty to expire, and having thereby damped the energies of the colonies, and excited the hopes of the protectionist and annexationist parties in the States, what are we to do?”

“In the first place Parliament should express its condemnation of the failure of the executive; in the second, its desire for peace and fraternity with the United States; and in the third, its determination to stand by the Queen’s Dominions on the other side of the Atlantic.

“What ought we to seek now to secure, in the interests of peace and civilisation?”

“1. A neutralisation of the 3,000 miles of frontier, rendering fortifications needless.

“2. A continuance of the neutrality of the lakes and rivers bordering on the two countries.

“3. Common navigation of the lakes and the outlets of the sea.

“4. An enlargement of canals and locks to enable the food of the west to flow unimpeded, and at the smallest cost, direct in the same bottom to Europe or any other part of the world.

"5. Neutrality of telegraphs and post routes between the Atlantic and Pacific, no matter on which territory they may traverse.

"6. A free interchange of untaxed and an exchange, at internal revenue duty rate only, of taxed commodities.

"7. The passage of goods in bond through the respective territories as heretofore.

"8. A common use of ports on both sides of the continent."

That statement was made nearly 20 years ago, and it is almost in accordance with the present resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), so that we find that all Englishmen do not consider it disloyal to enter into any reciprocity treaty with the United States. The latter clause is similar to the amendment of the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), and it also applies to the section of country which I have the honor to represent. At the present time there are residents in the towns along the lake shore, many brave sailors, captains and mates of vessels, second in courage to no men in the Dominion of Canada, who might be useful citizens if they were retained in Canada, but in consequence of not being able to obtain situations, owing to the destruction, almost, of our shipping, they have to seek work in the United States, although it does not have the effect, as hon. gentlemen opposite would seem to think, of making them disloyal, because they still live under the British flag and are loyal subjects of the Queen. Now, I will not contrast the condition of Canada at different periods, as that has been so frequently done by hon. gentlemen from this side of the House, but I will refer to one or two points. With regard to population, I think I have made a fair and moderate estimate. I have taken, as a basis, our population in 1861, and the natural increase of births over deaths. In the Australian colonies that increase is $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., or at least 25 per 1,000, and in order to maintain the position under all circumstances, I have placed our increase at 20 per 1,000, annually, as increase of births over deaths, which will be at the rate of 2 per cent. The population of the old Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, in 1861, was 3,000,000. Then our population in those Provinces should have been, in 1871, 3,708,000. Adding to the Dominion the population of Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, Manitoba, and the North-West Territories, 200,000, which is, I think, a little under the mark, we should have, in 1871, a population of 3,908,000. Add to this from the same standpoint the natural increase, and we should have, in 1886, a population of 5,080,000; whereas, according to the statistics furnished by the Government, our population in 1886 did not exceed 4,725,000. Then we have lost of our natural increase, 355,000. Add to this sum the immigrants we have received, according to the Government figures, 824,000, and we have, under these circumstances, 1,179,000 to account for, and the question is, where have they gone, and what is the cause of their departure? Sir, if a remedy can be found which will retain these people at home, and, if possible, bring back those that have gone away, I think it should be adopted, and I believe that unrestricted reciprocity would have that effect. We all remember the great promises that were made of a home market under the National Policy. Well, this home market has not been found for the farmers. In some cases, I believe, there is a slight increase in the population of the towns and cities, but it has been at the expense of the country, so that there is really no home market whatever. It has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite that under unrestricted reciprocity our cattle trade with England would be destroyed. I will not presume to give you an opinion on that point myself, but I will give you the statement of a gentleman whom all will admit to be fully competent to speak upon it, and that is Mr. Valancy Fuller, a stock dealer. I will not detain the House by reading a long letter of his upon this point, but in substance he says that this new arrangement will not affect the sale of cattle in England as our quarantine regu-

Mr. BRIEN.

lations remain the same. Now, it has always been claimed by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me on the opposite side of the House, that the National Policy has benefited the laboring men. Instead of using any argument of my own, I will mention a circumstance that occurred to my personal knowledge, which shows the effect it has upon laboring men near the border who are in frequent communication with the people across the line. A young man who was employed as a painter in the village of Leamington, went to Detroit and bought an article which cost him \$1. Coming back over the river, he had to pay a duty of 30 or 35 cents. He went to his home, and a few days afterwards a painter came from the city of Detroit and offered to work for the same employer at a much less rate of wages than this young man could obtain himself, so that the young man had to come down to the standard of the American laborer or else lose his situation. That was the effect upon this laboring man. It not only reduced the purchasing power of what he earned, but it gave him no protection. Indeed, public money has been spent in the past in bringing laborers over from Europe to compete with our own laborers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Times are much better in Canada than in the States, then?

Mr. BRIEN. That only shows the principle. It is a special case, it shows what they can do. Now, the question of interprovincial trade has been frequently referred to; the Minister of Marine has referred to it at great length, and I am glad to say that I think we can produce evidence of the benefit of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, by taking the result of inter-provincial trade. What has been the principal cause of the increase of inter-provincial trade? Why, Sir, simply throwing down the barriers between the various Provinces which formerly had a tariff of their own. Unrestricted reciprocity is a continuation of the same argument. It had the effect of increasing the inter-provincial trade, and I am sure that trade will not stop on account of the flag. Canada is a long, narrow strip of country 4,000 miles in length, situated in nearly the same latitude, and hence a similarity of climate and of productions. Well, we must have variety of products in order to secure an exchange of trade, because two individuals having the same classes of goods to export are not likely to trade so freely with each other as those having dissimilar classes. Variety is the basis of exchange and exchange is the basis of commerce, and I know of no means to meet the case except that set forth in the resolution now before the House. The Government may tunnel mountains, they may bridge rivers, and annihilate space by means of the telegraph, but they will find it impossible to overcome the difficulties of climate. The hon. the Minister of Marine referred to the natural market. With regard to that question, there are many things to be taken into consideration. A natural market is one in which we can sell at profitable prices, and from which we can obtain goods in exchange as return cargoes. The hon. gentleman also referred to the West Indies, and to the increase in provincial trade as compensating advantages to the Maritime Provinces for being debarred from their natural market. On this point, I will read what the late Mr. Howe has said, and Mr. Howe, I think, is an authority whom no one would be likely to question. Mr. Howe, according to a report in the *Halifax Chronicle*, said:

Our neighbors may have their faults and their misfortunes, but there they are 34,000,000 of them divided from us by the Bay of Fundy as by a street—they on the one side and we on the other. Where will be our market for coal for ever? In the United States. Where will be the market for our grindstones? In the United States. Where will be our market for plaster, and fish, and our potatoes? In the United States. Here are five great staples, and there is our market."

That ought to be accepted as good authority. He goes on to state:

"The man with a shallop of coal goes to the United States; he wants a freight to return with, and you say to him: 'You shall bring back flour from the United States, but you must turn your shallop up the St. Lawrence and make a twenty-five or thirty days voyage to Quebec.'"

Hon. members also differ, as did the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Porter), with regard to what the result of the policy embodied in this resolution would be. The hon. member for Perth intimates that we would likely become hewers of wood and drawers of water, while the hon. member for Huron claims that we produced in Canada as fine a type of men as exist on the face of the earth. There is a contradiction somewhere. I thoroughly agree with the hon. member for Huron that Canada does produce the highest type of man to be found in the world, just as I believe it is not the country which presents the greatest facilities for man's livelihood that develops the highest type. The highest type, on the contrary, is found in those countries where pluck, energy and skill are required to overcome adverse influences and consecrate nature to men's own use. If Canada produces a superior type of man, how is it that Canadians will not be able to compete with their American neighbors when they will have just as cheap labor and all the raw material at hand? It seems to me somewhat strange that while hon. gentlemen opposite are willing, if we can judge by their past utterances, to let the farmer seek his market where he will, they will not allow him to buy where he will, but insist on giving control of the whole market of this country to the manufacturers. That the interests of the farmers, the lumbermen and the fishermen should be sacrificed to protect the interests of the manufacturers does not appear on its face to be just. With regard to our manufactures, our exports have within the last few years been on the decrease, instead of the increase. A great deal has been said about this cry of disloyalty. It does seem to me that, in this case, that cry is quite uncalled for; and I would not insult the constituents of hon. gentlemen opposite by insinuating that they are disloyal when there is no cause for disloyalty. When this question is being discussed, I have always in my mind what the historian Hallam says. I hope it does not apply in this case. He says: "Patriotism and loyalty are too frequently the pretense of the hypocrite, and the plea of the designing politician." The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Baird) gave us quite a lecture on this question, but I think if he were reminded of the past, he might take a little of the lecture for himself. He did not know how to manifest his loyalty sufficiently, but the hon. gentleman occupies here a unique position; and if we are to judge from the past, all he need do would be to visit his returning officer, and, with equal justice, that functionary might appoint the hon. gentleman to any position he chose and thus give him an opportunity to sacrifice his life by accepting a position in the British Army or the British Empire. Let us turn back to 1869, and we will find some interesting reading. In the speech of the late Hon. George Brown, that hon. gentleman, when speaking about the demand made in 1869 to negotiate a treaty on a basis somewhat similar to that laid down in the resolution before us, said:

"More than one effort was made by the late Government (Macdonald-Cartier) for the renewal of the old treaty between 1866 and 1869. In 1869 formal negotiations were entered into with the American Government and the *projet* of a treaty was presented for discussion. The negotiations continued from July, 1869, to March, 1870. The *projet* included the cession for a term of years of our fisheries to the United States; the enlargement and enjoyment of our canals; the free enjoyment of the navigation of the St. Lawrence River, the assimilation of our customs and excise duties; the concession of an import duty equal to the internal revenue taxes of the United States; and the free admission into either country of certain manufactures of the other."

To make this stronger I will read the comments of the *Times* on Mr. Dorion's speech. The *Times* said:

"A single circumstance may show to what extent the freedom of action of our colonies may go. It is at this very moment a matter of

discussion in Canada whether a treaty of reciprocity should not be concluded with the United States; and the result of the deliberations may very possibly be the admission of the manufactures of New England into the Dominion under lighter duties than the manufactures of Great Britain. If the Canadian Ministry come to the conclusion that such an arrangement is for the benefit of their country, will the Colonial Office advise the Crown to disallow the negotiations? Assuredly not."

With regard to this discrimination against England, I took some trouble to ascertain what was the effect of the old Reciprocity Treaty of 1864 on the trade of England. From 1844 to 1850, our aggregate trade with England was \$160,000,000, or an average of \$14,500,000 a year. From 1854 to 1866, \$332,000,000, or an average of \$25,500,000 a year. This is an increase of about 80 per cent. I think that will be a full answer to the question of discrimination. Instead of decreasing our trade with the United Kingdom, I am confident that this would have a tendency to increase our trade with Great Britain, as it would induce such an era of prosperity in this country as would enable us to purchase more than we do now. Further, I believe it will also have the effect of consolidating the various Provinces, and creating a feeling of satisfaction which I think no man will doubt is required at the present time. I think any person, looking at the situation calmly, will find that there is a feeling of dissatisfaction with Confederation itself, and I think it is a duty on the part of all those who have at heart the interests and the stability of Confederation to support this resolution, if it is going to have the effect, as we believe, of consolidating and cementing together the various Provinces of this Dominion. There can be no doubt that it would have that effect, that it would give greater satisfaction to the Maritime Provinces, that it would afford a more convenient market to the people of the North-West, and that it would also largely add to the prosperity of the farmer and the manufacturer in the Province of Ontario and Quebec. We believe that such an era of prosperity would set in if this were carried out that it would have the effect not only of doubling our trade with the United States but also that with England. It certainly would have that effect if we are to judge from the past. It is time that this question should be faced and should be looked at from a serious standpoint. We aspire at some future time to become a nation, and there is no doubt that we have a good foundation on which to build a great nation if we now pursue a proper course, and I believe this is the first step to consolidate the Provinces together.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox.) Mr. Speaker, I have been somewhat surprised to hear the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) pressing this debate after the observations which were made by Sir Charles Tupper. Has the hon. gentleman got any more information from the United States Government leading him to believe that this is a more opportune time to present this matter to that Government than the time when it was presented at Washington? Does not the hon. gentleman know that the great political parties in the United States are now engaged in getting ready for the presidential election, and that the party in power is not likely to do anything to lessen its chances of success at the poll? The hon. gentleman will remember the efforts which were made by the Government of which he was a member—I refer to the Government of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie—when they sent the Hon. George Brown to Washington and made a desperate effort to get a reciprocity treaty passed. They were accused on that occasion of offering more than they were justified in offering, but, notwithstanding the liberal offers which they made to the people of the United States, the United States refused to make such a treaty. Is this agitation in the interests of the country, or is it because hon. gentlemen opposite have failed in their prophecies in relation to the Fishery Treaty and are now seeking to raise a cry in order to injure and embarrass the Government, and in that way, as the hon.

member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said, get a platform with which to go to the people? The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) drew a very doleful picture of the position of the farmers of this country. He seemed to think that, if we could get commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, it would be a boon for all our ills; our land would go up in value, we would have general prosperity, and we would be altogether much better off. I would like to compare our exports and imports in breadstuffs from 1875 to 1879 with those from 1880 to 1884. We exported of breadstuffs from 1875 to 1879, \$81,954,797; but we imported to the value of \$61,362,580, or we exported in excess of our imports in those five years, \$20,592,217, or a yearly average of \$4,118,443. Our exports of breadstuffs from 1880 to 1884, under the National Policy period, were \$90,201,639, and our imports \$16,623,986, or the total exports in excess of imports amounted to \$73,577,653, or a yearly average of \$14,715,530, as compared with a yearly average under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite of \$4,118,443, or about three and a-half times as much. I think hon. gentlemen opposite will admit that this must have been of some benefit to the farmers of the country, that, if the people of this country raised so much more produce, they must have had more money, and times must of necessity have been better. Now, the hon. gentlemen suppose that they have made a strong case showing the depression of the farmers of this country. I would like to give them a quotation from an hon. gentleman who stands high in the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, who was at one time a member of the Mowat Administration, and who was before that a member of this House. I think he has taken a great deal of pains to get the necessary information on which he bases the statement which I will read. It is a short extract from one of the five letters written by the Hon. James Young to the *Globe* in 1887. He says;

"How absurd it is, not to say unpatriotic, to speak of Canadians, especially our farmers, as being poverty stricken and suffering serious disadvantages as compared with our American neighbors. Let them go into the country districts of the various States; let them compare northern Maine and New Hampshire with our Maritime Provinces, or Michigan, Ohio, or any other State, with Ontario; let them contrast the territories of the Great North-West, and it will be found that our general prosperity does not compare unfavorably with theirs. So far as Ontario is concerned, I know no part of the United States in which the masses of the people are healthier, wealthier, or happier."

That is a statement made by a leading member of the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) also took great exception to the home market. He wanted to know where our home market was. He had a great deal to say about the tall chimneys which had been promised to us under the National Policy. I have another short extract here from the same hon. gentleman whom I have quoted before, and I think it ought to be good authority to hon. gentlemen opposite. In speaking of the markets in which we dispose of our farm produce, he classifies them as three markets—the American, the British, and the home market; and he says:

"It is the very marrow of the question to determine the relative value of these three markets to our farmers, and we are fortunately now in possession of some reliable data which may guide us in doing so. The able head of the Ontario Bureau of Statistics, Mr. Archibald Blue, in a carefully prepared statement now in my possession, makes the value of everything produced on Ontario farms in 1886 to have been close upon \$160,000,000. Adding \$140,000,000 for all the other Provinces, which must be a moderate estimate, we reach a total production for the Dominion of \$300,000,000. Assuming that one-half of these products were consumed by the farming community themselves. These various statistics will, I trust, furnish our farmers some reliable data upon which to estimate the relative value of their three chief markets. The surplus farm production of the Dominion (only one-half the total amount) for 1886, as we saw above, was about \$160,000,000, and of this our own market absorbed (to use round numbers), \$110,000,000, or 73 per cent.; Great Britain, \$22,500,000, or 15 per cent.; and the United States \$15,500,000, or 10 per cent. It is quite evident from these facts that it must be absurd to represent our farmers as dependent on a market which for twenty years has only taken 10 per cent. of their surplus and only 5 per cent. of their total annual production."

Mr. WILSON (Lennox).

Now, if the hon. gentleman will just consider this a little, I think he will find where the home market is. I think a home market that consumes 73 per cent. of our surplus products is a very good home market. England takes 15 per cent. of our surplus, while the United States takes only 10 per cent., so that we have not much to gain from commercial union. The hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Brien) who has just sat down, said that if we got unrestricted reciprocity with the United States it would be a great boon to the farmers of his district, and that it would bring back to this country many of the Canadian people who have gone to the United States. But he failed to tell us how we could bring them back. If he would only tell us that, it would be a good thing for this country, and we might make the effort. But the hon. gentleman forgets that if we have a market of 60,000,000 people to deal with, the moment we have unrestricted reciprocity with them, we shall have 60,000,000 competitors in our own market, and a people who export \$500,000,000 worth of farm products annually are not likely to want much of our farm products. The hon. member for North Norfolk in a very ably and carefully prepared speech, tried to make out that the farmers of this country pay the duty on all they export, and he was not satisfied with that, but he said they also pay duty on what they import. It is a new doctrine to me that we pay the duties both ways. It may be true, but I do not believe it. On that subject I would like to give another short quotation from the Hon. Mr. Young, to show what the view of the Reform party has been in the past:

"Equally fallacious is it to assume that the Canadian farmer pays all the duties on the horses, cattle, barley, &c., which are exported across the lines. For forty years the Liberal party has been taught differently, and the demonstrations of Adam Smith, confirmed by all great living political economists, as well as by practical experience, clearly prove the contrary."

That has been the doctrine of the Reform party in the past, and I believe it is the common sense view of all parties at the present time, that, although there may be exceptions, as a rule the consumer pays the duty. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald) said in his speech that we raise a particular kind of barley, and that the Americans must have that barley, and still he insisted that the Canadian farmer, in order to get it into the American market, must pay the duty. That seems to be a very strange kind of logic, and, if it is correct, I think it was very kind of the American Government, in 1883, to take 5 cents a bushel of duty off, just to benefit the Canadian farmer. With reference to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 in natural products, which has been so much talked about, some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have said that there were casual advantages which made times better for Canada than they would otherwise have been during the existence of that treaty. The hon. member for East Huron took exception to that statement. He said the Grand Trunk had been commenced five years before the Reciprocity Treaty went into effect. I do not wish to dispute that, because preliminary surveys may have been made, and some work may have been done; but one thing we do know, the Grand Trunk Railway was not opened for traffic until 1856, and consequently between 1854 and 1856 there must have been a large amount of money spent in this country in building that railroad, which must have added materially to the prosperity of the people. The hon. gentleman also said that the Russian war was nearly over before the Treaty of 1854 came into effect. We all know that the Russian war commenced in 1854 and the treaty of peace was not signed until 1856; and no matter whether the war was nearly over or not, I do not think any member of this House will venture to say that wheat went up to \$3 a bushel in consequence of the Reciprocity Treaty, but I think every hon. gentleman knows that the Russian war was the cause of that rise. The hon. gentleman also

said the American war from 1861 to 1865 was of no advantage to us, as it cut off 10,000,000 southerners from dealing with us. I think that war was a very great advantage to us, because it drew more than 2,000,000 of the American people from industrial pursuits for fighting purposes; consequently these men were not able to provide their own necessaries, and were at the same time kept from competition with us in our market. I have taken the trouble to look up some statistics on this subject, and I find that our total exports to the United States from 1855 to 1859, before the war, amounted to \$78,000,000, or a yearly average of \$15,610,000, while our exports to the United States from 1861 to 1865, during the war, amounted to \$93,866,600, or a yearly average for the five years of \$18,773,000. It does seem to me that these figures show that that war was of some advantage to the people of this country. The yearly average surplus exported to the United States during the war period exceeded that exported before the war by over \$3,000,000. It seems to me that was quite an advantage. There is just one other matter with respect to this treaty of 1854; it is part of the statement made by the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), and I agree with him. He said:

"Hon. members on this side of the House are willing to accept the same kind of treaty as the one of 1854."

I am willing to accept that kind of treaty too, and I believe hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are willing to accept such a treaty; but they are not willing to go the length to which hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be willing to go, that is so far as unrestricted reciprocity, in order to secure trade with the United States. As a reason why we are not prepared to do that, I am in a position to prove out of the mouth of the same gentleman to whom I have referred, that we have been more prosperous since the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty even than we were during that time. If that can be shown to be the case we ought to be able to dictate to the United States, or at least we ought to be prepared to say that we are prepared to accept a treaty on fair terms, and except on fair terms we are not prepared to accept any treaty. The gentleman to whom I refer is Hon. James Young, a gentleman belonging to the party of the hon. gentlemen opposite. He says:

"There exists almost universally throughout Canada not only the most friendly feelings towards the United States, but an ardent desire for freer commercial relations between the two countries. Not that we cannot prosper otherwise. On the contrary, notwithstanding some grievous misgovernment, Canada never developed or prospered more than during the twenty years since the Reciprocity Treaty expired."

It seems to me that this is a very good reason why we should be prepared to accept a reasonable and fair reciprocity treaty, and not be willing to give the Americans any advantage.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would that not be a reason for having no treaty at all?

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I would simply say, in reply to the hon. member for Bothwell, that we can do without a treaty. I think we can do better with one, and I am prepared to go any reasonable length to secure it, but I am not willing to go the length of annexation.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is?

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I do not like to be personal, for to be personal is to be unparliamentary, and I would not like to be unparliamentary. We will, however, soon find out what unrestricted reciprocity means. It is pretty hard to tell what it does mean, if it does not mean annexation.

An hon. MEMBER. Why did it not mean that before?

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). We never had unrestricted reciprocity before.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was proffered by Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. BOWELL. No, never.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Unrestricted reciprocity with the United States means free trade with the United States and the same kind of tariff against the rest of the world as the United States has in force. I think that is unrestricted reciprocity; I may be wrong, and if so, hon. gentlemen who follow me will put me right. I should like to give another quotation from the same gentleman to whom I have referred, because I rather like his views, and I think he is a sensible man and a good Reformer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. All Reformers are that.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Yes, all Reformers are, but they do not always show themselves to be so. That gentleman says:

"It may be presented in the pleasing guise of 'complete reciprocity,' but every intelligent person must see that what is proposed is simply a Zollverein, which is not only irreconcilable with our continued connection with Great Britain, but a sort of half-way house on the road to annexation. Political union has followed commercial union in Germany, and he must be very blind who thinks it would be different on this continent."

That is a statement made by Hon. James Young, who is a man that I think hon. gentlemen opposite will say is worthy of credence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That statement is an historical mistake.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). It may be, we do not know. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) may know, for he is said to be a philosopher. I have a statement here, taken from a newspaper, made by ex-city Attorney J. N. Cross, of Minneapolis. He says:

"The time has come to be generous to Canada, and to at once form with her a commercial union, a 'Zollverein' for tariffs, a perfect union for trade, traffic and commerce in their every aspect, to be followed by a political union."

This, I contend, shows the meaning given to unrestricted reciprocity by its advocates in the United States. I think if hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to investigate as to the men who are in favor of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity on the other side of the line, they will find they are only in favor of it as they hope it will be a stepping stone to annexation. I desire to give the House an illustration of the effect which unrestricted reciprocity would have in this country in regard to direct taxation. Our revenue, as a matter of course, is principally raised now from customs duties. We raised last year \$22,500,000, \$7,300,000 of which was on goods imported from the United States. We imported a little over 40 per cent. of our total imports from the United States last year, and although I have talked with many people, some favoring unrestricted reciprocity and others opposing it, I never met a man who said our imports from the United States under the system proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite would be less than 75 per cent. of the whole importation. My own impression is that it would be more, that if we had free trade with the United States, we would buy in that market everything we could, and only go outside that country for such articles as we could not procure there. In that way we would lose from \$18,000,000 to \$20,000,000, which sum would have to be made up by direct taxation. I desire to give the House an illustration of how this proposition, if carried out, would affect the county of Lennox and Addington, because hon. gentlemen opposite claim to be anxious to benefit the farmers, and they never tire of talking about the wrongs of the farmers under the present Administration. The assessment of the county is \$3,166,000. Of that amount only \$438,000 is for personal property and taxable income, while \$7,728,000 odd is for real property.

Hon. members, especially those who have had anything to do with municipal matters, can easily understand how this happens. The assessor can see the real estate and the improvements, and consequently he cannot be deceived to any great degree as to the value. If he is not satisfied, he can make enquiries of the neighbors and find the value, whereas when he comes to assess personal property or taxable income the people are interested in not telling him the whole truth, and people hold the opinion that there is not much harm in doing it. In my county we have one town of nearly 4,000 inhabitants, from fifteen to twenty villages with from 50 to 500 inhabitants, and in all those places there is a good deal of personal property; but my impression is, that three-fourths of the personal property in the county is not taxed, and the result of that for municipal purposes is that real property pays more than seventeen times as much as personal property and taxable income. If we have to raise a revenue by direct taxation in order to conduct the affairs of the country the same thing will happen. There is another serious aspect to this question which I think hon. gentlemen have forgotten. They are never tired talking about the wickedness of the revising barrister and his clerks, and the hon. gentlemen must know that if we have to resort to direct taxation that we will have to get in all probability valuers for every municipality, but certainly we will have to get tax collectors. Those people going around those different municipalities will have an opportunity of doing political work and that sort of thing, and I am afraid that if hon. gentlemen succeed in getting this resolution through and a treaty made with the United States they will be kept out of power for the next twenty years, let alone the next five years, which would be very bad for them.

Mr. BOWELL. Bad for them?

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Yes, bad for them.

Mr. BOWELL. Good for the country.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Yes, as my hon. friend says, it would be good for the country. There were some sweeping assertions made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). In his speech to this House, which was very carefully prepared, he said that all public works should be stopped, as well as all subsidies to railways. He would reduce the grant to the militia by a million dollars, or, in other words, wipe it out altogether; he would stop super-annuations, reduce the civil service 65 per cent., reduce the House of Commons one-half and virtually wipe out the Senate. I would like to know if the party which the hon. gentleman follows ever comes into power, will he say to them: "I will not give that party my support unless they make these reforms," or is it that he wants annexation pure and simple. Gentlemen, I do not know which view of the matter he takes. I suppose it makes very little difference to me personally, but I am satisfied that Canada wants to maintain her independence. I am satisfied the Government of this country is doing the best thing for the country.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Hon. gentlemen opposite may differ, but I say "yes." Notwithstanding the wail of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and the laudations of the United States by the hon. member for North Norfolk (M. Charlton) and his supporters, I have faith in the future of Canada, and I am willing to support the Government led by the right hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, who has brought this country to be a great Dominion from being a few scattered Provinces.

Mr. O'BRIEN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox).

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 4th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

STANSTEAD CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Brooks the certificate of judgment in the matter of the election petition for the Electoral District of Stanstead, by which the said petition was dismissed.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That, as the time for the reception of reports of Committees on Private Bills will expire to-morrow, the same be extended until Friday, the 27th instant, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, in their fifth report.

Mr. LAURIER. Is not that a very unusually long period to extend the time to? If I understood aright, it was up to the 27th instant that the hon. gentleman proposed to extend the time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No, it is not an unusual thing. On the contrary, we have to do it from time to time on account of the work of the committees. I think our committee, which has, I suppose, three-fourths of the Bills presented to the House this year, cannot sit oftener than we are sitting. We sit twice, and sometimes three times a week, and we will require all this time to pass the Bills which have been presented.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What time do you propose to get through?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As soon as you let us get through.

Motion agreed to.

FORFEITURES FOR TREASON AND FELONY.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 88) to abolish Forfeitures for Treason and Felony, and to otherwise amend the law relating thereto. He said: It is proposed by this Bill to adopt the provisions of the law of England in reference to forfeitures for treason and felony; practically to abolish forfeitures for treason and felony, but to provide a means by which the property of persons convicted shall, during their incarceration, be administered, subject to an account to them at the conclusion of their term. Power is also to be given to the court which has jurisdiction to try these offences, to award compensation for the injuries the convict may have inflicted.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 89) to amend "The Dominion Elections Act," chapter eight of the Revised Statutes. He said: I will make a few brief explanations as to the purport of the Bill. In the first place, it contains the principal provisions which were embodied in

the Bill which was under discussion during last Session of this House, which seemed to meet with a good deal of favor on both sides of the House. In addition it is proposed to adopt the section of the English Act which allows to a member whose agents have, without his knowledge or connivance, committed the offences of treating and undue influence, which would forfeit his seat—to excuse himself by showing affirmatively to the court the following circumstances: that no corrupt or illegal practice was committed at such election by the candidate or his regular election agent; that the offences mentioned in the Bill were committed contrary to the orders or without the connivance of such candidate or his agent; that such candidate or his agent took all reasonable means to prevent the commission of corrupt or illegal practices; that the offences mentioned in the Bill were of a trivial and unimportant character; that in all other respects the election was free from any corrupt or illegal practice on the part of such candidate or his agent. In such case the candidate is not to be subject to the incapacity provided by the Act. It is proposed, likewise, by this Bill, to make uniform the dates for holding elections in British Columbia and in the other electoral districts for which special provisions had been made as to the time for nomination, and the interval between nomination and polling day, in consequence of the difficulties of communication. Then it is proposed that special disqualifications, as in the mother country, shall be established in relation to persons who are convicted, upon indictment, of any corrupt practice. It is proposed, in addition to the penalties prescribed by the existing law, that these persons shall be, for seven years from the date of their conviction, incapable of being registered as persons entitled to vote, or of holding any public office within the gift of the Crown or the Parliament of Canada; vacating any such office if they hold any when convicted of such offence; they are made incapable of being elected to this House, or if holding a seat in the House, they must vacate it. There are various other provisions inserted with a view of increasing the safeguards as to secrecy, as to tampering with ballot boxes, providing for greater conveniences for the taking of oaths which are required to be taken at the close of the poll, and for the authentication of the statements which are usually enclosed in the ballot boxes. The Bill likewise deals with the cases mentioned last Session, of the boxes being lost, and the statements not being forthcoming.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As to the gazetting of members?

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no special provision.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice as to whether there is any provision regulating, within certain limits, the issue of the writ to the returning officer, or perhaps I should say more correctly, taking care that a returning officer be appointed within some reasonable period after the writ has been issued by you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is no provision on that subject.

Mr. TROW. I would like to ask from the Minister an explanation of the first section of his Bill. He said that the subject had been fully discussed last Session, and favorably received by this House, yet he omitted to explain the nature of the amendments.

Mr. THOMPSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The sections which I referred to particularly, were those providing that the ballot paper should be sufficiently substantial to prevent the marking or puncturing it in such a

way as that it would be possible to discern the way in which a person has voted, and providing for a hard surfaced paper to be furnished by the returning officer or his deputy, in order that the ballot may be marked without showing through on the other side, and various other details of that kind.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PUNISHMENTS, PARDONS AND COMMUTATIONS.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 90) to amend chapter 181 of the Revised Statutes, respecting Punishments, Pardons and Commutations of Sentences. He said: It is merely to remove a defect in the existing law as applicable to the North-West Territories. There are provisions in the Speedy Trials Act with reference to sentences carrying with them hard labor, and the Speedy Trials Act does not extend to the North-West Territories. This Bill will remedy that defect.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FRAUDULENT MARKS ON MERCHANDISE.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 91) to consolidate and amend the law respecting Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise. He said: This Bill will be found to be an adaptation of the English Fraudulent Marks Act of 1887, and which all Her Majesty's colonies have been asked to adopt. I may explain that the provisions of the existing laws with reference to the fraudulent marking of merchandise were found to be almost entirely inadequate, and in 1883 a convention was held at which the following powers were directly or indirectly represented: Belgium, Brazil, France, Great Britain, Guatemala, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, San Domingo, Servia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunis and the United States. These States adopted the provisions which are contained in this Act and in the Imperial Act of 1887. A subsequent convention was held in 1886 in which the provisions of the preceding convention were confirmed, and extended as regards some matters of detail. I will say that the new provisions, in the first place, confine the protection by criminal proceedings in relation to fraudulent marking of merchandise to the registered trade marks. The system of registration has been in force for ten or eleven years, and it has been held, both in the mother country and, I think, in the colonies, that sufficient time has elapsed to enable the registration system to be perfected, and it is, therefore, proper to restrict criminal procedure for fraud in relation to registered trade marks. In the second place, the burden of proof has been changed in relation to goods fraudulently marked with fraudulent trade marks. Persons having such goods in their possession are required to prove affirmatively that they came by them in good faith and had no intention of fraud. Then it is provided that all offences against the Trade Marks Act shall be punished by summary conviction, instead of being left to be dealt with by indictment under the old system. It has been found that the practice of resorting to indictment is one of great practical inconvenience to the mercantile community, and that procedure by summary conviction was more appropriate and suitable in dealing with offences of this kind. There is an enlarged provision as to false trade mark descriptions. There are provisions for searching premises in which it is supposed that goods fraudulently taken out are to be found, and a provision likewise for the seizure of goods of that description, and the prevention of their passage through the Customs.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is it the intention of the Government to drop entirely the Bill respecting the Controverted Elections Act?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

REPRESENTATION OF RUSSELL.

Mr. LAURIER. I desire to ask the Government whether they can inform the House to-day if the Order of the House for the issue of a writ for a new election in the county of Russell has been complied with? We were promised it would be issued immediately.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Will the hon. gentleman repeat the question when the First Minister is in his place?

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH UNITED STATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to ask of the Minister of Finance, whom I am glad to see in his place, whether the attention of the Government has been called to a certain Bill recently introduced into Congress, called a Retaliatory Bill, which may have important effects on the commerce of this country, and whether the Government are prepared to take any action with regard to it? Numerous communications have reached me, and I dare say have reached the hon. gentleman, showing there is great uneasiness in many parts of the country as to a possible disturbance of trade; and if the Government have come to any conclusion it is highly in the public interest that it should be announced at the earliest possible moment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say in regard to the enquiry made by the hon. member that the Government have not had their attention drawn in any especial manner to the Bill which has been introduced and to which he has referred; but I am led to suppose that that Bill was introduced under an impression that the Government of Canada were unwilling to carry out the arrangement which the Government of the United States had expected would follow upon the reduction of duty. I may say that if that Bill has been inspired by any such impression, I think the action that the Government have taken will entirely remove that impression, and I do not anticipate that any such Bill will be proceeded with or any such action taken by the Congress of the United States. I may be permitted to say, also, as I was not in the House on a former occasion when this question attracted attention, although I do not wish to refer to a past debate, that the policy of both sides of this House and of both parties in this country has been steadily directed to obtaining a free interchange of the natural products of the two countries; that from the date of the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty both sides in this House, whether in Government or in Opposition, have always been prepared to do everything that it was possible to do to obtain, if we could not obtain a reciprocity treaty, a reciprocity tariff, and, as far and as fast as we could, to obtain the free interchange of the various natural products of the two countries that were indicated in the Treaty of 1854. I can only say that is the policy of the Government to-day, and that any measure we can take to carry that forward will be taken, and that, as hon. gentlemen are aware, the moment the attention of the Government was called by a communication from Sir Lionel Sackville West, covering a memorandum of the Department of State of the United States, to the fact that certain duties had been removed from articles that were contained in the Act of 1879, especially pointed to as inviting reciprocity, an Order in Council was passed placing those articles on the free list, and the proclamation will be issued in the next *Gazette*.

Mr. MITCHELL. Score one.

Mr. THOMPSON.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That communication was made to Sir Sackville West, and I have no doubt it has been communicated to the Government and to the Committee of Ways and Means and to all of those who were under any impression that we would recede from the policy which, as I say, has not been the property of one party or the other in this country, but which all parties believe should be steadily carried forward.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can only say that I think it is a great pity the hon. gentleman was not in his place a week ago.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may add my congratulations to those of my hon. friend on my right in regard to this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. You want order, do you? I think I am giving order. I will move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope the hon. gentleman will permit me to say that we all have one object in view, and I am gratified to know that the course taken by the Government is one that meets with his approval; and I am satisfied he would not wish to make an observation that would tend to lessen the force of that action in any way. I hope, if the hon. gentleman has risen to compliment me at the expense of my colleagues, he will postpone doing so.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is one object I have in view, and that is, if the Secretary of State desires to call "order" to prevent me from stating what I think it is my duty and right to state, he has made a little mistake in his man. That is what I want to say. I want to compliment the Minister of Finance for the frank and manly manner in which he has acted.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I rise to a question of order. This is not in order.

Mr. GILLMOR. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have already moved the adjournment.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman is not in order so long as the motion has not been put.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have moved the adjournment, and I have a right to speak on this matter. I am not going to be put down by the Secretary of State nor by anyone else when I am in the right. I rose for the purpose of paying a proper compliment to the Government, that when they found they made a mistake they took back water at once. I will simply say that I entirely approve of the remarks the hon. the Finance Minister has made, and I believe that no remarks should be made, nor any utterances given expression to in this House, that would in any way detract from the frank manner in which the hon. gentleman has stated the policy of the Administration. But I wish to say this, that the attempt to snub me the other day by the Premier, and the statement he made, shows that the policy of the Government on Wednesday last was entirely different from what it is to-day. I simply wish to vindicate myself from the impertinent and insolent remarks that were applied to me on Wednesday by the right hon. the Premier.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I think, Sir, that the House and the country have reason to congratulate the Government on the presence of the Finance Minister here to-day. The views expressed by the Finance Minister are very different from the views expressed by his leader in this House not very long ago. Sir, there has been a change in the views and opinions of the Government and there has been a change which the country will receive with pleasure. Not very long ago when it was proposed to put certain

articles on the dutiable list that had been on the free list and that were on the free list of the United States, we remember that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House—perhaps not all the hon. gentlemen who are there, because it was not formally before Parliament—that the colleagues of the Finance Minister on that occasion adopted views and expressed sentiments altogether different from what the hon. gentleman has expressed here to-day. The hon. gentleman has stated to the House, that on both sides of the House we are one upon this question, and that we are in favor of a free interchange of the natural products of Canada and the United States. Sir, I am glad to find out that the Government are now of that view. It is true that many years ago they did express sentiments of that sort, but a very considerable period has elapsed since we have heard those sentiments expressed by hon. gentlemen sitting on the front benches of the Treasury. The hon. the Minister of Customs shakes his head, but has the hon. gentleman forgotten the altercation which took place on this subject between himself and the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Patterson), who supports the Administration? Does the hon. gentleman forget the discussion which took place about fruit trees and grape vines, and with reference to the other matters which were put upon the dutiable list and the duties upon which were from time to time increased? Sir, the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are like Captain Scott's coon, they have come down. The hon. the Finance Minister has taken great pains to explain to the House that they do not know what is going on in Congress, but the hon. gentleman, I suppose, will bring down to the House the communication received from Sir Lionel West. We will find out from that, and be able to judge, whether the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have recently done as the organ of the Minister of the Interior says they have done, namely, that they have passed an Order in Council putting upon the free list articles which the First Minister but a short time ago declared would be ruinous to Canada to put on the free list. Then, Sir, that hon. gentleman said that we had scores of articles on the free list already that the United States had not put on their free list, and that he was not going to put upon the free list articles which would promote the interests of the United States and which would enable the people of the United States to crush the interests of the people of Canada. Well, Sir, the hon. gentlemen have had new light, and I have no doubt whatever that that light has shone in the Congress of the United States. Sir, we find in the Montreal organ of the hon. gentlemen the following communication:—

"Since the discussion in the House last Wednesday relative to Canada placing on the free list certain natural products specified in clause nine of the Tariff Act, the equivalents of which have been placed by Congress on the American free list, the attention of the Government has been officially called to the matter by the Washington authorities through Sir Lionel West."

Mark, gentlemen, "By the Washington authorities through Sir Lionel West." Now, Sir, I have no doubt that the production of that communication from the English ambassador at Washington would prove to be an excellent commentary on the speech of the Finance Minister here to-day; it would greatly add to the clearness of that speech and would enable us to understand how it was that this Government that has allowed those articles to be on the dutiable list since 1884, have had new light since the discussion which took place here on Wednesday last, and have discovered that it was for the interest of the people of this country that those articles should now be transferred from the dutiable to the free list. Sir, we are making progress. We supposed that the Government here was as fixed as Atlas with the world upon his shoulders, and almost as free from anything like a correct idea upon the subject of the trade and commerce

of the people of this country. Sir, I think that the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has done an excellent service to the people of this country in bringing this matter to the attention of Parliament. He has forced the gentlemen upon the Treasury benches from that position which they have so long occupied, and where they entrenched themselves behind an Act of Parliament which they had no intention of putting into force, which they declared they would not put into force, which they declared it was not for the interest of the people of this country that they should put in force, and which the hon. the First Minister not long ago informed Parliament that the people of this country would sustain them in refusing to put it into force. Those gentlemen have had new light. They have an Order in Council carried on the subject. The hon. the First Minister not long ago told us—what? Why, he told us that if we would allow him to determine the fiscal policy of this country that within two years he would force the Americans from their exclusive position and secure to the people of this country free trade. Well, Sir, we find out how this enforcement has gone on. We find that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues have been forced from their position. It has not been Congress which has been driven from its exclusive position by the Government of Canada, but it has been the Government of Canada that is driven from its exclusive position by the action of Congress. The British Minister told the hon. gentleman what the consequences would be if they persisted in the particular policy they had adopted, and which the First Minister declared the Government was prepared to stand by. But we find, Sir, that they have paid a deference to the opinions expressed in Congress which they have refused to pay to the opinions of the people of this country. Sir, we congratulate the hon. gentlemen on the respect they have shown for the public opinion of the United States.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, I understood the other day that I would be permitted to allude to this matter when the subject came up for discussion. The First Minister took the position that we were not compelled at all to add to our free list such articles as the United States might choose to pick out from the number that was mentioned in what is termed our statutory offer to the United States. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance what articles they have placed upon the free list by this proposal, and whether it includes all the articles that are mentioned in that clause of the statute which is generally spoken of as our statutory offer to the United States, or whether we have just placed on the free list such articles selected from among those as the United States have placed upon their free list?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I beg to say in reply to the hon. gentleman that it was never proposed by us that we would place any of those articles upon the free list or reduce the duties imposed upon them by our law, except in accordance with similar action on the part of Congress. It was only as the duties on these articles were reduced or abolished, and satisfactory evidence that such changes had been made was given to the Governor in Council, that it was proposed that we should take corresponding action. I am very sorry to find that the hon. member for Bothwell does not seem disposed to adopt the course that I believe would commend itself to the great majority of the gentlemen on that side of the House, and that is, not to use language here, in dealing with this question, for a miserable, unworthy party object, calculated to prejudice the interests of the very people he proposes to serve. I say, Sir, if these gentlemen were sincere in desiring that Canadians should have the benefit of this reciprocal free interchange of commodities, they would not take the line the hon. member for Bothwell has taken just now. They would adopt the line I have taken, not in

claiming credit to the Government or the party to which I belong, but declaring, as I do declare in my place in this House, that no person can read the past history of this country in relation to this question without finding that it has been the avowed policy of both the great parties in this country to obtain as far and as fast as they could, the free interchange of the natural products of the two countries. In 1854, a treaty was made which met with the approval of both parties, and when it was abrogated, both parties in this country united in every effort they could possibly use to prevent that abrogation going into effect. Subsequently, at the negotiation of the Treaty of Washington Sir John Macdonald, the leader of the Conservative party in this country, pressed on the Government of the United States, and induced the British high commissioners associated with him to press on the Government of the United States, the desirability of returning to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, under which the natural products of the two countries were freely interchanged. That proposition was rejected. Subsequently, the Hon. George Brown, representing hon. gentlemen opposite, who then held the Government of this country, went down to Washington and represented it as the desire of the Government of the day, and of the Liberal party in this country, that there should be a return to the principles of reciprocity established by the Treaty of 1854. That offer was refused by the Senate of the United States. I say, therefore, that the credit does not belong to one party or the other, but it belongs to both the great parties in this country, of having steadily endeavored, as far as possible, to obtain a free interchange of the natural products of the two countries. Subsequently, when Sir Leonard Tilley, my distinguished predecessor, brought down the policy of the Government in 1879, he placed on the Statute-book an Act which invited reciprocal action on the part of the United States, and took power for the Governor in Council to make free any or all of the articles that were named. It was discretionary power, as has been stated, and discretionary for the reason that when you are dealing with the action of the Crown you must necessarily use a language that is discretionary. But it was, in my humble judgment, none the less an invitation to the Congress and Government of the United States to make these articles free, and holding out an expectation that this Government would take similar action in such an event. Now, this question is not quite so plain as it would appear to be, and I am very sorry that in the discussion which took place here a few days ago the House did not rest on the statement made by the hon. First Minister, as I understand it to have been made, that this subject was engaging the attention of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. No, no; that is not the statement he made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say he would have been warranted in making that statement, for it was engaging the attention of the Government before a question was raised in this House. I may say that no member of this Government is so much to blame in this matter as I am, and I will explain to the House why. I confess I had overlooked the action that had been taken by Congress; it is fair and right that I should say so. My colleagues had a perfect right to expect that in a question of this kind, which appertained to my department, I would bring to their notice any required action to be taken. But there are difficulties in this matter which hon. gentlemen do not seem to appreciate. I will give an illustration. In this application from the Government of the United States, through Sir Lionel Sackville West, reference was made to the admission of seeds free of duty by the United States. Now, the clause in our Act does not pledge us to make free whatever seeds they choose to make free; it specifies

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

"seeds of all kinds." The broadest interpretation you can give to that Act will not make it cover a partial action in regard to any one of the articles named. We say that when they make seeds of all kinds free, the Governor in Council has power to make them free here. But the United States Congress have not made seeds of all kinds free, and, therefore, it would have been perfectly competent for us to say to them: "Until you make seeds of all kinds free, there is no moral obligation upon us to admit any of that class free." But we have not stood on that technicality, and it should be remembered that the nomenclature used by Congress differs in a wide degree from that used by us. We have included in the Order in Council all the seeds which have been made free by the tariff of the United States, and they will be free hereafter; so that we have not only complied with the Act of 1879, but have even gone further in the desire to remove the possibility of any ill-feeling or any prejudicial action to Canada being taken through any misrepresentation or prejudice that could be excited on this question. Then, barley is one of the articles with regard to which we have taken power, whenever the United States removes or reduces the duty, to take corresponding action. But a very nice question arose in regard to barley. True, the United States Congress reduced the duty from 15 cents to 10 cents per bushel, but at the same time they greatly increased the duty on malt, thus acting in the interests of the United States, not simply by the reduction of the duty, but by taking a line that was inimical to the interests of the people interested in barley on this side. I mention these matters to show that in this matter there is not quite as plain sailing as hon. gentlemen seem to think. But I may say that the moment the Mills' Bill was introduced into the Congress of the United States, long before the discussion arose in this House, I had the Deputy Minister and the staff of the office engaged in making a comprehensive statement in reference to this question, in order that I might bring it to the notice of my colleagues, as I was bound to do, because I found that by an oversight on my part, caused no doubt by the various duties imposed upon me, the action of the United States Congress had been lost sight of.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is a pity you did not coach the Premier.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman must know that the Premier had a right to expect that the Finance Minister would bring the subject under his notice. As I say, I am sorry, desiring as we all do to place the relations between the United States and this country on the most friendly footing, desiring as we all do to have the freest interchange of natural products between the two countries, that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) did not take the course that the rest of his friends on that side did, of not raising the question; and I think the course he took was unworthy of the hon. gentleman, in view of the great interests that are at stake.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Order.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am speaking in a qualified sense and not in any personal manner. I think it was unworthy of the high position which the hon. member for Bothwell occupies in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The insinuation is unworthy of you.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was unworthy of the hon. gentleman's position in this House and of his former position as a member of a former Administration, to adopt a tone or take a means calculated in any way to weaken the action the Government have taken. I will say, in answer to my hon. friend who asked me the question, that we have reciprocated with the United States in the articles they have dealt with, and I have in my hand a message

which I sent to Sir Lionel Sackville West for communication to the Government of the United States, which I intend to read to the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wish just to know what are the articles that will be placed on our free list.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We shall place on our free list every article to which our attention has been drawn by the Government of the United States as having been made free by them, and which is mentioned in our statute.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How is the barley dealt with?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The statement made by the First Minister was quite correct.

Mr. MITCHELL. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You had better, perhaps, hear what I have to say before you take exception to it. The statement of the First Minister, which was quite correct, was that the subject was receiving the consideration of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. No; he did not say that at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He stated that the subject was receiving the consideration of the Government.

Mr. MITCHELL. He subsequently stated that, but that was not his first statement.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The right hon. the First Minister said:

"However, that subject, having been brought forward in the interest of the American seedsmen, is now engaging the attention of the Government."

Mr. MITCHELL. Read what he said before that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not want to go back to a discussion which I regret should have taken place, but I desire to say that what we have done was to make everything free that the Government of the United States have called our attention to as having received the action of Congress, under that clause and in relation to that clause in the enactment, and we have stated that we are prepared to go further.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How did you deal with the barley?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That remains untouched for the reason I have given—that and straw, which is another article that has been made free by the United States. Barley has only been reduced in duty, and that reduction is accompanied by an increase in the duty on malt against the interests of the maltsters of Canada. An additional reason is this: a Bill is now before Congress of which I shall have occasion to say more hereafter. That Bill has been introduced there by the gentleman who virtually represents the Finance Minister here, the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, who is the mouthpiece of the American Administration. He has introduced a Bill in which Canada is greatly interested, making a number of articles free which it is very important to us should be made free, and we think it better to defer taking additional action until we see the result of that measure. I may say that I believe, notwithstanding the action of the present opposition in the United States, that the measure dealing with the tariff will, in a modified form, at all events, become law; and if so I shall take the opportunity of inviting the attention of the House to measures which, I think, will be calculated to go further in the way of freeing the natural products of both countries and having a larger measure of reciprocity on both sides.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The speech of the hon. Minister of Finance will be received with no small satisfaction by the people, and to a large part of his remarks no exception can be taken, either as regards the tone or the matter. As regards, however, some of the references to my hon. friend Mr. Mills (Bothwell), it is plain to every hon. gentleman that the hon. the Minister could not have been in his place on Wednesday last, when the conversation on this subject took place, or he would never have made the remarks he has regarding the discussion which was then had. The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that it has been the avowed policy of both parties in this country to move in the direction of reciprocity regarding the natural products of each. Certain action had been taken by the United States with reference to the admission of certain natural products of this country into theirs, and the question arose, on the interpellation by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), as to whether the policy of the Government, as laid down in our statute, to reciprocate would be carried out, or whether they had a secret policy which was opposed to that avowed one. The First Minister replied with a good deal of warmth, and stated that the matter was entirely within the discretion of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER. You cannot discuss a matter which has been already the subject of debate.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Finance Minister has just given us his view of that discussion. He has made statements as to what was said before, and only to the extent of answering those statements do I wish to refer to a previous debate. The First Minister said at that time that there had been no official communication in reference to the matter, and the question arose whether the Government of the Dominion, without reference to any official communication from the United States, were prepared to carry out in good faith the terms of our statutory offer. A discussion arose as to the meaning of the offer, and the First Minister declared it was merely a permissive clause which left the Government very full discretion as to whether they should act or not; and the point which the First Minister omitted to refer to entirely was the point on which my hon. friend for Bothwell made his remarks. The First Minister said that, in the exercise of that discretion, it would be in the highest degree impolitic on the part of the Government to reciprocate in those articles. That was the statement of the First Minister, and as evidence that it was not a mere haphazard statement, we have the fact that the Minister of Justice, who followed him, agreed in the construction put upon the statutory clause, laying stress on the word "may," and wound up by saying there was a large discretion left in the Government, and that if the Government would use that discretion in the way the hon. member for Northumberland said they should, they would use it to betray the interests of the people of Canada. We had then the declaration of the policy of the Government, expressed in clear, terse, and undisguised language, that we were not to carry out the statutory offer in the sense in which hon. gentlemen on this side understood its terms. It was argued on this side that you must not place the same strict narrow meaning on a great international offer of this kind as you would on a simple contract between man and man. It would have been in the highest degree advisable, and in the best interests of this country, as is proved by the statement the hon. the Minister of Finance has made to-day, had the Government at once declared their intention of abiding by the spirit of that offer. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said that, in view of the change of front upon this very important matter, he desired to know what was the motive of that change, and what was the nature of the despatch that the Government had received from the American Secretary of State. Let us hear the whole of it. There

was not a word said by my hon. friend but what his duty called upon him to say as one of the leading men in this House. Therefore he was quite within his right in demanding what he did, the House having been put in possession of the very important fact that the Government have made a complete change in their policy, a change upon which we congratulate them thoroughly, a change which I think is in the interests of the country. I think that the motive which has induced them to make that change will induce them to go a little further, and I have some hope, in view of the change which they have already made, that they may withdraw the resolution which the Minister of Marine has moved, in which they have, as it were, nailed their colors to the mast, and declared for the National Policy every time and the National Policy only. I am still in hope that they will withdraw that in favor of the motion proposed by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) for a broad, free and generous interchange of commodities.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, for a broad, free and generous interchange not only of natural products but of other articles as well. It will not be contended now that it is treason or disloyalty to admit into this country some of the natural products of the United States, and the hon. gentleman who leads the Government, or some of his very clever supporters, will have to state to the people of this country exactly where they draw the line, and what are the articles in regard to which it becomes treason to admit them reciprocally, and those in regard to which it is not treason. My hon. friend the Finance Minister has eased the way for them a great deal, he has smoothed it down. He says it is the natural policy to remove all the barriers which exist.

Mr. MITCHELL. But he differs from the Premier.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) He not only differs from the Premier, but he lays down a line of policy which the Premier declared to be in the highest degree improvident, and which the Minister of Justice said would amount to a betrayal of the interests of the people of Canada. We have heard that sort of language used for the last fortnight in this House, that our policy was a betrayal of the interests of the people of Canada, but that has all been taken back—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let me finish my sentence—that has all been taken back so far as the natural products of the country are concerned, and now those gentlemen will have to confine their argument to this, that free trade with the States means treason and disloyalty to the Crown in regard to manufactured articles, and to those alone. I have not lost entire confidence in the Government in this trade question. I believe that the Finance Minister in his heart and soul is with us on this point, and I believe he will yet reorganise the First Minister upon it, and will perhaps give him a little more light. I hope, before this Session breaks up, to hear the announcement made, in a frank, honorable and manly way, by the First Minister that he has misconceived the position and is prepared to accept, if not in whole, at least in a great part, the proposition of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It would be a great advantage for Canada, and I think that, if the Finance Minister proceeds in his educating policy a little further, he will succeed in achieving this end.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I find that I have been able to lay my hand upon the despatch which I said I would submit to the House if I had it:

"April 3rd, 1888."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the date? Is it to-day?

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, yesterday, April the 3rd.

"To the Hon. Sir LIONEL SACKVILLE WEST:

"Immediately on receipt of copy of your despatch to Lord Salisbury, enclosing memorandum from Department of State of the United States, calling attention to certain articles made free of duty by United States, an Order in Council was passed admitting all the articles mentioned, when imported into Canada, free of duty. Proclamation will issue next *Gazette*. Canadian Government awaits further legislation by Congress in same direction."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. We have got one progressive Minister on that side, anyway.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am reminded of the very eloquent reference that my hon. friend from one of the North-West constituencies made on another occasion, when he referred to the perilous attention which certain hon. gentlemen paid him.

Mr. MITCHELL. You do not seem displeased with it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may add that it will give me great pleasure to lay the despatch and the papers in connection with it on the Table of the House.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I hope the House will pardon me for a moment, while I refer to the subject under discussion. I listened with a great deal of attention to the debate on this subject which took place last week. If hon. gentlemen desire to deal fairly with this discussion which has now been resumed, they will find in the first remarks of the First Minister, in answer to the hon. member for Northumberland, the very reply which, condensed, was made by the Finance Minister this afternoon.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh! oh!

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Allow me to continue. I have not interrupted hon. gentlemen on the other side, and the fact that they try to interrupt me shows that they do not want to hear what is coming. In answer to the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) on that occasion, the First Minister said:

"I do not know that this is exactly the time to answer the question, but I may say that no applications have been made by the American Government upon the subject which the hon. gentleman speaks of."

Did the Minister of Finance this afternoon make any other explanation?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Wait—Did he make any other explanation than the expression of a sincere regret that hon. gentlemen should bring this forward at this time, or did he say anything inconsistent with what seems to be so objectionable to the hon. gentleman opposite in the remarks of the First Minister, which I now propose to read?

Mr. MITCHELL. Read the whole of them.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I will read the whole.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I tried to read them, but I was not allowed.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). After many interruptions from the other side of the House, the First Minister declared in effect that it would not be the policy of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I shall read afterwards. He stated that it would not be the policy of this Government or of any Government in this country to respond to the action of the United States who might select some one particular article which would perhaps be injurious to the manufactures of this country, and might ask us to reciprocate on that alone and to be bound by any such partial arrangement as that. I say that by no mode of reasoning which

can be placed upon the clause in the Act of 1879 could the Government of this country be bound to place such a construction upon it which has been suggested, and, if the Government in this particular instance have responded to the advance made by the Government of the United States in regard to the natural products of this country, if they have responded to it fairly, generously, and liberally, perhaps more so than that section in the Act of 1879 would warrant, does it follow that we were wrong, or that the First Minister was wrong in his opinion the other day as to the interpretation of the Act? No candid or reasonable man, no man who has a pretension to the possession of fair, sound reason can say otherwise, and all the crowing of the Opposition to-day amounts to nothing, and the position of the Minister of Finance as he has expressed himself to-day is exactly consistent with the position taken by the First Minister the other day.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have no desire to prolong the discussion, but an effort has been made to place certain hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in a false position. When the discussion took place here a week ago to-day, the attention of the Government was called by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), to the fact that the United States Government had placed certain articles upon the free list; that the 6th clause of the Customs Act of 1879 provided that any or all the articles named in that list should be placed upon the free list, or the duties upon those articles reduced upon corresponding action being taken by the American Government; that the Government of Canada had failed to respond to the action of the United States Government; that that failure had elicited bad feeling in the United States, and that retaliation was threatened. The hon. gentleman pointed out that this was a matter of very grave importance, and he desired to enquire whether the Government proposed to be governed by the stipulations in that clause of the Customs Act, and he set forth his belief that we were bound by the conditions of that Act to place upon the free list any such articles as the United States Government had placed there. Now, Sir, the First Minister on that occasion distinctly denied that proposition; he distinctly asserted that that provision of the Customs Act was not mandatory but was permissive, and that it rested with the Government in Council to do or not to do this thing, as they pleased. I may read, if permitted to do so, the words in which the First Minister presented that opinion to the House:

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only say that the hon. gentleman has not read the clause, else he would not make that statement. It is permissive altogether, it is not obligatory. The language is explicit: 'Any or all of the following things,' &c. [reciting them] 'may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided for by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council.' It is perfectly in the discretion of the Government. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but he did not read the clause, or he would not have made that statement. It is perfectly permissive.

"Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will point it out, although this irregular discussion is really interrupting the business of this House. I say to this House that if the hon. gentleman will look over our free list and the United States free list, he will find that there is an infinitely greater number of articles allowed to come into Canada on the free list of the United States than are allowed on the American free list from Canada.

"Mr. MITCHELL. That has nothing to do with it.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An infinitely greater number. But I will point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that we have got the interests of our own people to look after as well as the interest of the people of the United States. And, Mr. Speaker, if time permits, and a debate comes up, we will be able to show that it would be in the highest degree improvident in us to take some single article which will be specially for the benefit of the United States, and especially injurious to an industry in Canada, and put it on the free list, while they refuse to take any of the others in which there could be anything like reciprocity or interchange between Canada and the United States; I say they take out some articles the manufacture of which they think they can crush in Canada, and keep up their tariff on all other articles, except one particular article, when they think that they have got the

advantage. That is not the way which we, as a Canadian Government, think best to carry on the affairs of this country, and I have no doubt that the majority of this House, and the majority of the people of Canada, will think with us."

The Minister of Justice, in speaking to the question, said:

"Does the hon. gentleman mean to contend—because his argument goes that far—that this statutory offer—not only including the clause which has been brought to the notice of the House, because what is called the statutory offer embraces half-a-dozen other offers, and looks to the admission of free fish, coal and various other products into the United States—does the hon. gentleman mean to contend that it is a breach of faith on the part of the Government of Canada, even for that part of the statutory offer, to decline to allow the United States to say: 'You have made that offer; we will take portions of it, and enact those which please us, and which appear favorable to our people, and we will shut the door in the faces of your people in respect to all the other articles'? I can only say that, in my humble judgment, if the Crown, having discretion, uses it in that way, they would use it to betray the interests of the people of Canada."

Well, Sir, the Crown has used its discretion in that way. The Crown has taken a different position to-day from what it did a week ago, and has placed upon the free list the whole of the articles which the First Minister distinctly informed us should not be placed upon the free list, one week ago to-day. I do not know that, in discussing this question, I am doing anything that would prejudice the interests of Canada. It was pointed out by the Opposition, a week ago to-day, that the interests of this country were being threatened by the failure on the part of the Government to comply with the stipulations made by them in the Act of 1879; it was said that if we were not to live up to the letter of that clause, it would be better to expunge it from the Statute-book. Now, it is possible that in this matter we have not taken a step that will redound very much to our advantage, but we have taken a wise step, in my opinion; and if we do not wish to take any more steps of that kind, if we do not wish to act upon the statutory offer, we had better repeal it with all possible haste. I hold, Mr. Speaker, that the country deserves well at the hands of the Opposition for having brought this matter to the attention of the Government, for having pressed this matter home, and in consequence of the action of the Opposition, a grave danger has been averted. I believe that if this matter had been allowed to drift along, the result would have been retaliation on the part of the United States, and retaliation of a character that would most seriously have injured the interests of this country. I hope that the utmost care will be taken in future to carry out any offers that we may make by statute or otherwise. We are dealing with a country that is naturally jealous, dealing with a country that, perhaps, is not very scrupulous as to whether they give up the advantage, or whether they take it themselves. But that country certainly has a right to exact from this Government the fulfilment of its promises. It is an act of folly to put a promise upon the Statute-book without the intention of redeeming that promise.

Mr. BOWELL. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he is advocating reciprocity in a partial or a whole number of articles that may be offered to us by the United States, if we have upon our Statute-book a law which says we may do so-and-so? Is that what I understand?

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister of Customs may understand me to say that if we place upon our Statute-book an offer such as that of 1879—

Mr. BOWELL. Partial or wholly?

Mr. CHARLTON. The language of the article is "any or all," the offer is either partial or wholly, and although that offer may be permissive, yet it is an offer calculated to mislead our neighbors; and if they accept that offer as *bond fide* and mandatory, it is better, as I said before, and as I say to-day, to carry out the provisions of that offer, than not to do so, and if we do not do so we had better repeal the clause. I do not dispute that the clause was per-

missive, yet I do say that in the position of matters it had better be treated as mandatory, or we had better abolish it if we do not intend to live up to it in respect to those articles which the Americans put upon the free list.

Mr. BOWELL. Then we will expect the hon. gentleman to support the Bill before the House brought forward by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), because that makes a special provision in matters of wrecking.

Mr. CHARLTON. We will discuss that question later on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sorry I was not in the House at the time the debate arose. I was engaged otherwise in public business, and, therefore, lost the advantage of hearing the statements which have been made. But I gather from what I have heard since I have come in, that hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavoring to make a little capital out of this question. The hon. gentleman who just sat down said that the country owes the Opposition credit for bringing this question up. Well, I am very willing they should have all the credit that can accrue to them in this matter; but it is very odd that it is only just now that they have thought of it. I think that on some of these articles, seeds and fruit, the duties were taken off in 1883, and yet, watchful as the Opposition are, they never thought of bringing it up until the hon. gentleman did so the other day. Well, I did not hear the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, but I am satisfied that he has not stated anything inconsistent with what I state to-day.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, he did.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a rude interruption that, a very rude interruption, a very rude interruption.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, very.

Mr. HESSON. He does not know any better.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman asks a question. I do not know that this is exactly the time to answer the question, but I may say that no application has been made by the American Government upon this subject which the hon. gentleman speaks of. That is true. There was no application of any kind, and there had not been any. Not only that, but until the other day no application was made in behalf of any person that I ever heard of, who had paid duties on seeds, trees, or vines, that similar duties were not exacted on the other side of the line. But I went on, and I stated that the subject had been brought before the Government, though not officially, by some seedsmen, and I said:

"However, that subject, having been brought forward in the interests of the American seedsmen, is now engaging the attention of the Government, but there has been no official statement even from the consul."

That is precisely the fact. There was an unofficial statement made to the Minister of Customs, and thereupon he was called upon to make a report showing exactly the articles included in the clause referred to made free by the American tariff and not made free by the Canadian tariff; and at the very time we were discussing this question my hon. friend was engaged in preparing that statement for Council, for the purpose of considering whether that statement would show the articles admitted free by the United States and dutiable in Canada were those respecting which we might properly exercise the discretion given us by the statute and admit them free. My hon. friend who has just spoken says he supposes the clause is permissive; the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said it was not permissive, but I do not think the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) will say that the statute is not permissive. I am quite satisfied, if he were a judge, and I hope to live to see him one—he will make a very good judge, and we will have a less formidable opponent in this House—I say if he were called upon to decide the question he would decide

Mr. CHARLTON.

that the clause was permissive, and he could not decide any other way as a judge. But the matter was before the Council in the manner that I speak of. It was of sufficient importance to call for a special report from the Customs Department, for the purpose of seeing what articles—they are not very important any of them—were admitted free by the United States and were dutiable in Canada. It so happened that, the day after this discussion, a despatch of the State Department, to which allusion has been made in the debate, was received, calling attention in a very informal and unofficial manner to those articles—seeds and trees. That was the first occasion on which it had come before the Government. So far as regards my remark, which has been quoted, that:

"If time permits and a debate comes up, we will be able to show that it would be in the highest degree improvident in us to take some single article which will be specially for the benefit of the United States, and especially injurious to an industry in Canada, and put it on the free list."

I say that now, and I can give a hypothetical case to prove it. Take this instance, and it is one worthy of the attention of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). Suppose the Americans should ask us to admit oranges free, because that would suit them, and they declined to admit potatoes, I think the hon. member for Queen's would say that was a very unfair bargain, that we ought not to allow American oranges to come in from the Southern States unless the United States allowed Canada to send blue-nose and other potatoes from Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia duty free. That is a case I give just as an instance. I say that the statute is discretionary, that it was meant to be discretionary, and that the Government did no more than carry out the principle of the statute. When the matter was brought before our attention by the United States Government, the Government took it up at once, and I hope that in consequence of the active and energetic exertions made by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and the great zeal and anxiety shown by hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, we shall have more agricultural products introduced on both sides, duty free, than has previously prevailed.

Mr. IVES. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) congratulated himself rather prematurely, I think, when he assumed to think that by the action of the Government in this matter the House and the country were about to accept the policy enunciated in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). It seems to me that although the people as a whole do now, as they have always approved of the interchange of natural productions between the two countries, it does not follow that they are prepared to go the length of sacrificing our interests, of dropping eighteen or twenty million dollars of revenue, of resorting to direct taxation, subsequently or gradually falling into the arms of the United States by way of annexation or otherwise. It strikes me there is a difference between admitting potatoes and oranges and a few other natural productions of the United States into Canada free of duty, and adopting a policy of unrestricted reciprocity, including, as it does, loss of revenue, direct taxation and annexation to the United States. The hon. gentleman said there were no cries of treason now. The cry of treason does not come in that way. We do not say it is treason to propose to trade with our neighbors; we say, it is treason to propose a policy which must wipe out Canada's nationality and which necessarily leads to annexation. I rose not to speak on the resolution before the House, but simply for the purpose of disclaiming so far as I am personally concerned, and I trust the Government and the House will also disclaim it, that the action of the Government in this matter has been in any way brought about or hastened by the legislation

which it is said has been introduced into Congress. I do not think there could be anything more mischievous to Canada than to have the impression go abroad, especially among our neighbors, that all they have to do to bring us to book is to threaten us with the passage of legislation like that said to have been introduced into Congress. Why, only a Session or two ago they adopted the celebrated Retaliatory Bill. That measure was passed through Congress with an object similar to that with which the proposed Retaliatory Bill was now introduced. The retaliatory measure, fortunately, was not put into effect by the President of the United States—he had too much good sense; but we were not frightened by that Bill, although it was of very much more importance and would have proved more serious in its effects, than the Retaliatory Bill of the present Session. Our country, our Government and our people were not struck with alarm by the proposed putting into force of that Retaliatory Bill. I repeat that I make these remarks simply to disclaim for myself the idea that the Government have taken this action because of, or on account of that proposed measure, or that their action has been hastened by it. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has told us—and he ought to know—that our neighbors are unscrupulous. He has made that statement.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think, Sir, it is proper to allow that expression to go to the House in the sense that the hon. gentleman has placed upon it—that is, the statement which he alleges to have been made by me, “that the Americans were unscrupulous.” What I said was that they were not very scrupulous as to whether they give up the advantage, or whether they take it themselves. I think the bald statement that I said “they were unscrupulous” would not do justice to the sense in which I used the words.

Mr. IVES. I am quite prepared to accept the correction. I do not think it would be right to deprive the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) of the esteem and friendship of his friends on the other side, which he has earned during the present and past Sessions of this House. I think it would be a pity, indeed, if there should be a feeling of difference between him and his good friends, the gentlemen who represent the people of the United States in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman imputes motives to me and insinuates relations with regard to me that he is not warranted in doing. When I rose to make the remark which I did, it was clearly with the intention that nothing said in this House should be of a character to prejudice the interests of this country. It was in that sense that I used the expression. The gentleman is entirely unwarranted in making such insinuations with regard to me or any other member of this House, and I call for the protection of the Speaker.

Mr. IVES. I made no insinuation of that kind and I wish to say so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; chair.

Mr. IVES. I have a right to say what I meant and I claim that no point of order can be taken. I merely said the hon. gentleman was a friend of the United States and was a friend of the men who advanced the interests of the States. That is all I said. If the hon. gentleman wishes to repudiate that, I think it would be useless for him to withdraw the statement he made that they are unscrupulous.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman imputed a desire to me to stand well with them and that I did not wish to do anything that would effect my friendly or business relations with them. I repudiate having rela-

tions of the character and manner he refers to. The imputation is an unworthy one and I desire your ruling that it may not be permitted to go on the journals of the House without being retracted.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. IVES. I have not given up the floor yet. A point of order has been raised.

Mr. SPEAKER. I really fail to notice in the remarks of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) anything that could be objectionable from a parliamentary point of view. I fail to see that any of those remarks went as far as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) thought they did.

Mr. IVES. I have only to say one thing, and that is this: That I am happy that the Government have taken this action. I think the section of the country from which I come will approve of that action. I believe they would be delighted to see the free list in natural products very largely increased, as largely increased, or even more so than is proposed in the Bill now before the Congress of the United States. In view of that measure, I think it would be extremely prejudicial to our interests if it were to get abroad in the United States that we have been driven into this action by a threat of retaliation from the United States. There are no doubt many people in the United States who are working upon that very idea and who are endeavoring to make the people of the United States as a body believe, that if they can only coerce us or “freeze us out” as they term it, they will accomplish the object they have in view, namely, the annexation of this country. Those men are found to be against Mr. Mills' Bill or any other measure for improved or enlarged trade relations between this country and the United States, and nothing could be more injurious to the prospect of the passage of the Mills Bill than for it to be supposed that our Government was forced into this action by the threat of a retaliatory Bill in Congress.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to protract the discussion with regard to this matter. I think that, with the members of the House who have spoken on this side, I should be permitted to congratulate the Government on the step forward they have taken. I would not have said anything with regard to the matter had it not been for the statement made by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who seems to have embodied in him a very great deal of loyalty. This seems to be the cry that comes from that side of the House on every occasion. They declare that we are a disloyal people, and that this matter may result in annexation. I think it does not come well from the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) to talk about any such question as that, and I would just read an extract which I happen to have in my desk. It is a special telegram from Sherbrooke, dated March 12th, and I will read it to show the way in which the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) professes his loyalty to the British Government, and to the institution which he professes to think so much about. This special was sent from Sherbrooke on the 12th of March. It is in reference to a matter in which the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) is very much interested. He is not only interested in the welfare of Canada, but it appears he is interested in the welfare of the States, and particularly interested in the welfare of Texas, and I will just read the extract:

“Sherbrooke, March 12th.—(Special.)—The bankrupt Dominion cattle enterprise was before the court here a few days ago. It appeared that Senator Oochrane, President, and Mr. W. B. Ives, M.P., Managing Director of the defunct company, undertook, some two years ago, without proper authority from the directors or shareholders, to give the Eastern Townships Bank a chattle mortgage upon the whole of the assets of the company to assure an overdue indebtedness to the bank. This deception upon the —”

Mr. SPEAKER. I would ask the hon. gentleman what has this to do with the present debate.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I want to show the loyalty of the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives).

Mr. IVES. I rise to a point of order. I would like the House to permit the hon. gentleman to continue if they will afterwards allow me a moment to answer. I am aware of that passage in the *Free Press*, but I could not take any notice of it there. If the hon. gentleman brings it before this House I shall take an opportunity to answer it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be better for the hon. gentleman to refrain from reading that, because we have no debate on this question. It is clearly out of order.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) desires to make an explanation it would be a good place for him to explain his position with regard to this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot allow the rules of the House to be broken even for the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives).

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have no desire to transgress the rules of the House at all—I supposed I was perfectly in order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, Chair.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish just to say to those gentlemen who profess so much loyalty that when a search is made into their past history it will be discovered they are not quite so loyal as they profess to be. Dr. Johnson says: "That loyalty as professed by some is the last refuge of a scoundrel." I think, Mr. Speaker, that the loyalty manifested by some gentlemen on the other side of the House is somewhat of this species.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will not insist on what he has said, but will withdraw it and apologise to the House for having said it. Characterising the loyalty of a large number of the members of this House in the way he has done, I think, is derogatory to the dignity of the House, and he ought to withdraw what he has said.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I merely referred to what Dr. Johnson has said. The species may be very varied, but I did not say it was positively of that character at all. Therefore, I do not think I have transgressed the rules of the House in any way whatever. I think it is very much out of place for those gentlemen to throw out the insinuations they have.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must submit to the ruling or else appeal. I decided that the words were unparliamentary and very ungentlemanly and he ought to withdraw them and apologise to the House. If he cannot do that I will have to take another proceeding.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How did I transgress?

Mr. SPEAKER. In what you have just said.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Tell me the words I made use of that were unparliamentary?

Mr. SPEAKER. The words were that with a certain number of members of this House—"that loyalty was the last refuge of scoundrels."

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member said something to that effect and I understood it so.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That was not what I said in the precise words; but if you and the House understood that I did say so, I am quite willing to withdraw it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

Mr. IVES. I shall not occupy but a moment. Your decision, although I bow to it, is rather unfortunate to me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. IVES. The House allowed him to proceed with the reading of that document, and I can only say there is no truth in it whatever; and if permitted by the House and you to refer to it, I would be very happy to do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, —

Some hon. MEMBERS. Apologise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think there is much use in pressing for that. If there is any lesson to be learned from this at all, it is the extreme and excessive folly of gentlemen who live in glass houses casting stones, and in particular the extreme and excessive folly of men whose record for loyalty will not bear investigation for one second, either in their own persons or in the persons of their colleagues, presuming, as many have done from the beginning to the end of the late debate, to cast imputations on the loyalty of better men than themselves. However, I do not propose to go into a discussion as to whether my hon. friend here or the hon. gentleman who spoke last is the more loyal or better citizen of Canada. They can settle that matter between themselves at their leisure, and I have no doubt my hon. friend has nothing to dread from the encounter. What I rose to call attention to is this: In the first place, Sir, I do not know whether you entirely comprehended, if I may be allowed to say so, not being as familiar as we are with the intricacies of the English language, the very dangerous attempt made by the First Minister to seduce from his allegiance to our side our estimable friend from Charlottetown, when he got up and intimated that a chief justiceship was at his disposal. I think you ought to call attention to the danger to the morals of our hon. friend.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). That is on a par with the accusation that Nova Scotia was going to be bribed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Sir, the public records and the public accounts show that I had very excellent ground for anything I said in that respect. However, I want to call attention to the fact that the First Minister has been endeavoring to corrupt the morals of my hon. friend by telling him that the chief justiceship was waiting for him when he was ready to take it. But I am bound to say this, that I have known a very much higher price to be paid for infinitely inferior men to my hon. friend; and knowing that, I cannot but feel that the matter ought to be more or less taken notice of. But I wish to call the attention of the First Minister and of his colleagues to the fact that the First Minister was not correct in saying that attention had not been frequently called from this side of the House to the action of the American Government in freeing certain articles. If my memory does not fail me, in the debate in which the present Postmaster General proposed certain changes in the duties on fruit, that point was taken, and taken strongly. He was told that he was likely to destroy a valuable trade which was growing up, and that it was expedient that we should act at once under this identical clause now under discussion, for the purpose of showing the Americans that we were disposed to meet them half way in order to obtain reciprocity in the articles named in that clause. The hon. First Minister will find on reference to the *Hansard* that he is not at all correct in supposing that we on this side of the House did not over and over again call attention to the fact that the American Government had placed on the free list certain articles referred to in the Act of 1879, and that it was eminently desirable that we should meet them in the same spirit.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

THE WRIT FOR RUSSELL.

Mr. LAURIER. Now that the First Minister is in his place, I would like to inquire if he can inform us whether the Order of the House for the issue of the writ for the election in Russell has at last been complied with.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I think not. I was looking into the matter this morning and I had not time to consider who the returning officer ought to be.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman stated yesterday that it would be issued immediately. I will renew the question to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If you please.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, in desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very sure the House must have been pleased that an incident should have occurred which even for a few moments cast a gleam of hilarity over those usually very gloomy countenances on the other side of the House; but they may be sure of one thing, that whatever credit they may take to themselves from the recent discussion, those representing the majority of the people of this country will never permit that any reciprocal advantage, no matter how great it may be, with reference to any class of commodities, will divert the people of this country from pursuing their own interests in the way best calculated to promote those interests and in the manner indicated by the National Policy. Now, Sir, this debate has already been so protracted that any hon. gentleman who undertakes to intervene in it can hardly expect to obtain the attention of hon. members unless he avoids as far as possible going over ground which has been already occupied, and avoid reading newspaper extracts which swell the pages of *Hansard* without really affecting the issue of the debate. The contention of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) I take to be this, that the agricultural interests of this country are in such a depressed condition that they require a remedy, and that this depression is due to the limited market for their productions, and is aggravated by the burdens laid upon them by the National Policy. To cure this depression he proposes the remedy, the only one, he claims, that can be found, of widely extended commercial relations with the United States. I

Mr. HAGGART.

deny the premises, and I say that, even admitting them to be well founded, the remedy suggested is neither the only one nor the best one. When we come to examine the grounds upon which this alleged depression is based we are confronted with the remarkable fact that at the time of the last general elections, a little over twelve months ago, we heard nothing about it; we heard nothing of the farmers being in such a bad condition that it was necessary to resort to the heroic remedy—an ignoble remedy would be the more fit term—of subverting the policy which the people adopted in 1878, a policy in which they renewed their confidence in 1882, and which they finally sanctioned in 1887. Then with this remarkable fact staring us in the face, we must draw the inference, either that the hon. gentlemen opposite were then ignorant that such a thing as depression existed and, therefore, did not think any remedy necessary, or that they did not dare to face the evil and propose a remedy. The first inference would be an insult to their intelligence, and the second would be an insult to their courage and statesmanship. The only other inference is that since the general election some terrible calamity has overtaken this country, which has brought about the state of depression that now exists. If we examine the history of the country during the last twelvemonth, we will find that we have had causes for depression, but they are causes which are beyond Government control. We have had a dry season and short crops. Our cattle have suffered from want of water, and many of our grains were light. But are we to blame the Administration for those evils? Is it the fault of the Government that there has been rust in the wheat or that there has been a failure of pasture? And is it contended that reciprocity with the United States would prevent the recurrence of these evils? I would venture to suggest another hypothesis for the course adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite. I feel rather loath to make it, because it is not very creditable to hon. gentlemen opposite for whose statesmanship and knowledge of the affairs of this country I have much respect. That hypothesis is this: At the last elections they had no policy, and they found it impossible to obtain the support of the majority of the people for want of a policy. Not having the wit, or ingenuity, or sense, to devise a policy for themselves, they took up one which they found cut and dried, devised by a renegade Canadian, a renegade Englishman and a Yankee politician. The political garments which they had had so long in use were worn threadbare, and they had nothing with which to cover their own nakedness; so they adopted this garment of commercial union, and having put it on, they strutted about like jack-daws in borrowed plumes. But there is one hon. gentleman among them who is above wearing ready made clothing and second hand garments, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who, by virtue of the magic letters which gives him the title he wears so gracefully, could not think of putting on a second hand garment, even that of Wiman, Smith and Butterworth. He needs must have a coat made to fit himself, so he took this garment, brought it to a tailor, had it made up anew, and called it unrestricted reciprocity. That is the best explanation that can be given of the course pursued by the hon. gentleman. When we come to consider again the evidence given of the alleged agricultural distress, we find the only tangible statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite is that the mortgages on the farm lands of this country have become so heavy that it is absolutely necessary some relief should be furnished. As a matter of fact, the farm lands of this country have always been mortgaged, and in the existing state of things must always be mortgaged, and I deny the proposition that the mortgages represent a debt. Except to a very limited extent they do not represent a debt. They represent the capital invested. They represent the money invested in improving farm lands and promoting the agricultural interests of the country.

Not one farmer in one hundred has capital of his own beyond that which he evolves out of the labor of his own hands, and it is good economy for him to borrow money for the purpose of making improvements. At any rate, he thought it was good economy, and the great majority of the people think it is; and I am justified in my contention that that money does not represent a debt, but represents capital invested for the purpose of improving and carrying on the agricultural interests of the country. Even if it were a debt, it is one to which we are no more subject to-day than we were in times past. How, I ask you, can the burden be more heavily felt to-day, when money is obtainable at 6 per cent. and $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., than it was years ago, when the farmer had to pay 10 to 12 per cent. So much for the depression among the farmers, which, I think, I have shown to exist largely in the imagination of hon. gentlemen opposite. But assuming, for the sake of argument, that that depression does exist, let us see what the remedy that is proposed amounts to. We are told the remedy lies in more widely extended commercial relations with the United States. But before entering upon this subject I wish to say that with regard to the burdens said to be laid on the farmers by the operation of the National Policy, ever since 1878, hon. gentlemen opposite have been endeavoring to persuade the farmers that the duty levied on articles imported necessarily adds to the price of similar articles made in this country. The farmers, however, have refused to be deluded by that fallacy, as shown by the fact that they have elected as their representatives men who take the opposite view. I am not going to weary the House with figures, but I wish to point out, by reference to a few of our leading articles of production, how little our agricultural interests would be benefited by this new policy. My contention is, that the American market is not our only and not our best market, and it does seem to me an argument which no one in his senses would resort to, unless driven to it by the impossibility of finding anything else to say, that the best market for an agricultural country is a country which produces a large surplus of similar products. If the hon. member for Bothwell were called on to advise the people where they should seek their best market, he would say go to that country which requires the things you have to sell. Do not go to a country which competes with you in the same market. Let us see what the actual state of things is, taking a few of the leading articles. I do not pretend to say that this is a full statement. It is only a partial statement, but it is sufficient to illustrate my view of the case, and I think it is very suggestive. England is the best market for the following Canadian products, and to this extent:—

Cattle.....	\$ 5,300,000
Butter.....	750,000
Cheese.....	7,000,000
Bacon.....	870,000
Hams.....	370,000
Apples.....	649,000
Oats.....	509,000
Peas.....	2,000,000
Wheat.....	4,278,000
Flour.....	1,580,000
Oatmeal.....	176,000
Total.....	<u>\$23,482,000</u>

The United States is our best market for the following:—

Horses.....	\$ 2,200,000
Sheep.....	900,000
Eggs.....	1,800,000
Wool.....	288,000
Barley.....	5,245,000
Beans.....	206,000
Hay.....	670,000
Potatoes.....	328,000
Total.....	<u>\$11,637,000</u>

Mr. O'BRIEN.

Therefore, England is our best market for leading agricultural products to the extent of nearly twenty-three millions and a-half, while the Americans give us the best market for only a little over eleven millions and a-half. Of course, there are many other articles on both sides, but I am taking those on which the difference is very apparent on one side. Of our cattle, for example, the value of nearly five millions and a half goes to England and less than one million to the United States. The result is this. If we had a market for barley, if the Americans did not require our barley, and did not buy it almost at any price we choose to ask for it, the case would stand this, that we would sell to England twenty-eight millions and a half, and to the States only six millions. Where is our best market in that case? Clearly where we sell the largest quantities of our products. Now, in regard to this article of barley and in regard to the article of horses and in regard to most of the agricultural products that we sell to the States, there is this remarkable fact that everything we sell to them is better than they have themselves. I have been told, on what I believe to be very good authority, that in the New York market the life of our horses for the sort of work for which they are purchased is very much greater than that of horses bred in a southern climate; and it is well known that our barley is superior to theirs.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman consider that that statement would hold good if there was a free admission of all these articles in the United States as there is into England?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not think it would make a great difference, and if it made a difference, it would not be to our advantage. For instance, why should we sell flour to the Americans in order that they may export it and make the profit out of it? Why should we sell them wheat in order that they may grind it, and export it, and make the profit out of it, which is now made by our own mills? If we must have commercial union with any country, it should be with the country which affords us our best market, and that is not the United States. If we must have free trade in manufactures, let us have it with the country which enters least into the competition with our own manufacturers. The manufactures which we buy from the United States are precisely the same as we make ourselves; or, rather, those that we would buy from the United States if the resolution of the hon. gentleman opposite were adopted. But what we buy from England are goods which our manufacturers do not produce. So, if we could have free trade with England, it would interfere to a far less extent with our manufactures than for us to have free trade with a country that manufactured the same class of goods that we do. If, therefore, we are to have a system of commercial union adopted, let us have it with the country which gives us our best market, and in which we meet with the least competition as regards agricultural products and manufactures. There is another subject which has not been touched upon to any extent in this debate, and it is one of which I have some knowledge in a general way, although I do not pretend to have a particular knowledge of it, and that is as to the effect that reciprocity in lumber would have upon our trade in this country. We have always dealt with this question as though the lumbermen were the only people in this country who had an interest in this trade. I say the people of this country as a whole have a much larger interest in this trade than the lumbermen themselves, and I confess that I look with great suspicion upon any measure which is said to tend to stimulate the lumber trade. When I see our lumber going out of the country to the extent to which it is now being sent out of the country, when I remember that in the part of the country in which I live there was a time when lumber was plentiful and that now a hemlock board is the best a

farmer can get, and that that is the same all over the Province of Ontario, it is no wonder that I should regard with suspicion any measure which stimulates the export of lumber. When once a pine tree is gone, it is gone forever, for all practical purposes. We are doing nothing to replace the trees which are cut down, we are doing nothing to fill the gaps in our forest, even where there are facilities for doing so. Besides, I take it for granted that, if the American import duty is taken off, our export duty up on sawlogs must go too. The effect of that is easily understood. In my own constituency, before that export duty was put on, I have seen the representatives of Michigan firms who had made elaborate preparations for taking our logs across the lakes, who had built scows for the purpose, to be loaded and unloaded by machinery, and I think the other day in Toronto, at the last sale, some of our most valuable limits were bought by those men. Their policy is clear, and I think we might take a lesson from them. They know that their supply of timber is limited, that pine trees are increasing in value every year, and so they are saving their pine forests in Minnesota and Michigan and purchasing our limits. If that goes on, instead of our timber being cut up and manufactured in this country, it will be transported to the mills in Michigan, and this country will not only lose the timber but the profit which it has hitherto made on the manufacture. One or two words in regard to this unrestricted reciprocity. I do not charge hon. gentlemen opposite, in the view they hold on this question, with desiring to change the political relations of this country, and I think they have carefully framed this resolution so as to avoid that imputation, but I may point out to them that the practical difficulties in the way of carrying out such a scheme as that which they present to the House would necessarily lead either to its being extended all the way to commercial union or its leading to disputes which would result in its abrogation by one party or the other. Without pretending to know much about importations and about the transaction of business, it does appear to me that, supposing such a treaty were made and there was a difference, as there probably would be, between the import duties of the two countries, a year would not elapse before we would find complaints made from the country which had the higher import duties that the other country was bringing in English or French or German manufactures and passing them through by some trick by which they evaded the letter of the law and so got them into that country. I may be wrong, but I think there is good ground for that expectation, and I think we could never stand still on the resolution which is now before the House. I think that either the whole thing would be abrogated in consequence of disputes in regard to the customs, or it would be extended to such a degree as necessarily to bring about the subservience of this country in a fiscal point of view to the neighboring country, and what the result of that would be hon. gentlemen can judge for themselves. I think there is no possibility of avoiding the conclusion that it would bring about a change in our political relations which would be most disastrous to what I conceive the best interests of this country. I believe that there is no such depression as would justify a revolution in our fiscal policy, no such depression as would cause us to depart from what has been our policy ever since Confederation; for, mark you, if this view is correct, we have been under a mistake ever since Confederation, we must abandon all hope of realising the dreams we have held of ever becoming a great nation, and we must admit that we have been the greatest fools in expending millions of dollars in public works that would then be practically useless. I say to propose a remedy like this, an ignoble remedy, would be to ask the people of this country to do something which nothing but the direst necessity would drive them to. Having failed to establish that point, the whole case of the hon. gentleman falls on the ground, and

he has no right to ask this House, or to ask this country to revolutionise our commercial arrangements and to adopt a policy which, in the opinion of the great majority of the people, whether rightly or wrongly, will lead to political changes which are abhorrent to them. Therefore this House would be justified, in view of our highest and best interests which are not to be measured by mere dollars and cents, in rejecting the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, and if we are to have reciprocity, confining it simply to those natural products which do not interfere with the policy adopted by this country, and which has so largely contributed to its welfare and prosperity.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not my intention to take up a great deal of the time of the House in discussing the question before us. When the question was before the people last summer, and there was a great deal of agitation throughout the country in favor of commercial union, I paid a good deal of attention to it; but it always seemed a great objection to me that the proposition had never been put upon such a financial basis that I could understand it becoming a serious question before the country. I can understand a commercial union between this country and the United States, but so far as the proposition of the hon. gentleman opposite is embodied in his resolution, I confess I am unable to understand it. Commercial union, as it was proposed, is something similar to the Zollverein which existed among the different principalities of Germany. We were to have similar tariff regulations in this country and the United States, and we were promised that the customs duties between the two countries would be abolished. We were told how the revenue was to be divided, and a basis was to be agreed upon between the two countries, either a *per capita* one, or one according to the interests involved in the two countries. I could understand that proposition. The difficulty that always occurred to me was this: if we receive only a *per capita* allowance of the duties on goods which came into this country, how were the engagements of the country to be met? We import into this country at present nearly double the amount per head that they import into the United States, and the revenue which we receive barely suffices for the wants of the country. In any arrangement between this country and the United States in the form of commercial union, the basis would be a *per capita* one, we would receive only one-half the customs duties which we receive at present. Hon. gentlemen say that we are not going to have commercial union, we are going to have unrestricted reciprocity, with the rights of fixing our own tariff; but I shall endeavor to show, in the remarks that I am about to make, the absurdity of any such proposition as that. Unrestricted reciprocity with the rights of fixing our own tariff—what does that mean? It means that we shall have the fixing of the tariff on any goods which come from any other country than the United States, into our own, and an unrestricted interchange of commodities, either manufactured or otherwise, between this country and the United States. That is a proposition which never enters into the heads of any one in the United States. They never make a proposition of that kind; you never see anything like it proposed by any statesman in the United States; you hear nothing of that kind in the press of the United States. They always ask, as a condition attached to unrestricted reciprocity, a similarity of tariffs. The hon. gentleman from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) gets up and says: The proposition which we propose for you is not one of commercial union, we intend to reserve to ourselves the right of fixing the tariff. Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall endeavor to show you the absurdity of such a proposition as that. What does it mean? Suppose the United States, on some articles, have a tariff of 25 per cent.; suppose we have a similar tariff to theirs on iron, which ranges from \$4 up to \$22 per

ton. Suppose they leave to the people of Canada the right of fixing the tariff on articles coming into this country in any manner which they like. What is the object of unrestricted reciprocity? Is it not for the purpose of compelling us to interchange commodities, manufactured or otherwise, with the United States? I can show you how, if we are left to the fixing of our own tariff, we would not be at all obliged to take a single article of manufactured goods from the United States unless they can manufacture them cheaper than we could import them from any other part of the world. The simple reason is this: Iron, as we all know, is at a high price in the United States. That price is fixed by the import duty of from \$4 to \$22 per ton. Supposing we were left the right of fixing our own tariff, and we wanted to use, say, 100,000 tons, or 50,000 tons, of steel rails in this country; would we go to the United States and pay \$10 or \$12 a ton more for them if we had the right of fixing our own tariff? Would we not fix the tariff at such a rate that we could get these rails into the country \$6 or \$7 or \$8 cheaper than we could from the United States? I know the answer hon. gentlemen will make to a proposition of that kind. Their answer is that the liabilities of our country are such as would compel us to raise as large a revenue as possible on all articles coming into the country, and that fact would oblige us to prevent any such transaction as that occurring. But, no, Mr. Speaker, if we import these goods from the United States, we would have to pay no duty, and there would be nothing accruing to the revenue in that case. If we put on \$4 or \$5 a ton, or 10 per cent. duty, there would be a larger amount coming into the revenue of this country, and we would be getting the articles cheaper. You would think that no sane person, no politician or statesman in the United States, would make any such a bargain as that with us. They do not propose it, Mr. Speaker. The proposition is the simple and bald one, on their side, of unrestricted reciprocity in natural products and manufactures, with similar tariffs. What would be the result in this country if we had a similar tariff with that of the United States? What would be the amount we would receive from duties on goods coming into the country? As I said before, the Canadians import into this country double the amount *per capita* of what the Americans import. Supposing there was a pooling system between the two countries, Canada would only receive one-half in the shape of import duties of the amount it does at present. How are we to pay our liabilities in a case of that kind?

Mr. COOK. Reduce the expenses.

Mr. HAGGART. There are some fixed liabilities we are obliged to pay. We have to pay the annual subsidies to Provinces, the cost of legislation, interest on the Dominion indebtedness, expenses for the purpose of keeping the Indians from starving in the North-West, the cost of the constabulary there—all these sums we must pay some way or other, and it devolves upon hon. gentlemen opposite on submitting a proposition before the House, the adoption of which would completely change the fiscal arrangements of the country, to show some financial basis upon which the proposition can be supported. Not a single hon. gentleman who has addressed the House during this debate has attempted to solve the problem, except the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and he made his statement on the supposition that the imports into this country would pay as much duty to the treasury with commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity between this country and the United States as they do at present. I can understand the benefit of commercial union between peoples similar to one another, peoples of similar ideas, of similar lineage, without different feelings and sentiments, peoples the same as the German people, having a fiscal arrangement by which there was

Mr. HAGGART.

commercial union and by which the customs duties between the two countries were abolished; but I cannot understand the proposition for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States which the hon. gentleman has introduced. I cannot understand it, because it means, if it means anything, commercial union *plus* the custom houses between the two countries. It has no other basis or foundation. What arguments do hon. gentlemen opposite advance in support of their proposal which involves an entire change in our fiscal policy? They speak of the benefit which would accrue to this country from the free exchange under unrestricted reciprocity of agricultural products, of fish and the products of the mine and other products. Their first effort is to show a depression in our agricultural industry. I deny that our agricultural interests are depressed. I make the statement, and I make it supported by the opinions of the best statisticians, that the agricultural population in Canada are in as good a position as any other agricultural population on the face of the globe. The amount of money invested in agricultural lands in this country is greater *per capita* than in the United States, the yield is within a percentage of being as great. The reason why it is greater in the United States is because the returns of California are included. We have larger receipts and returns for our agricultural population than any of the New England States; our return is greater than any of the Middle States. A farmer in any portion of Canada is better off than a farmer in New York or any of the Middle States. We are now, according to the opinion of statisticians who have made the subject a special study, in the same position as the Western States, and the only reason of the percentage of return being greater in the whole United States is because of the enormous return of California *per capita*. I am convinced that if we had the statistics down to the present day, giving the returns of our North-West, with its enormous crop this year, and the returns of British Columbia, the return *per capita* for the farming population of this country would be greater than in the United States, and the farming population per man is better off in this country than in any portion of the United States except California.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why do our farmers leave in such numbers?

Mr. HAGGART. I have heard a great deal about farmers leaving this country. It has been natural, since 1820, for the surplus population of the country to leave here. The whole number of people, being Canadian born subjects, who have left here from 1820 up to 1888 and gone to the United States, has been about 1,000,000. The present number in the United States according to last census, the only return we have, is 713,000. When I heard the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) the other day talking about the large number of people that were annually leaving Prince Edward Island, that it was almost depleted, that the country was naturally going over to the United States, I turned up the census of the United States out of curiosity to find out how many had left Prince Edward Island and gone there, and I find that of people born in the Island there were at present living in the United States, according to the last census, 7,313. That was the total number of people who had left Prince Edward Island and gone there. Hon. gentlemen may think I am wrong in my statistics, but I will take the American Almanac and show there is no mistake about them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman will find that they do not distinguish between British North America and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. HAGGART. They do; they distinguish in every particular. Nationalities of the foreign born population, from the official return of the tenth census, 1880, Canada

610,000, New Brunswick, 41,788, Newfoundland, 4789, Nova Scotia 51,150, Prince Edward Island, 7,537.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that; I also know, what I intimated, that they are not very particular about distinguishing between the small Provinces.

Mr. HAGGART. The only official statistics we have are those of the United States census, and I have quoted from that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What year?

Mr. HAGGART. Last census, 1880, and compiled in 1881. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very fond of telling us of the immense advantage that would result from the interchange of agricultural commodities and minerals between the two countries. It is true there has been an immense traffic developed in the Lake Superior district and in Michigan from extracting ore from the mines there; but hon. gentlemen opposite always reject or refuse to state, or at least they do not tell us the reason. There would not be, I venture to say, a single ton of iron ore extracted out of United States mines or manufactured there if it were not for the protective duty which exists, ranging from \$4 to \$22. Are they going to offer to the people of this country markets so highly protected without receiving some corresponding advantage? Hon. gentlemen tell the House of the paltry 30,000 tons of iron ore exported from this country to the United States. The United States, or rather the people of the United States, tax the industries and the agricultural portion of the country in order that they may manufacture for themselves. They have ores in the country, but is it not a notorious fact that you can take better ore than is to be found anywhere in the United States from Bilbao in Spain and deliver it in the United States for a less price than it can be taken from the Michigan mines to Philadelphia? If it were not for the protective duties they have at present in the United States there would not be a single ton of United States ore smelted and worked there, because free trade England and Spain and those other countries could send them the products of their mines and undersell them in their own country.

Mr. CHARLTON. Is the hon. gentleman aware that in northern Alabama and in other portions of the United States iron is produced for less cost than in any other place in the world?

Mr. HAGGART. I am quite aware of it. I have the authority here for my statement, and the statistician on the subject says that there would not be a ton of ore manufactured in the United States if you could export iron ore into the country free of duty, and that the ore of a better quality from Bilbao could be delivered cheaper in Philadelphia than it could be extracted from the different mines of the United States and delivered there. What would be the use of the railroads in the United States, and where would their increased prosperity be if England should at one time or another alter her fiscal policy in reference to foreign nations? What is it builds up Chicago and Milwaukee and those railroads which centre there? Is it not the carriage of the surplus cereal products of that country for the purpose of delivering them in England? What is it that gives a benefit to the agricultural population of our North-West and the western States of America? It is the high market in England; it is the carriage of the surplus products of this country towards the Atlantic coast for export to that great country beyond the Atlantic which consumes so much of our produce. We have had a great deal of talk in this country about the glorious United States. Sir, we belong to an Empire greater and more glorious. We belong to a people, and we belong to a country, which consists of 35,000,000 of inhabitants. We belong to an Island which has increased in wealth during the last decade at the rate

of £400,000 sterling a day. The wealth of that country has increased at that rate. The people of that country emigrate to every portion of the world, but you do not hear the cry that the country is becoming poor, nor do you hear her people running down their own country. If we are going to unite to any country let us have closer bonds with the country which can benefit us. What would be the use of all that great farming country in the western States unless they had England as a market for their surplus products? And are we going to cut our connection with the best market in the world for the purpose of forming some absurd political policy proposed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and which not one of them has attempted to put before us upon a financial basis. As I showed in my opening remarks not a single one of the gentlemen opposite except indeed the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has attempted to put their proposition on a financial basis. Are they going to ask the people of the country to support any such policy as this, or are they going to ask the people of this House to support it, without giving us the financial aspect? The pre-requisite, to advancing any proposition of that kind which will alter the fiscal arrangements of this country, is to show how it can be done. Has any one of them attempted to do that? Not a single one, but the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I have endeavored to show how absurd his proposition is; I have endeavored to show that the amount paid in import duties by the inhabitants of this country is as two to one compared with the amount paid by the people of the United States, and that the requirements of this country need nearly the whole revenue. We may reduce our requirements to some extent, but even the hon. gentleman could not explain his case in any other way than by saying that the balance of what we require should be raised by direct taxation.

Mr. CHARLTON. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. HAGGART. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I thought, perhaps, that I was listening to him the other evening, and I listened to him in order to hear how he proposed to raise the customs duty and excise, and how we should get the balance, which even, according to his own calculation, was required after that. I may have misunderstood him, but I think he said it was to be raised by direct taxation.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman will allow me I will explain.

Mr. HAGGART. Certainly. I do not wish to make any statement as to what any gentleman may have said, unless it is correct.

Mr. CHARLTON. I proceeded to point out in what way I deemed the necessary revenue could be raised. I asserted distinctly it would not be necessary to resort to direct taxation. I then said: "even admitting for the sake of argument" that which I would not admit, that it were necessary to resort to direct taxation, and I proceeded to show that in that eventuality the country would be a large gainer. I did not say that it would be necessary to resort to direct taxation, and I did not believe it.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps it was from some remarks like those I drew the conclusion which I did. I was paying attention to the hon. gentleman's remarks, because he was the only one who endeavored to supply the information which the country and the House required from gentlemen opposite. When they demand a complete change of the system of government of the country they should show in some manner or other how they intended to carry out their project financially. I say they have never done this, and as I said before, it is required by the country that they should do so. The hon. gentleman from Queen's, P.E.I.

(Mr. Davies), described the glowing condition of the country which would follow from this change, and I trust I may be pardoned if I show how it would be entirely different from the glowing condition he represented. What would be the effect of this policy on this country? Would not the manufactories, or the majority of the manufactories, of this country be closed?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. HAGGART. It is true, I admit the proposition that a Canadian is just as intelligent and as good as an American, and as good a man as any to be found in the United States, but, unfortunately on account of the smallness of the market the whole capital of the manufacturer in this country has been forced into the supplying of four or five articles while in the United States his energies are centered in the manufacture of one article. Any manufacturer in this country will tell you, or any one who has enquired into the matter will tell you, that the result of this policy now proposed would be almost a complete destruction of the capital at present invested, if there were open competition between Canada and the United States. They are the judges of what would be best for themselves, and I venture to say that 99 out of 100 manufacturers in this country will tell you that it would be complete ruin to them if such an arrangement was made as they propose. And another thing. What would become of the commerce of this country? The hon. gentlemen themselves say: "Oh, we naturally go south, we naturally go to the United States for anything we can buy, and importers going from New York or Boston to the old country buy wholesale and buy larger quantities than are required for the limited markets of Montreal and Quebec, and as a consequence they may be able to sell cheaper. His facilities for navigating between the ports of the old country and this on account of the immense export and import trade being nearly equal both ways, and as a natural result the people of this country would go to the markets, where perhaps they can buy a little cheaper, where perhaps they would have a larger stock to select from, and Montreal and Toronto and Halifax and St. John, instead of supplying the retail trade of the Dominion as at present, would become ports in which there would be hardly any commerce done whatever." Under this system we would have the whole trade and commerce of this country transferred to a foreign country. What benefit would that be to the agricultural portion of this country? No benefit at all except the interchange of two or three commodities, in the sale of horses, the sale of chickens and the sale of barley over there. The great agricultural products of this country are sent to Great Britain where they have a market, and what benefit would it be to have a free interchange only for those articles? It would be of course to some extent a benefit to the country, and that, I suppose is the policy of this Government and of all parties in this country—to get as unrestricted a trade between this country and the United States as possible, having regard to our fiscal position and our manufacturing interests. It is in the interest of the people of Canada to have such an interchange as that. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite tell us how much better off people on the other side are than people here. On the contrary, the people of this country *per capita* are nearly as wealthy as the people on the other side. Our commerce is nearly double *per capita* what the commerce of the United States is. Our shipping is greater by nearly two to one *per capita* than that of the United States, in everything that constitutes a nation, man for man, we are equal if not the superior of the people of the United States.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Why cannot we hold our own, then?

Mr. HAGGART. We can hold our own. Now, what would be the result of such a proposition as that of hon.

Mr. HAGGART.

gentleman opposite, even supposing it had a financial or fiscal basis? It is not a proposition in the form of a treaty that would be continuous, say for thirty or forty years. It proposes to leave to each nation the framing of its own tariff. The time might come when there would be a change in the Government of the United States, or a change in the Government of this country; a different set of people would come in who might change the tariff regulations altogether; and if our manufactures were wiped out and the present commerce transferred from Montreal, Quebec and all our other seaport towns to the United States, then how could we expect to revive trade if the arrangement came to an end? It would be impossible. The country would be put back, and it would take ten or fifteen years to restore it to its former position; and even then capitalists would lose confidence in the country, for they would say that although the Government and Parliament of this country had promised a certain policy to the manufacturers of this country, they had revoked that policy at the instance of the Opposition without providing for compensation. The consequence would be that promises of any kind from any party would not induce capital to re-engage in manufacturing. A more absurd proposition I never heard propounded in my lifetime by any great party in the country. The primary condition of such a proposition should be to put it on such a financial basis that it can be clearly understood by the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have never endeavored to do so. The hon. member for Queen's described the wonderful wealth that would accrue to this country in a few years under the carrying out of this policy. He described the flag as drooping over his head, but the breeze of public opinion he said would soon come and open its folds. The breeze of public opinion will never blow in this country in favor of such a policy. It is to the interest of the people of this country to have an Opposition which will propound a policy that will be acceptable to the country. It is to the interest of the people of this country that there should be an independent spirit, perhaps not in the House, but in the country, to change the current of opinion from one party to another; but the party that propounds such a policy as this, mark my words, will never get into power.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 59) to confer certain powers on the Nova Scotia Telephone Company (Limited).—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 61) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 69) to confirm a mortgage given by the Central Railway Company to the Central Trust Company of New York to secure an issue of Debentures.—(M. Weldon, St. John.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Tobique Gypsum and Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon, Albert.)

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Annapolis Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Mills, Annapolis.)

ST. JOHN'S AND IBERVILLE HYDRAULIC AND MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

Mr. BAIN (Soulanges), for Mr. VANASSE, moved second reading of Bill (No. 7) to grant certain powers to the St. John's and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Company.

Mr. BECHARD. There is a strong opposition on the part of numerous people, who will be seriously affected by

it, to this Bill. I would ask that the second reading be delayed so that I may have time to communicate with those people.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The last time the Bill was up for a second reading, I asked that it be allowed to stand over, in order that the hon. gentleman and his friends might have an opportunity of presenting one or two petitions against it, which I knew were coming on. These have been presented, and I understand others are coming. This Bill will be before the committee for eight days, so that there will be plenty of time for the presentation of petitions, and I would advise the hon. gentleman not to object to the second reading, but to reserve his opposition until the Bill goes into committee.

Bill read the second time.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed debate on proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright, on amendment of Mr. Foster, and amendment to amendment of Mr. Jones (Halifax).

Mr. HAGGART. I was about concluding my remarks before dinner, and those which I shall now make will be very short. I wish briefly to refer to some of the remarks I made before recess, and to which I defy contradiction from hon. gentlemen opposite. I stated that unrestricted reciprocity means parting with our right to fix our own tariff; I stated that it means parting with all our rights in respect of our fiscal policy. I stated that unrestricted reciprocity, as rightly understood between reasonable men and between countries, means that the tariff of each country should be the same. I referred to statements made by gentlemen who advocate that scheme in the United States, and I showed that, without exception, they require similar tariffs in the two countries. I may refer to an address to the American people, which was issued by Mr. Blaine, son of the gentleman who was supposed to be a candidate, in the republican interest, for the presidency of the United States. He is supposed to mouth the opinions of the Republican party in the United States, and he said that there were only two ways of dealing with the Canadian people, either retaliation or unrestricted reciprocity with similar tariffs. I have shown that if unrestricted reciprocity means anything it means an agreement between the two countries to have a common tariff, and I defy any hon. gentleman opposite to prove the contrary. I stated that if we desired that our manufactured products should be admitted free into the United States, and have the benefit of their highly protective tariff, we would have to prevent goods manufactured in other countries from coming into this at a nominal rate of duty and thus competing with United States manufactures in our markets. I showed the absurdity of an agreement such as that proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, by pointing out that if on the American side there was a tariff on foreign goods of 30 to 50 per cent. and we had a similar one here, and if the power was given to us to legislate in any manner we liked in regard to our own tariff, we might legislate to admit foreign goods which are manufactured cheaper than American goods, into this country at lower rates, and thus nullify the whole agreement. The United States will never agree to a proposition such as these gentlemen propose. A proposition to receive the support of this country and of the people of the United States, must be a reasonable one. We must, if we expect to enter into an agreement of this kind with the United States, be prepared to assimilate our tariff to theirs. That argument is incontrovertible. I have never heard it attempted to be answered by hon. gentlemen opposite. Another reason, which is advanced to the people of Canada, especially Ontario, for

the purpose of inducing them of entering this commercial union—for commercial union it is, notwithstanding the denial of the hon. member for South Oxford—is that between Ontario and the sea, our country is occupied by an alien population, a population of French origin, a population alien to us in religion, in tradition, and in sentiment, and we are asked how is it possible to build up a nationality with such a population between us and the sea. Well, we, the representatives of the Conservative party, have accepted the position. We entered into a union with our fellow countrymen of French descent, and we entered into that union, not with our mouths but with our hearts. We believe they are as great a nation and as great a people as we ourselves are, and we are willing to accept the responsibility of building up a nationality on the north shore of the St. Lawrence with them. We are told that through the influence of their priesthood, through the influence of early marriages and other causes they are increasing in population to such an extent that the time will come when they will rule this country. That time may come, and if through the teaching of morality and from other causes, they will succeed in building up a nation on the north side of the St. Lawrence, we are perfectly willing that they should do so. Those remarks were intended solely for the population of Ontario, with a view to induce us to enter into the scheme of commercial union. What does it mean? It means not only intimate relations with the people on the other side of the border commercially, but it means a union in every respect; it means that we are to cease this nationality which we are endeavoring to build up in connection with the British Empire on this side of the St. Lawrence. As for me and the party to which I belong, we are in favor of that union, we are in favor of building up an empire on the north side of the St. Lawrence in accordance with the sentiments of the British Empire. We believe that, if the day ever comes that we should separate from the Empire, we will have a nationality of our own on the north side of the St. Lawrence. We live in a climate which begets men, and we will at some time have an influence over the continent of America as great as that of any other empire that ever was on the face of the globe. That is the ambition of our people, and it is a laudable ambition. What is that Empire that we are in accord with? Has it not done everything it possibly can for the advancement of this country? Has it not loaned us money, and protected us in every respect? Has it not opened to us its markets and done everything it possibly could do for a colony, which we are? I think it is to the interest of this part of the Empire that we should be in accord with the Empire? It is the greatest Empire on the face of the globe. It is the greatest Empire that ever was known. We have free intercommunication not only with the colonies of the British Empire but with the British Empire itself. We are part of an empire which, as I said before, contains 352,000,000 people under the dominion of the British Crown, and it is to our interest to have closer communication with that Empire than we possibly can have with the people to the south of us. While we are willing to have as great an interchange of commodities and of manufactures with that people as we can, consistently with our position, still, as I said before, we are man for man equal to the people to the south of us. We have as great intelligence, as great industry, and we have, perhaps, as fine a climate—at least we have a climate that begets as good men as they have—and it is to our interest to build up our own nationality. I urge upon hon. gentlemen opposite to adopt a financial and a fiscal basis which is sensible, which people can understand, and until they do that the proposition which they now put forward should be voted down. It has no basis. It is merely a statement of individuals. It is a sentiment without any basis which any reasonable person can be asked to support. It is my opinion that the position

we occupy is one which we properly ought to occupy, in communication with the great Empire with which we are connected; and, if the time should come when we will be separated from that Empire, it is my opinion that it would be to our advantage to remain a separate nationality, which it would be impossible for us to do if the doctrines which are preached on the other side were carried out. I have shown that, if our manufactures and our commerce and everything that constitutes a nation are wiped out, we will be left at the mercy of the people to the south of us, and it is our duty to ourselves, to our children, and to our children's children, to build up a nationality on this side of the St. Lawrence in accord with the Empire; and I believe that these sentiments will be echoed by every elector throughout the whole Dominion of Canada.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I have just heard, Mr. Speaker, fair words spoken, with much eloquence, in respect of the great British Empire. For my part I am proud to belong to that great Empire, and I shall have the opportunity, in the course of my remarks, to revert to the question, but the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Haggart), might have told us whether or not this great Empire is attacked at the heart, and whether, in the centre of this great Empire, there are not millions upon millions that weep and suffer persecution under the British flag? He might have told us, before singing the praises of those 350,000,000 souls, why it is that this powerful country not only does not protect, but persecutes those who are nearest it, the people of poor Ireland? He wishes us to be annexed to that Empire. We shall soon witness the love borne us by that great metropolis which he calls the mother country, and we shall learn the burning love which it bears to the integral members of the British Empire. I shall not make use of the formal pretence that I should not speak at this stage of the debate. On the contrary, the subject has been treated with much ability from the two standpoints of free trade and protection. But there is an important fraction of the country whose voice has not yet been heard, and I regret that their advocacy is not entrusted to more eloquent lips than mine. There are people in Canada who believe in the necessity of protection, and others who stand by the positive need of free trade, while others hold that circumstances should determine the events of the case. In 1878 the United States had raised a wall against us, and we were not allowed to send over either our farmers' produce or our manufactured goods. But, on the other hand, they shipped over to us whatever they liked, flooding our markets with the fruit of their harvests and the production of their manufactures. This was not fair, and whatever gentlemen on this side may say, I proclaim that there was no justice there. Such a policy tended to impoverish the country, and so long as the United States force out our products, we should prevent them from reaching us and protect ourselves against them. But, Sir, I say further, that when the United States open their doors to us, point to their population of 60,000,000 and invite us to join them in trade, we shall be prepared to do it, and march along with them under the flag of America.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I hear exclamations of surprise. The word of "American flag" startles them, but I will explain it to them presently. They are people, I fancy, who would have hindered the Americans from achieving their independence and who would push their loyalty so far as to imagine that it is even best to work in behalf of any other country than their own. We shall soon see what England has done for us, how far our loyalty should extend to her, and what is the meaning of the American flag? We should not dread calling things by their right names. In 1878, I repeat, protection was necessary. As the United States were closed to us, keeping

Mr. HAGGART.

their markets from us, while ours were open to them, the excess of their crops and manufactures poured into our towns and parishes and caused the decline of our own industries. Our farmers had no opportunity of disposing of their produce, as the Americans could cope with them on their own ground. Protection was essential to counteract this state of things, and so long as the United States keep up their protective system against us, we shall be forced to keep up ours against them. But what is taking place, Mr. Speaker? We are witnessing a movement in favor of reciprocity, an outcome of commercial union, which has long occupied the public mind. Months since, a Canadian-born gentleman, of whom we should all be proud, Mr. Erastus Wiman, started the question of commercial union. His speeches, and the comments to which they gave rise, were naturally transmitted to England, and do you know what Mr. Chamberlain said when sent over by the British Government to the United States? I will read what is reported in a resolution unanimously carried by the New York Board of Trade, on the 3rd of last November:

"Whereas the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, the representative of the Government of Great Britain on the Fishery Commission, in a speech delivered before he left England, is reported to have said as follows: "The arrangement between the Colonies and Great Britain, is essentially a temporary one. It cannot remain as it is." Already you have in Canada—the greatest of all the Colonies—an agitation for what is called commercial union with the United States. Commercial union with the United States means free trade between America and the Dominion and a protective tariff against the mother country. If Canada desires that, Canada can have it;" and,

"Whereas, on a subsequent occasion, the right hon. gentleman further said, that "Commercial union with the United States meant that Canada was to give preference to every article of manufacture from the United States over the manufactures of Great Britain. If the people of Canada desired an arrangement of that kind, he did not doubt that they would be able to secure it, and he did not think anybody in England would prevent such arrangement by force; but he remarked that in that case all the advantages of the slender tie that bound Canada to England would disappear, so far as England was concerned; and it was not likely that the people of Great Britain would continue much longer to sustain the obligations and responsibilities of a relationship, all the reciprocal benefits of which had been withdrawn;" and,

"Whereas, The foregoing expression of opinion by an eminent public man, in a high official position, is an important contribution to the knowledge of the members of this Chamber and as it is supplemented with information from Canada that a strong movement is in progress there favoring the closest possible commercial relations with the United States, it would seem to be the duty of this Chamber, without any regard whatever to political or territorial considerations, to investigate the possibility of a greatly enlarged extension of the commerce of this city and country with the northern half of this continent, and;

"Whereas, It is most desirable that the Canadian Fishery question, which for over 100 years has periodically threatened to disturb the peaceful relations existing between Great Britain and this country, should be settled on the broad and enduring basis of a mutual interest, resulting from an enlarged commercial relation between Canada and the United States; therefore, be it Resolved—"

The words of Mr. Chamberlain were spoken in England, and have never been disowned to my knowledge, and he spoke as the representative of Great Britain. In the United States, on the other hand, a notable movement is going on. Boards of Trade are meeting everywhere; the newspapers discuss the matter, speakers crowd the hustings, and, from one end of the great Republic to the other, we are asked to enter upon a free trade alliance with them. In our country a number of public meetings have signified their readiness to embrace such a policy. Should we accept this reciprocity? Let us recall what was said, in 1878, in favor of reciprocity, which, in my view, was then necessary? The right hon. the First Minister closed his motion on the subject in these words:

"That this policy will retain in our midst thousands of our fellow-countrymen who are now forced to leave the country in search of labor which they cannot find at home; it will restore prosperity to our manufactures, now struggling and suffering so painfully; it will prevent Canada from being a slaughter market; it will foster, develop and stimulate our interprovincial trade, and tending to reciprocal tariff with our neighbors in proportion to the various interests of Canada, it will powerfully contribute eventually to provide for this country the benefit of commercial reciprocity."

The elections of that year took place on this issue. We told the electors that we asked for protection in order to

reach the goal of their desires—commercial reciprocity with the United States. We may therefore treat of reciprocity without being branded as rebels, traitors, or utopians in politics or business. All this had been foreseen so far back as 1869. I found the following in a speech of the late Sir Francis Hincks, on the budget, 7th April, 1870:

"The hon. gentleman has drawn the attention of the House to the words 'National Policy.' My opinion is that we should have the faculty of doing all that is right and useful to our interests, and it should not be forgotten that if several of these articles have so far been kept on the list of exemptions, it is because negotiations have several times been opened with the United States, on the subject of a renewal of the reciprocity treaty. On this point, I cannot do better than give the words of my predecessor in his budget speech of last year. Addressing the Americans, he said: 'We have allowed you to bring in your coals to us free, although you place a high duty on ours. We allowed your flour, grain, hops, salt and other articles to be imported free, while you do not reciprocate, but injure our millwrights by imposing a higher duty on flour than on grain. This state of things has lasted for three or four years, but you must understand that it cannot last. The time will come, and perhaps shortly, when we shall have a National Policy of our own, no matter how much it may clash with some theories of political economy. We have to be guided chiefly if not wholly, by the thought of what suits us best, and we may have to consult our own interests in the premises, without regard to that of others.'"

The hon. First Minister himself, in a speech delivered at Montreal, on the 7th July, 1877, said:

"You are going to bury this false policy and adopt that of the party which declares that it will keep Canada for the Canadians, and have a National Policy. You will embrace the policy of the party which holds that Canada shall no longer kiss Uncle Jonathan's feet and will exact reciprocity of trade and reciprocity of duties. If the Americans want to be hemmed in by a Chinese wall we will help them to build that wall. If they do not want us to go to them, we will let them come to us. We shall not allow Canada to become a market for the excess of the American production, nor let our country be the servants of the manufacturers and capitalists of the neighboring republic.

In the Montreal Board of Trade, in 1875, there was a meeting to which certain members of this House were no strangers, and here is the resolution they passed:

"Acting upon the invitation from the St. John Board of Trade, formally accepted at Ottawa, your council, early in the summer, commenced preparations for the special session, which they decided should be held in St. John on the 16th day of July. At that meeting there were forty-eight delegates present, representing 20 different cities and towns,—while the following gentlemen attended from the National Board of Trade of the United States:—

Portland: T. O. Hersey, Esq., Chairman.
Cincinnati: W. W. Taylor, Esq.
New York: John Austin Stevens, jr., Esq.
Boston: B. F. Nourse, Esq.
Milwaukee: W. E. Smith, Esq.
Detroit: E. Hawley, Esq.
Buffalo: E. P. Dorr, Esq.

"A full report of this important gathering was published soon after adjournment, and extensively circulated, so that any statement of the business done there, seems needless in the present report.

"That the draft reciprocity treaty formed the principal subject of discussion, is generally known,—and the following resolution was adopted as the result:—

"1st. That this Board reiterates its frequently expressed opinion in favour of a Treaty of Reciprocity between the United States and Canada."

At that time, Mr. Speaker, we embraced protection because we could not get free trade. We saw that our people could not possibly get along if the Americans continued to flood our markets and farms with their products. But to-day, as I have shown, the United States want reciprocity with us. Shall we decline? Are there genuine advantages for Canada in a reciprocity treaty? Let us first take the opinion of free trade authorities. Adam Smith says, among other things:

"To prohibit a great people from making all they can of every part of their own produce, or from employing their stock and industry in the way that they judge most advantageous for themselves, is a manifest violation of the most sacred rights of mankind."

In the next place, we have the lessons of the past. Is there a solitary man, speaking in good faith, who can say that the country did not make giant strides under the reciprocity treaty of 1854? Figures and statistics may be made to say anything, but they can never be used to prove that such

was not the fact. I heard an hon. member of the right say this afternoon that our trade with the United States was worth about \$5,000,000. Why, the blue books tell us that the total fluctuates from \$35,000,000 to \$40,000,000 every year. If we spent months before our constituents, quoting statistics, we should be none the wiser or better for it. But tell them about reciprocity and they will all admit that it is a profitable measure. They will all add that, while it lasted, their lands were beginning to improve in value, and their crops sold at higher prices. True that, in those days, our manufacturers were not worth much, and unable to cope with American industries, but for our farms and farmers the era of reciprocity was a positive boon. The reason is obvious. Such a treaty threw open an immense market, fruits for our agricultural staples; next for the yield of our mines, and for the timber of our woodlands. In other words, our grain, mines and forests received at once a most powerful impulse. Another reason, in the same sense, is our particular situation on this continent. We appear to be providentially set to trade with our neighbors. There is only one step to take, in crossing an imaginary line, which severs us from the United States. We must have markets. There is no doubt that protection gave rise to a large number of manufactures, but after five or six years of production, the local market got overstocked, and numerous failures were the result. Another result was those large business coalitions, called "combines," that raise the prices of manufactured articles, at the expense of the consumer. And I make bold to say that the only manufactures that successfully resisted were those having an outlet in some foreign market. For instance, the manufacture of leather and boots and shoes is flourishing, precisely because finding a market in the United States and elsewhere. We are looking out for markets, on all sides—in Spain, the Windward Islands, and elsewhere, and rapping, at every door and asking to be let in. But we make an exception for France. It seems there is no good applying there. It is objected that our manufactures will be destroyed. I heard an hon. gentleman who passes, with reason, for a philologist, and a christian philosopher at that, say that he should certainly protect agriculture, but not at the expense of our manufactures. What constitutes the happiness of a people? Is it the manufacturer, whose training is often defective, or the farmer, the true head of the family? And the gentleman who would pass muster as philosophers and moral teachers, would they venture to tell the people that the farmers, who are the genuine backbones of the country should not be protected, unless that could be done without injury to manufacturers? The strength and vitality of the French race are not due to those who take refuge in cities, where they lose their moral character in the factories, but to those of the rural districts who have preserved the manhood, force and moral rectitude which have won the admiration of the American continent. People may say and think what they like, but speaking for the farmer of Quebec, to whom my speech is addressed, I hesitate not to affirm that, if the French race have preserved all their vitality, it is not due to the working people of the factories, but to the honest farmers and settlers—and they should be protected first and foremost. I do not believe that our manufactures would be ruined by the adoption of reciprocity. At least, a large number would survive and stand, such as the cotton, woollen, cigar, leather boots, and shoes, paper, piano, organ, farming implement, furniture, cheese, flour-mill, India rubber, ready-made clothing and many other factories, including sugar refineries. These would be powerful enough to cope with American competition. But they tell us, Mr. Speaker, that we shall have 5,000,000 Americans here to take possession of the country. I should like these 5,000,000 Americans as much as I do the Mennonites, or as any of those benighted races brought over to us from across the

Atlantic. Let five, ten, or fifteen millions come from the United States; let them come to help us in our manufactures, and take part in the labors of our thrift. I for one, shall be happy, on account of the impulse the movement will give to our farming, mines and forests. I could ask nothing better than to have come to us that intelligent people, whose genius and rapid development have become the wonder of the world. We have among us a number of petty manufacturers, or even large manufacturers, who can subsist only by paying low wages, or by employing "combines," or by exerting pressure on the purchaser. It is just as well that these should go. What I should like to see is the establishment of every sort of manufacture suited to the needs of the locality, and which would flourish, while contributing to the wealth of the several localities. Manufactories are something like the waters of a stream. They follow the current. Wherever there is need one or two are founded. When we shall have entered into communication with the United States, we shall be certain of having capitalists ready and able to assist the genius of our young men in the establishment of manufactories on solid grounds, and spreading prosperity throughout our country parishes. We have the raw material, the water power, and all the handiwork required. I was pleased to hear gentlemen on both sides of the House declare that, man for man, Canadians had nothing to apprehend from their neighbors. Well, then, open your doors and gates. Let the Americans in with their money, and their competition will insure general success and prosperity. We are told, Sir, that free trade is suitable for a very rich country, but there is no question of free trade here. The Americans are not free traders. The point is to join with the United States against the remainder of the world, to associate with their 60,000,000 of people and protect ourselves by a common tariff against such combines as we are interested in protecting ourselves against. The true principle to follow, in this instance, is to produce and sell as profitably as possible, and buy as low as may be. There are other advantages flowing from a reciprocity treaty. We get rid of customs difficulties, which may at times give rise to considerable trouble. We avoid the boycotting of our railways and the refusal of their traffic by the United States. Where would the Grand Trunk be to-day if the United States took the right of way from it and forbade its transportation of freight? Where would the Pacific and our other railways be? We would avoid, furthermore, seeing our transit trade forestalled. The United States may payment of enormous duties. Then our insurance companies would probably do considerable business with the United States. Why have several of these gone down, bringing ruin on many families in their crash? Because their field of operations was too limited. Throw open the United States to them—offer them a commerce of 60,000,000 souls, and thus they will enjoy an immense compass, where their capital could fructify and yield large returns. We should likewise push our maritime trade. If at any time we were denied access to the marine trade of the United States for the simple bauble of refusing them marine trade in our own waters, could we calculate the millions we should thereby lose? It is all very well to be continually repeating that Canada is wealthy, great and powerful. Where are the riches? An excursion through our parishes and farming country will show that the inhabitants have left for the United States, to work there three or four years, make a little money, pay their lands and debts and live on the farm which they had been forced to abandon. These people leave the country because farming does not pay, and farming does not pay because there is no market. The prosperity of which we hear so much may be all very well for a few hundreds of manufacturers combining together to prey on the public; very well for railway nabobs and

Mr. AMYOT.

government contractors, but for the common people there is no such thing as prosperity; for the people that toil, that rise before dawn, that return after the sun and that work all day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh!

Mr. AMYOT. Perhaps these hon. gentlemen do not care to hear French spoken here. If so they had better say it.

Mr. GAUDET. On the contrary. We like it.

M. AMYOT. If those gentlemen do not wish to hear one speak French, let them say so, and let them not be sneering at people who speak so. Let them remember that there is a Province called the Province of Quebec, where we speak French, and they have to pass through that Province to communicate with England. We want to be respected here as we respect others. We have the patience to sit here months and months listening to English speeches and we do it with deference and pleasure and we expect others to do the same to us. The first objection against reciprocity is that it would lower the revenue and bring on direct taxation. I deny that, Sir. The revenue might decrease a little the first year, and perhaps the second, but if I am to believe the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) we have nothing to lose. He told us this afternoon, that we had hardly any trade with the United States, and that it is no use bothering about it. Yet others tells us that our income would be reduced by \$7,000,000, and even up to \$15,000,000, and if the debate lasted another fortnight we should reach \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000, or double the amount of our present revenue. Our income will decrease somewhat, but when we enter into relations with a country which does not know how it can spend its revenues, which sees no limits to its material progress, do we not see that our revenues would increase, grow ten and one hundred fold, and that we might set about decreasing that fearful debt which we have contracted within the few past years, for an object of which I shall presently speak. We might also lessen our expenses. Thus, on the eve of elections, we might vote money to forty or fifty railways less, or buy up forty or fifty counties less. If, for once, we went before the people with empty hands, with arguments only, and the truth of facts, we should make a very considerable saving. There are many methods of economy, and if the gentlemen on the Ministerial benches do not know how to compass that, they have only to apply to the Opposition, give them their place, and they would soon meet the objection. Expenses might again be curtailed in the customs duties between the two nations, care always being had to guard against fraud, although that would be less expensive than the present customs system. But the best method of all is to limit the outlay by the income, taking a lesson from the experiences of ordinary life, and then with such allies as the people of the United States, we could do well and so increase our revenues as to meet all demands. The second objection is more serious, in that it implies an injustice to England. I heard the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Freeman) set England before us as a good mother, and Canadians as a lot of little children, rocked and coddled on the good mother's knee. Well, what are the facts? I am going to have the pleasure of citing somewhat at length a pamphlet, the publication of which must have pleased the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Chapleau), as coming from a man dear to his heart, who deserves all his esteem, who for long presided the Conservative party during election times, and whose pen is as flowing as his soul is generous. This friend is named Arthur Dansereau, and his pamphlet is entitled: "Protection and Free Trade," published in 1879. With this pamphlet the electorate was approached then; with this pamphlet it will be appealed to now. I draw the particular attention of my

Quebec friends to what Mr. Dansereau says, in the name of the Conservative party :

“As we are about it, we may go a little further, and respectfully charge England with not caring for us in her diplomatic relations. She sacrifices us everywhere and in every way. If England had been more generous in her trade treaties, for instance, if she had favored us as she attempted to favor herself in her business relations with the whole world, perhaps there would be no question to-day of a protective tariff.”

And I might add that, perhaps, there be no question of reciprocity.

“It was when we saw the markets of all nations closed against us that we enquired of ourselves what we should do? In former times, farming, the forests and its outputs were sufficient for our needs. We should likely not have gone beyond this, if we had been given a chance to earn a livelihood. But England thought only of herself, Canada was left in the cold on all sides, having nothing left to sell to other nations, but obliged to buy everything from them. Poverty and exhaustion brought us down to the lowest ebb. We took up our cause into our own hands, and work first of all for ourselves. Canadian goods are subjected, at the frontier of every European State, to differential duties as against Canada, equivalent to a direct prohibition of a large portion of our products, and to what is no better than prohibition for several other articles. Thus, while the producers of Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Switzerland, Austria, Sweden, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France and England can exchange goods at reasonable rates, Canada stands in the virtual impossibility of selling her products in these several countries, and can have no access to a market which feeds 200,000,000 consumers, owing to a differential tariff, which is tantamount to protection. Taking for instance, the French tariff, which is repeated in all European countries, we find Canadian products prohibited as follows :—

Articles.	Duties paid by European nations.	Differential duties against Canada	More per cent.
	\$	\$	
Wood or iron vessels.....	0 40	8 00	1,900
Cheese, per ton.....	8 00	36 00	350
Fish, lobsters, per ton.....	8 00	60 00	200
Soap.....	12 00	Prohib.
Starch.....	3 00	50 00	1,500
Alcohol, per hectolitre.....	30 00	69 00	100
Woven cotton, per cent.....	0 15	Prohib.
Woollen garments, per cent.....	0 15	Prohib.
Carpets, per cent.....	0 10	60c.p.lb.
Blankets, per cent.....	0 10	24c. "
Saddlery, per cent.....	0 10	Prohib.
Leather gloves, per cent.....	0 5½	Prohib.
Flax cordage, per ton.....	30 00	60 00	100
Steam engines, per ton.....	12 00	80 00	550
Agricultural implements, per ton.....	12 00	36 00	200
Machinery, per ton.....	20 00	192 00	900
Sewing machines, per ton.....	20 00	192 00	900
Scythes, per ton.....	40 00	228 00	620
Sickles, per ton.....	40 00	192 00	450
Circular saws, per ton.....	40 00	280 00	550
Cutlery, per cent.....	0 15	Prohib.
Castings, per ton.....	10 00	do
Iron bedsteads and chairs, per ton.....	10 00	do
Wrought nails, per ton.....	16 00	do
Forged locks and hinges, per ton.....	24 00	do
Building material, per ton.....	24 00	do
Wood screws, per ton.....	16 00	do
Iron kitchen ware, per ton.....	28 00	do
Copper ware, per ton.....	40 00	280 00	600
Carriages, per cent.....	0 10	Prohib.
Hats and flowers.....	Free.	14 p.c.
Wooden goods, per cent.....	0 10	18	80
Furniture, per cent.....	0 10	18	80
Ready-made clothing, per cent.....	0 10	36	260
Boots and shoes, per cent.....	0 10	Prohib.
Leather, per cent.....	0 10	54	440
Woollen goods, per cent.....	0 10	Prohib.

I may state here that when England concluded her commercial treaty with France, the question was asked: “And what about Canada?” To which England made answer: “Canada will settle her own tariff.” This is a grave statement, but I make it from my seat in this House, and among those who listen to me are several well acquainted with the facts. It is a deep shame for us to have England, when she enters upon treaties with other countries, refuse

to take in Canada, and deprive her of the chance which she allows her other colonies. Mr. Dansereau continues :

“One of the Canadian representatives at the last Paris Exposition thus expressed his views in the papers some months since, on the result of this destructive policy. After quoting the text given above, he said: ‘This awful catalogue, bad as it is, might be carried out farther, so as to show that every busy man in the country is affected thereby. In fact our exhibitors at Paris have seen from experience how far Canadian trade is affected by these differential duties. Mr. Malcolm, of Toronto, had to refuse, for his very superior saddles, orders made him by French sportsmen, because, being Canadian, his goods were in reality prohibited, while those of more highly-favored competitors from other lands, paid only 10 per cent. duty. One of the best Paris houses, dealing in ready-made clothing, had meant to order 6,000 pieces of Canadian tweeds, but they were told that Canadian tweeds were prohibited, although the same goods, from other ports, were allowed in at 10 per cent. duty. Numerous orders were sent in for farming implements. On one of these, consisting of 1,000 mowing and reaping machines, Mr. Eliot, of London, Ont., will have to pay a differential duty of \$12,400, against \$4,000 exacted from the maker of any other country in Europe.’

“This exclusion of Canada in the treaties of Great Britain with European powers is the more striking as favors of such a nature were granted at the request of England to the woollens of Australia, New Zealand, Cape of Good Hope, and also for Indian jute, all of which are among the principal products of those countries. Other nations have not forgotten to include their chief colonies in their treaties. France, in her trade and navigation treaty with England, made stipulations in behalf of Algeria, whose products received the same treatment as those of continental France. In connection with this latter treaty, the following clause will not fail to strike the observant reader :

“English vessels and their cargoes in France and Algeria, and French vessels and their cargoes in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, on their arrival at any port or wherever they come from or whatever is the destination of their cargo, will enjoy in all respects the same treatment as the national vessels and their cargoes.

“The French-Spanish treaty includes the products of Continental Spain, as well as those of the Balearic Isles and the Canaries. The treaty with Portugal favors the products of Portuguese colonies and distant settlements, as well as those of the Isle of Maderia, Porto Santo and the Azores Archipelago. In the divers Turkish treaties are comprised not only Turkey in Europe and Asia, but Servia, the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, Egypt, and the Regency of Tripolis in Africa. Other nations, as Holland, for instance, have comprised their colonies in their treaties of commerce and navigation with England and France, and the new treaties that are in process of negotiation, and depend on the same lines. Nya more. In the commercial treaty between England and Belgium, under date of the 28th July, 1862, the tenor of article 15 is as follows: ‘Belgium products shall not be subject, in the British colonies, to higher duties than those levied on British goods of the same description.’

“This simply proves that England imposes on her colonies the obligation of receiving foreign products on the same conditions as similar British products. Might she not also allow her colonies to partake of the advantages derivable from her treaties with their same powers?

It is evident, further, that the policy followed in such cases is that of providing for one's self. In that case, if nobody will lend us a helping hand, we must act for ourselves. Every year we remain in debt some fifteen or twenty millions. This method is ruinous, and we must alter our tactics. Having been refused a share of the advantages flowing from the free trade which England keeps for herself alone with foreign powers, we have perforce been turned into protectionists. The British Government, understanding the situation thoroughly, gives us leave to do as we like in the premises. We should take advantage of that circumstance, inasmuch as there are many other questions on account of which our colonial position imposes or will impose new sacrifices. We should remember the case of New Zealand, which incurred a debt of \$20,000,000 to co-operate in a war declared by England, and with which the colony had nothing whatever to do. In 1864, the St. Alban's raid cost us some \$60,000, which the United States claimed of us for not sufficiently guarding our border. In 1868, the Fenian invasion cost us one million and a half, which England could have reclaimed from the United States on the principle that they, too, should have watched their frontier more closely. The Fenians were American citizens; they organized openly within the limits of the American Republic, and bought their arms in the United States. They were much more under American police control than was the *Alabama* on the high seas, and yet England never claimed a cent from the United States, because the interests of the Empire led her so to act.

In the Treaty of Washington, for the sake of promoting the success of British diplomacy, we were obliged to consent to the opening of our fisheries, rivers and canals to the Americans. We acquiesced without complaint, and although we never enjoyed the use of the American canals, as we were promised in return, England did not deem it fit to intervene and bring the Americans to notions of fair play. In 1783 the Americans asked no more than the navigation of the River St. John, but the mother country accustomed them to obtain whatever they liked. When the interpretation of the Treaty of 1814 came up, because the Americans were not satisfied therewith, England quietly bowed to the arbitration of the Czar, and consented to lop off a portion of Canada, by the cession of territory in Maine. Later, when it became known that the King of the Netherlands, the umpire chosen by the Convention of 1844, had decided adversely to the United States, on the strength of a new interpretation of the Treaty of 1783, in regard to fisheries, the

Americans declined to accept the award, and continued to tease England until the latter gave up to her 8,000,000 acres of land. By the Treaty of 1782 alone England has ceded to the United States over 260,000,000 acres of land in the west.

This is the third time that England has agreed to trace the Pembina line. By the treaty of 1814, the United States undertook to sell British Columbia, in 1824. Recourse was then had to the Treaty of 1842, by which the Americans preferred new claims, and it is hard to say whether they will not again carry off large portions of our territory, by constantly appealing to new commissions. After the millions upon millions of acres of land, from the Pacific to the great Lakes, comprising Oregon, Wisconsin, &c., and Pembina, and Isle St. John, we may look for something further.

"These remarks are made in no unfriendly spirit. Our aim is simply to show that if England makes sacrifices for us, we do something equally by her, without either boast or complaint. What is done is done, and if the whole was required for the consolidation of British power, well and good, and let us say no more about it. But, at least, people on the other side of the sea should be a little more careful. They should allow us to work to our own affairs, as we know best how to do. Mr. Bright's recent attempt, backed by the British manufacturers, is an exhibition of cynical selfishness. Why should they compel us to buy from them, when they purchase their timber, for instance, in Norway or Russia?"

"England seems to have made up her mind to buy her timber and lumber everywhere, except in Canada. The following table shows it:—

	1877.	1878.
From Russia.....	£322,219	£675,364
" Russia	914,807	2,487,477
" Sweden	968,096	789,795
" Sweden	1,453,477	2,348,096
" Germany	216,158	697,143
" Canada	1,229,061	3,307,060
Elsewhere.....	413,442	1,098,789
Elsewhere.....	267,641	916,017
	£5,299,901	£13,119,741
Total.....	\$26,499,505	\$65,593,705
Bought in Canada ..	1,120,305	16,535,300
Bought elsewhere	\$25,389,200	\$49,063,405

"If England would have commercial union with her colonies, should she not set the example?"

In addition to all these facts quoted by Mr. Dansereau, I may add another taken from the lips of the hon. First Minister, in a speech delivered at Montreal, on the 24th November, 1875, on the question of the waiving of our exclusive rights on the St. Lawrence:

"Now, Mr. Mackenzie must have known, because he has had the papers before him, that instructions were given to the head of that commission that the freedom of the navigation of the St. Lawrence was to be yielded. The commissioners had no discretion in the matter; it was an instruction from the Imperial Government, from the Liberal Government, from the Gladstone Government, that we should surrender the navigation of the St. Lawrence. It is true I might have taken my hat and walked back to Canada. But that would not have done Canada any good, because the instructions were positive, and the navigation of the St. Lawrence would have been handed over whether I was there or not."

Here you have, Mr. Speaker, palpable proof of the interest which England bears toward us. And yet people tell us of the advantages which she is able to offer us. Where is the voice that is authorised to speak in that sense? Where is the British Minister who can say so? Mr. Chamberlain asserts the very opposite. He tells us that if we want to do business with the United States, we may do so, as we are free, and the ties binding us to the mother country are very feeble. In view of the movement taking place here and in the United States, does England begin to interest herself in our behalf? I see no signs thereof. It is surely not through affection that she imposed on us, without consulting Canada beforehand, the sacrifice of one of the finest tracts of our territory. In this matter I challenge contradiction. Is it not true that by the terms of the Ashburton Treaty, a splendid portion of an inheritance was stolen from us and handed to a people who had declared their independence from the Home Government? Was not the Ashburton Treaty a robbery perpetrated by England, at the expense of her colony? We must add the further fact that we have just had a Commission at Washington, where orders went forth that our hon. Finance Minister should make an immolation of our fisheries? These fisheries a few years since were worth \$4,500,000 for a certain period. Orders were

Mr. ANTOT.

given—I am positive of what I say, and we have a semi-official proof of the same—that these fisheries, for which we struggled so long, should be sacrificed for the sake of avoiding war. England, the good mother, at the head of her 350,000,000 souls—England, the powerful, said to her plenipotentiaries: "Go to Washington, and to prevent my troops from exchanging shots with those of the United States, give them the fisheries of Canada." And we had to yield. This is the good mother that takes the member for Queen's (Mr. Freeman) in her lap and coddles him. But let him listen to the big children, on the other side of the Atlantic, beside the good mother. What do they say of the member for Queen's, and of Canadians in general? "You are mere Colonists." We are regarded as children brought up in the kitchen, or belonging to another family, and this is the people for whom we are expected to sacrifice Canada. When a Canadian goes to England, he is looked down on with scorn and they say of him: "You are a Colonist." Offers, Mr. Speaker, have been made by us to the United States, but I hold that these offers were empty and not meant in earnest. The force of public opinion, the brilliant result of yesterday's election (in *L'Assomption*) and that of *Missisquoi*, a few days back, are such factors that those who live in and for power are full of apprehension. They have also been stirred by the eloquent advice of my hon. friend, the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). It was in pursuance of his solemn warning, that they determined to disengage the credit of the country, and they passed that Order in Council to which they were bound by the statute of 1879. For the sake of my country, for the sake of the Dominion of Canada, for the sake of our flag, I regret that pusillanimous courage which, enclosed in a statute, offers to a great nation, of which no account was afterward made. But if any in the United States can hear the voice of the Canadian Parliament, they will learn that we have here a large number of members who protest against this behavior, are indignant at the negligence of their Government and the refusal to redeem a promised pledge. Hundreds of millions of dollars have, perhaps, been staked by the United States on the faith of a statute. It is a cheat on our part, which we deplore as much as may be. I compliment the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) who represents a fine party in this House, for having raised his voice, and I thank the Opposition for having backed him. I am happy to find that the Canadian people will at length be able to hold up its head and say to the American people: "If you have been deceived, we are not all of us in fault." As far back as 1869, Mr. Speaker, the question of reciprocal treaty was mooted, and in an instrument which I hold in my hand—I know not whether it has been thought of before—bearing date the 3rd September, 1868, and signed by John Rose, Finance Minister, I read:—

"In conclusion, the undersigned trusts that as the circumstances of political exigency and the important national considerations which, as stated by Her Majesty's Government, led to the concluding of the former Treaty of Reciprocity with the United States, still exist—and even in a greater degree than previous to the date of that treaty—and as the interests of Canada continue to be seriously affected, Her Majesty's Government will not refuse to give the same weight to these considerations as before; and that in any future negotiations between Canada and the United States, in reference to their trade relations, the Dominion will receive the co-operation and influence of Her Majesty's Government."

And yet, Mr. Speaker, a few months later, on the 4th of January, 1869, we have a letter signed by the right hon. the present First Minister in which he declares that the United States must take the first step. Anyhow, in those days, one could stand up for reciprocity without being branded as a rebel. Here are Sir John Macdonald's words:

"Should the United States Government express any desire for the renewal of the treaty, Canada will be prepared to send a delegation to Washington to act in concert with the British Ambassador on the

subject. Meanwhile, Council think that it would be unwise for Canada to make any statements in advance of what she will be willing to do, and that the negotiations should be entered upon at Washington, without either party being hampered by any previous engagement or offers of any kind."

But there is no need of going as far back for offers made by Canadians to the United States on the subject of reciprocity. I shall confine myself to recalling this afternoon's working, when the hon. Finance Minister (Sir Charles Tupper), who enjoys general esteem, stated that, in his opinion, what was comprised in a statute, under optional conditions, was imperative as between nations. He said, furthermore, that reciprocity with the United States was within the views of both our political parties. On the other hand, we hear the leader of the Government (Sir John Macdonald) telling us just the opposite—that reciprocity would be the ruin of us all. Well, what has just happened? On the 31st March, 1887, Mr. Bayard wrote:

"I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

The above was addressed to Sir Charles Tupper, and the latter's reply was:

"I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

Cannot these fisheries difficulties be settled? We have the Finance Minister telling us that there is only one way of settling them, that is, by settling at the same time all our trade relations. Of course, full details are not given in these letters, as is never done, but a principle is laid down and the groundwork of an arrangement or treaty foreshadowed. Hence, in one breath, we are informed that reciprocity is impossible, because the source of ruin, and all manner of pretexts and excuses are imagined to stay it. But in another moment there is disagreement in the Cabinet itself, and certain Ministers stand up for reciprocity. But we shall see what the hon. the Finance Minister (Sir Charles Tupper) did before his departure from Washington, at the close of the draught of the Fisheries Treaty. On the 3rd December, 1887, he made this last offer:

"That with the view of removing all causes of difference in connection with fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the Fishery Articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of a mutual arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada and Newfoundland."

Thus, you perceive, Mr. Speaker, that I have no need to travel back very far for proof that nearly the whole of us desire reciprocity with the United States. Unfortunately, when the hon. the Finance Minister made these offers, he made them, while having received instruction to give up our fisheries anyhow. The navigation of the St. Lawrence had already been yielded. We have the right hon. the First Minister's word for that. Our Dominion had also been stripped from us in parts. There remained the sacrifice of our fisheries. What else will that good mother of the member for Queen's not take from us, since she has deprived us of our lands, our fish and our navigation? Will she come to snatch our bread and kidnap our children? Someone may possibly entertain such a project. I call the attention of the House to the importance of sincere Government action in the appreciation of the law of 1879. I found in *Bradstreet's Journal*, published in N. Y., for 1887, the following figures, showing the importation of articles of trade during the three previous fiscal years:—

IMPORTATIONS FROM THE UNITED STATES TO CANADA.
Free of Duty.

	1886.	1885.	1884.
Fish	\$ 1,071,217	\$ 3,447,294	\$ 3,720,412
Eggs	1,993,672	2,095,437	2,356,325
Live stock	1,877,955	1,849,644	2,108,759
Lumber	1,382,237	1,062,983	1,573,217
Furniture	1,378,002	1,354,993	1,553,395
Skins and furs	1,193,187	1,080,621	1,345,667
Total of importations free of duty....	\$12,042,627	\$12,871,984	\$15,237,507

Subject to Duty.

	1886.	1885.	1884.
Fish	\$ 1,005,382	\$ 69,268	\$ 153,387
Wood and manufactures	7,515,756	7,841,147	9,016,841
Barley and hops	7,409,148	6,788,623	6,031,891
Live stock	3,163,740	3,111,014	2,701,705
Hay	1,034,496	1,517,483	998,789
Coals	1,014,116	1,074,029	1,007,954
Total, importations subject to duty....	\$25,453,711	\$14,089,657	\$33,778,533
Total, importations of all kinds.....	37,496,338	36,960,541	39,015,840

These figures display the enormous quantity of articles that we sell to the United States, and that we could not sell if the duties set down in the Act of 1879 had not been removed. I might speak also of the Reciprocity Treaty proposed by Hon. George Brown, it being well known that, since the abrogation of the Treaty of Reciprocity, everybody and both political parties, as the hon. the Finance Minister has said, pleaded for reciprocity. But you may ask why do we not get what everyone wants? I draw your particular attention to the real cause, as stated by the hon. the First Minister himself. You have doubtless heard, Sir, of the mighty scheme of Imperial Federation. Meetings have been held about it at Toronto; another will take place here, at Ottawa, and there is a proposition to the like effect on the Order paper of this House. Now, on the 24th November, 1875, at Montreal, Sir John Macdonald said the following, which I cite in English, that all may understand:—

"Gentlemen, I look forward to a permanent union, and I look forward to it not as a mere Utopian speculation, but as the practical result of our connection with Great Britain. It is not an idea of to-day; and if you would so favor me, if you think it worth your while to look over the debates on Confederation in 1865 at Quebec, you will find that what I am now stating to you I stated then as being the hoped for future of Canada. It is this:—That England would be the central power (applause), and we auxiliary nations; that Canada, as one Confederation, would by degrees have less of dependence and more of alliance than at present; and that we would be all united under the same sovereign, all owing allegiance to the same Crown, and all inspired by the same British spirit; and that we would have a close alliance, offensive and defensive. You see now the progress of events in carrying out this scheme. You see South Africa about to form a great Confederation. The position of the Australian Colonies is such, strewn as they are around the edge of that vast continent, that they may not be able to form a Confederation so closely allied as our Provinces of Canada, but a Zollverein and arrangements by Treaty amongst themselves, by which their quota of land and sea forces, and their several subsidies for the purpose of doing their share in the defence of the Empire is quite probable. Now, gentlemen, twenty-five years is but as a day in the lifetime of a nation; let us go on as peaceably and happily as we are now going on, and twenty-five years, I fully expect, should see the solution of that question. Great Britain, by that time, will have forty millions; Canada, ten millions; Australia, her millions; and these latter with South Africa, capable of unlimited extension; and New Zealand, nearly as large as England, will be separate auxiliary countries, all ranged around the Central Power, England. I do not look for Colonial representation in the Imperial Parliament, because the Imperial Parliament, with such representation, would claim the right of taxation, but I look for the alliance of these auxiliary Powers with the Central Government under Treaty arrangements similar to the existing arrangement between England and Canada. The arrangement at this moment is that we are pledged to expend a certain sum of money on our militia in response and return for the pledge obtained from England that the whole military power of the Empire shall be used for our defence; make an

extension of that arrangement by providing that the Central Power shall contribute so much, that each of the auxiliary nations shall give their quota; and then when any nation goes to war with England she will go to war with half a dozen nations. (Hear, hear, and applause.) It will give an assurance of peace to the world, and it will give an assurance of peace to us when it is known that if one extremity of the vast British Empire is attacked, British subjects and soldiery from every extremity of it will rush to the rescue. (Hear, hear.) Then, gentlemen, so powerful will be England that she will be safe from all attack (applause), and instead of being a source of anxiety and a source of weakness to the British Empire, we will find ourselves standing by our grand old mother, become a defence, a fortification, an outwork, instead of being a weakness and a source of expense. (Cheers; hear, hear and prolonged applause.) Remember, too, that Canada has already the fourth commercial navy in the world, and a large population of hardy seamen, and that all the Sister Colonies I have named must, from their position, become Maritime Powers. So that the Sovereignty of the Seas seems assured for all time to this United Empire. To this I look forward. It is a grand scheme, and it is a scheme quite capable of being carried into practical operation, and when carried out, gentlemen, it will not be too much to expect that the great nation, our congeners on the other side of the line, seeing that all the different peoples who speak the English language, but themselves, are formed into one great nation, as it were, for the purpose of operating as a moral police, and of keeping the peace of the world—it will not be too much to hope and expect that our congeners, speaking the same language, and being of the same race, will assist in the great work of keeping the peace of the world, and if necessary, gentlemen, of enforcing it. (Applause.) Gentlemen, in the great war, when Napoleon, by the power of his arms, had forced the nations of Europe to close their ports against England and English shipping, even then, gentlemen, although England's colonies were few and feeble, she fought that battle, and carried it to a victorious conclusion, and drove the tyrant from his throne, with the aid of the domestic commerce she had with her own colonies. And when all these become great nations, having one head, and being one people, and having one interest, England if all Europe were in arms against her, with her trade, her commerce, and her wealth, with the waves rolling about her feet, would be still secure, living in her children, and her children blessed in her. (Loud and continued applause.) One word more. While independence is generally annexation in disguise, some speculative philosophers, who look into the distant future, seem to believe that it will be our fate and our advantage to walk alone as a separate nationality. Mr. Goldwin Smith is one of those. I would fain hope that the future that I desire for the Empire and its auxiliary kingdoms, might strike his imagination and be accepted as a substitute for independence. If this policy could only enlist his magic pen in its behalf, it would be an infinite benefit to the good cause."

Here is the secret of the situation. The right hon. the First Minister tells us that at the establishment of Confederation he wanted Canada annexed to England; all other English colonies joined in the same view and so he hoped to carry out the scheme of Imperial Federation. Thus, when the good mother drifts into war she will call on her little ones in Canada and elsewhere and ask them to fight for her. She will say to the good small boys of the colonies: "Subscribe in my defence, your good mamma." Such is the bearing of Imperial Federation, and to reach it Canadians must be debarred from trade with 60,000,000 of people. As for myself I hereby declare that I am not in favor of such Imperial Federation, and believe that my country coincides in my view. We do not want to espouse the quarrels of England with Ireland. We do not choose to go to war beyond the seas, as far as the Indies, whenever the needs of British trade may require. We are here at home in America, in the land of freedom, and mean to stop there. I am not so sure that this project is to be taken seriously. Our incoming Governor General is an advocate of Imperial Federation. He bears its flag aloft, and see how the followers are stirred; how the chief friends of the right hon. Premier move around, and especially his neighbor to the right (Mr. McCrathy). He is one of the devoted friends; a trusted henchman. The right hon. gentleman has put him at the head of the movement in Toronto; he thrusts him forward here in Ottawa; he has him make a motion in our Votes and Proceedings. And the right hon. the First Minister, who, I admit, is a political genius of broad experience, and for whom I entertain all possible respect, has conceived this scheme, and is carrying it out slowly, but surely. He set out by annexing Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and the North-West. He directed the older Provinces to take 200 or 300 millions and build a great railway binding Britain to her Asiatic

Mr. AMYOT.

possessions. We built the railway; and now what more does he want? He wants to buy Newfoundland, which is nothing worth to us, but purchase it with nine millions in order that the whole of Canada be taken in one block and annexed to Britain. And, as a crowning point, he sees that there comes from England a Governor favorable to the federation idea. I have this charge to make against him that, if such was his purpose, he should have said so fairly and squarely. He might have owned that, as Canada is in debt \$100,000,000, and is unable to pay, England will pay instead and annex the colony. This is the reason why the reciprocity treaty—demanded by both parties, as the hon. the Finance Minister has told us, and desired by the whole country, as the greatest boon for Canada and America—is denied us. I am aware that party spirit will stand in the way of this reciprocal treaty on the present occasion. I do not blame the hon. gentlemen who do not share our way of thinking. They have their rules of drill. They heed naught but the voice of their old chieftain; but there are solemn times when the links of party should fall asunder in the face of the public weal. When these members return to their constituents they may perhaps be reminded by the people, who are less wedded to party, and whose eyes are opened wider to genuine public interests, that they have overlooked the prime welfare of the country. I hereby declare before my Province and country that the aim of the right hon. the First Minister is the federation of the Empire, for which he has been working these twenty years. He is about finishing that chain of provinces with which he means to bind us, if he can. He wants to confederate us with Great Britain and make us espouse England's cause. What part would we play in that scheme? I denounce the project and tell him the Dominion will have none of it. He has often repeated the words: "Canada for Canadians." Is that the blending of Canada and Canadians which he wishes to-day? No, it is Canada for Britain. Our reply is a negative. But if he still persists; if the thing must be, then I answer, and that is the meaning of my words, at the opening, in reference to the American flag, if he holds that Canada must be for England, we will return the response, "Canada for America." I had meant to say a few words on the amounts which we were to lose by the so-called Retaliation Bill, proposed at Washington, but as the Government stated, this afternoon, that an Order in Council would be published on Saturday, in pursuance of the law of 1879, I shall abstain. I close these observations, which have been, I fear, too long for those unacquainted with our tongue. I trust that the day will come when the English-speaking people of Canada may discover, as the people of England have done, that French is the language of diplomacy, and English the vehicle of business, and that, in consequence, they may learn the French tongue, and then we should be still happier to meet. We are told by our adversaries that they would like to meet the people on this question of reciprocity. It is their affair, Sir. They have only to sign an instrument and we shall step down into the arena at once. For ourselves we are quite ready. We are not at liberty to dissolve Parliament, but we are very anxious indeed to have the mind and vote of our constituencies. The Regina scaffold was drawn out in this debate. He must be a genius that did the thing. I think it was the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), one of those good youngsters so snugly cradled in the arms of the good mother. And this gentleman mentioned the National party. I can say that the National party sprang from the heart and is a patriotic movement. At first, it was scoffed at, as if made of straw, but it burns still. Let no one fancy that any of the Nationals, voting against us on this question, are crossing over to the other side. They stop with us and we are ever the same. I had not intended to broach this question, but since it was introduced, I may say that it is

the National movement which increases the majorities in our own counties and wins for us others that we had not fore. It is the National movement that has given us power in the Province of Quebec, and it will give us the majority at the next general elections. It is grounded on truth. We are indignant that our Ministers should have deceived us and humbled as a people, sacrificing as to the fanaticism of the few. But there is no question of this in the subject of reciprocity, which I have avoided treating in a partisan spirit. For me it is a far wider topic; an affair of country and of national wealth. I shall use it as a lever of defence and resistance in the great contest which is about to come on in favor of Imperial Federation. It is high time the people saw to it; time that Canada kept her eyes open. I repeat that the purpose is to annex Canada to Britain, by constantly harping at these words: "Spend millions; fear not; Canada is for Canadians," and trying to persuade us that we shall soon be getting rich. This contest is on the eve of taking place. We shall be told that we owe so much; that we cannot pay; but that the money is forthcoming, furnished by Britain on the provision that the people and country of Canada pass over to the other side. We shall be delivered up to Britain to live under her rod of Empire in the future, and this is said to be Canada for Canadians. Well, Sir, I shall conclude by repeating that when others will say: "Canada for Britain!" we shall reply, exclaiming: "Canada for America!"

Mr. MASSON. A great deal of time has been occupied by hon. gentlemen opposite in trying to prove what perhaps they might have taken almost for granted, namely, that the members on this side of the House, the leaders of the present Government and other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, had in times past a favorable opinion of reciprocity, and that, even at the time of the introduction of what is known as the National Policy, that was looked forward to as the thing to be aimed at, and that the National Policy was only a means to that end. I take it for granted that, at that time, all parties and all classes in this country looked forward, as a great boon to the country, to the attaining of reciprocity with the United States. There are many reasons why all classes of the various communities of which this great Dominion is composed looked to that as a very great boon. One of the principal reasons for that is that they looked back to the time of the old reciprocity from 1854 to 1866 as having on the whole been a very prosperous period, and, judging that the prosperity had been caused almost entirely, if not entirely, by the reciprocity then in force, they very naturally came to the conclusion that reciprocity would again bring about these fortunate and prosperous times. But, looking at the prosperity of those twelve years, I think it is often lost sight of that that prosperity, especially in regard to agricultural pursuits, was not due entirely to the reciprocity then in existence. During that period there were great public works being constructed in this Canada of ours; we find that the Grand Trunk Railway was being built, that the Great Western was being built, that the nation of which we form a part—and of which we form no insignificant part, be it said—was engaged in several great wars. During the earlier part of this period we had the Crimean war; following that, we had the East Indian mutiny; then, shortly afterwards, our neighbors across the border were engaged in their civil war; and all this tended to enhance the value of farm produce in this country. When we look back at those prosperous years and think only of reciprocity, we forget to take into account these great public works and these great wars which contributed more to our prosperity than the treaty itself. During this period of reciprocity, when the nation was comparatively at peace, before the effect of the Indian mutiny

was felt in Canada, and after the result of the Crimean war had ceased, we find the year 1857 one of the blackest periods in the history of Canada; indeed the oldest resident cannot recollect such an universal bankruptcy and universal distress as was felt in the year 1857, yet that year was in the very period during which this reciprocity is supposed to have been making the whole of Canada rich. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite may be pardoned for having a preconceived idea that reciprocity would be beneficial, but when they seek to bolster up these ideas by evidence, they should be careful to present it in a straightforward and honest manner, and not attempt to present only one side of the proposition, and leave the other side unrepresented, in fact almost to falsify the figures that they are quoting from. However, as that part of the subject has been so fully dealt with, I shall not attempt to go into statistics relating to it, but I will try for a few minutes to show what I consider has been the effect of the National Policy on the agricultural interest of the country. Now, when we advocated the National Policy, we were often charged with having made the assertion that the adoption of a protective tariff and applying it to agricultural products, would have the effect of increasing the price of these products. Now, Mr. Speaker, as one who took part in the debate before the country at that time, one who was a strong advocate, in the election of 1878, of that policy, I may say that that assertion contains a certain element of truth. Statements were made to the effect, that, relatively, the price of grain would be increased. Some gentlemen, in speaking of it, may not have used the word "relative," but they speak of a general increase in the price of farm produce, whereas we must always take into consideration the relative increase as compared with the various markets of the world. Now, Sir, the market of Liverpool at that time was acknowledged by both parties as being the ruling market in respect to wheat. Now, wheat is by no means an insignificant article of export from this country; it is really the largest, both in the number of bushels and in value, of any article which the farmers have to dispose of, especially the farmers of Ontario. Now, hon. gentlemen told us that the markets of Liverpool then gave the price of wheat, and that they now establish the price of wheat. Well, I agree that the Liverpool market at that time did govern the price of wheat, but that is no longer the case. At that time the difference between the price in Liverpool and the price in Toronto averaged about 50 to 55 cents, often much more, seldom much less. The difference between New York and Toronto then averaged about 20 cents, often 30, seldom less than 20. Now, what was the effect of the National Policy on that one product? We find that the difference between Liverpool and Toronto gradually sank from 50 down to 40, 30, 20—in fact at the present time it is actually under 10. Now, there is, under the National Policy, a relative increase in the price of wheat. Hon. gentlemen opposite refer to the markets of those years, when, for many reasons, the price of wheat was higher in Liverpool, and higher in New York, and they will compare the prices then with the prices now. But that is not a fair comparison. If wheat is low in Liverpool and low the world over, how can any policy make it high here? The only question is, can we make it relatively higher? And that, I claim, has been done. There is no other reason to give for the fact we are now within 10 cents of the Liverpool market, while formerly we were 50 cents from it; there is no other reason to give why we are within 5 to 8 cents of the New York market, when formerly we used to be from 20 to 30 cents. Nor is wheat the only article to which these remarks will apply. What I have said in reference to wheat applies with equal strength to all other grains that the farmers produce, barley alone excepted. Now, one article of grain produced by the farmers is that of oats, and in that

we find the difference used to range from 15 to 25 cents between Toronto and New York, and now it is seldom more than 5 cents, often equal. It is stated by some hon. gentlemen that the present time is about the only exception in favor of Toronto, as compared with Buffalo, whereas we find many exceptions, and if we trace back the markets during the last eight years, we will find that there has been six such exceptions as the average price which I have stated. Now, we are told that it requires an exception to prove the rule. I fancy that six exceptions out of eight must prove the rule the other way. It may be said that the assertion that this is due to the National Policy, is only an assertion on our side. I take that question up in this way: I say there is a reason for all these changes, and if we trace these reasons down we will see whether they are due to the National Policy or not. If we look at the Trade and Navigation Returns of these former years, we find that we were importing six, seven and eight millions of bushels of wheat—either wheat or flour—into Canada, a wheat-producing country; we were importing nearly one-third of our annual product, and we were exporting at the same time a much larger quantity. But, now, all that has changed, a duty has been placed on the importation of wheat, and it has decreased so that now the importation of wheat and flour, instead of being eight million bushels, is under two. Our exports at first decreased, naturally they would, we had not enough to fill our own markets and, therefore, we had to fall off in our exports; and hon. gentlemen would argue that that was an objection to the National Policy, because, forsooth, it decreased our import and decreased our export trade. Why, the very object was to prevent the importation of things that were a rival to our home productions, and the result of preventing importation, the result of increasing home consumption, all tended to decrease in like manner the export of the same articles. Now, we find that the National Policy has given good ground for another rise in price—it has increased our home consumption, we are producing more and yet we are not exporting more; we are increasing our home consumption, we have increased our home production, our towns are larger, our cities are larger, and villages are increasing in number. These cities, towns and villages have to be supplied with bread from the farmers, and every hon. gentleman will admit that the consumption of breadstuffs must be greatly increased. But we are told that the examples given by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in relation to the markets of the present day are wholly exceptional. A careful perusal of all the reports of the markets, as given by the *Globe*, which hon. gentlemen opposite no doubt will accept as correct, show that during the last eight years the prices, as between Toronto and Buffalo, have been more frequently in favor of Toronto than the other way. But I do not intend to go over the ground in regard to those markets, because they have been dealt with before; but I have what I consider a market which affects the interests of a part of the Province I represent, not only my own constituency, but all that portion of the Province similarly situated. I refer to that portion of the Province situated on the shore of Lake Huron and Georgian Bay, and what affects those countries must necessarily affect Ontario to a considerable extent. I wish, therefore, to refer to the market of Chicago. I take the market of Chicago as compared with the market of Toronto, or, perhaps, what might be even a more fitting comparison, with the market of Owen Sound, between which there is water communication and the cost of transportation is well known and firmly established, and it is easy, therefore, to make a comparison. I take first the market of Toronto. We find on wheat there is a difference between Chicago and Toronto of from 10 to 12 cents, the price in Chicago being that much lower on the average, not for a year or two, but for six or seven

Mr. Masson.

years, that it is so now and necessarily will continue so long as our present policy is in force. The cost of transportation is not over 4 cents at the outside. The cost from Chicago to Owen Sound is from 2½ to 3 cents and the cost to Toronto may be placed at 4 cents, so there is a difference of from 10 to 12 cents on wheat. Oats in Chicago on an average stand 15 cents below Toronto prices, 12 cents being as near as it ever comes, and I may say that it stands in exactly the same relation to the market of Owen Sound, in fact it is very rarely within 12 cents of that market. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite what would be the effect on the markets of Owen Sound, Goderich, Sarnia or any places bordering on the shores of Lake Huron or Georgian Bay if the duty were taken off those two staple articles? They could be purchased in Chicago at 10 or 12 cents below our price, and they could be delivered in our market for 3 or 4 cents per bushel, the natural consequence of which would be a drop in our markets of about 10 cents a bushel all round. That is only now prevented by the National Policy by the imposition of the duty; remove the duty and American oats would come into our harbors as they did in 1877. I well recollect in the spring of that year when oats were ranging in Owen Sound at 40 to 42 cents a bushel. American oats were brought in by schooner loads, and the result was that the price fell in one day from 40 cents to 28 cents. All that section of country does not depend so much upon the markets of Buffalo and New York or even the markets of Liverpool for the price of grain. They are confined to home consumption almost entirely, they have their markets at their own doors. The whole of the northern country to which they have access furnishes a large home market for oats and coarse grains generally, and we have to-day, notwithstanding the duty, to compete with Americans in these markets. I hold in my hand a letter from one John Andrews, of Spanish River, in the employ of the Spanish River Lumber Company. That gentleman writes to me, not for the purposes of this debate, a letter unsolicited, in which he asks to have a custom house established there, and he gives figures, which I will take the liberty of using. The three lumbering companies established on Spanish River have imported during the last year \$13,000 of American goods in competition with our Canadian goods. Those importations comprised lumber supplies, pressed hay, oats, corn and pork. We have to compete with the Americans there. We could not sell one barrel of pork, one bushel of oats, we could not sell one bullock there if the duty was removed; that market would be taken away from our farmers entirely, and they would be placed upon the level they occupied prior to the adoption of the National Policy, and they would be forced by necessity to seek distant markets. And it must be remembered that what would apply to this section of the Province would apply with more or less effect to the whole Province, and what affected Ontario would affect the whole Dominion. During the navigation season last year there passed through Owen Sound about 3,000,000 bushels of western grain—When wheat in Chicago was 12 cents a bushel lower than in Owen Sound, and oats were 15 cents lower—they were fortunately passing through in bond; but for the fact that they were in bond and that we have a duty imposed of 10 cents per bushel on oats, our oats would not have remained 15 cents a bushel above Chicago price but on a par with it or at most about 2 cents over. The local market on the north shore can be reached by the Americans about as cheaply as we can reach it, and it is the duty alone that keeps up prices upon those articles. I consider it is not a question as to what hon. gentlemen on this side of the House or hon. gentlemen opposite thought of reciprocity in the past, but it is what the effect of reciprocity would be at the present time. That is the question we have to consider; it is the live

question, and it is immaterial as to whether we thought reciprocity a benefit or otherwise ten or fifteen years ago. How would it affect us at the present time, and what effect would it have on our markets? I am satisfied that the introduction of wheat, and of oats, and of grain, free of duty would lower the prices of those commodities in Canada, and just in that connection let me ask what would become of our pea crop? The pea crop of the Province of Ontario is considered one of the most valuable crops. It is true that some farmers say it has an objection, as the straw is not so useful for many purposes as the straw of other grain. But, on the other hand, it is grown by many farmers to clean their land, and grown upon naked sod turned over for the first time when other crops there would be by no means certain. The very best crops of peas are grown in that way, and for our farmers, generally, I believe it is a very good crop. What has been the effect of the western grain on the pea crop of the northern and eastern States? Why, it has driven peas out of the country. Take any paper in America, and look at the Detroit, Buffalo and other American markets, and you will find that they do not even mention the pea crop at all. What is the cause of that? Those countries grew peas as well as we do before the extensive cultivation of corn, but they found that they could not produce peas to compete with corn. They have not been able to compete with the western producer of corn. The consequence is that the pea crop is entirely annihilated, and in the event of the introduction of American corn free into Canada, what would become of our Canadian pea crop? It would vanish as the pea crop of the northern and eastern States has vanished. I ventured to remark, a few moments ago, that in the researches of the hon. gentlemen opposite for evidence in support of their contentions, they have sought to present to the House not all the evidence in the case, but, like prejudiced detectives who, having obtained what they considered a clue, they follow up only one class of evidence and ignore the remainder. They even go to the extent of suppressing evidence which will crop to the surface in spite of them when it does not suit their case. The hon. member for East Huron (Mr. McMillan), in a very elaborate speech for which I give him credit for having gone very carefully into his side of the question, has set before us with great care all the evidence he could find to bolster up his statement that the National Policy was injurious to the Canadian producer. He enumerated a number of articles in support of his contention, and I will refer to those articles which he named. He referred to horses, horned cattle, sheep, poultry, eggs, potatoes, vegetables, straw, hay, barley, beans, apples and wool. Strange, when he was selecting these that he should omit other and far larger products of the farm. Strange, that he should have selected some which are mere bagatelles; but stranger still that when he was referring to horned cattle he should have made an exception to them as regards the manner in which he treated other articles. He referred to poultry, eggs and potatoes by their value, as well as all the other articles except horses. I did not notice in particular whether he gave us the value or number of horses, but it is not very material. He tried to show that the trade of the United States was far more important to the Canadian farmer than the trade with England, and selected horned cattle as proof of this, but instead of referring to values as he did in the other cases he referred to numbers, and when asked from this side of the House: "What about the values?" he went off on a tangent, so to speak, upon another subject, leaving the question of values unrevealed. I will, therefore, try to supplement what the hon. gentleman said in that respect by referring to the value of horned cattle as he referred to the numbers. He wanted to show, and he stated in plain language, that horned cattle exported to the States was 39 per cent., while to Great Britain the percentage was 54. Now, that may be a correct calcula-

tion as to numbers, but as to value it is entirely wrong. The value of cattle, as taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns, where the hon. gentleman got the values of the other articles and the numbers of the horned cattle, shows that the value of cattle exported to Great Britain was \$5,300,000, while the value of cattle exported from Canada to the United States was only \$887,000, or instead of being 39 per cent. on one side and 54 on the other, it was 82 per cent. on one side and 13½ on the other. I may say that in value the export of horned cattle alone to England was greater than the export of all the other articles he mentioned to the United States, except barley. Leaving barley out of the table which he gave us, the value of cattle exported to Great Britain was greater than the value of all the other articles he referred to. I do not think that it was a fair selection to present to the House when he selected a lot of trivial articles. Potatoes would rank pretty high in the list, but Prince Edward Island gave almost the entire quota of that export. The other articles given here as evidence of what a great boon trade with the United States would be were trivial in value. As I said before when he referred to horned cattle he spoke of numbers instead of value, omitting to state that the value of that export to Great Britain was greater than the value of all the others. Why did he not give us the quantities of butter sent to Great Britain, as compared with the United States? We find that we sent \$757,000 of butter to Great Britain, while we only sent \$17,000 worth to the United States. Why did not the hon. gentleman refer to cheese, when he was dealing with cattle, and the other various products of the farm? Because he would have to admit that we export to Great Britain \$7,065,000 worth, while to the United States we only exported \$30,000 worth. Why did he not refer to oats? Because he would have to admit that we exported \$509,000 worth to Great Britain as against \$12,000 worth to the United States. Why did he not refer to peas? Because he would have to admit that there were \$2,000,000 exported to Great Britain as against \$300,000 worth to the United States. Why did he not refer to wheat? Because he would have to admit that there were \$4,278,000 worth sent to England, and only \$265,000 worth to the United States. I think that when hon. gentlemen opposite profess to give evidence they have obtained in this matter, and when they profess to seek their evidence they should give us the whole truth. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) also gave us some strange information. He gave us here a quota, which must be from imagination, because if a farmer produces the articles and the quantities that he says he produces on a 70-acre farm he must be an astonishing farmer, and he must deal in grains and articles entirely different to other farmers. He gave us a story about a colt, one yoke of steers, twelve lambs, three hundred bushels of barley, five tons of hay and thirty bushels of potatoes. Strange, very strange indeed, that that farmer had no wheat; strange, very strange indeed, that he had no oats; most extraordinary for an Ontario farmer that he had no peas and no pork. I think that farmer must be in the land speculation business, and not a genuine farmer. But he said that on that colt he would have got \$20 more. How so? What proportion of our horses go to the United States? The hon. member for East Huron tells us that that there were 18,779 horses exported from Canada, or about one to every 60 voters in the country; or, to be generous to him, give two votes for every farmer and it would mean that one farmer in every 30 has one horse to export. Now, we are told we must pay the duty on them. If we had the United States only as our market for horses, and there were no cities in Canada furnishing markets for the surplus of our farmers, then only would we pay the whole duty. The question who pays the duty is who seeks the market. In some cases it is difficult to apply that rule, but when it is

properly applied the answer will be correct in every case. Will the hon. gentleman tell us that this country produces only 18,000 horses in the year? By no means. Our farmers do not go into horse-breeding by any means as a paying business. Horses are bred in Canada more as a luxury than for making money, and the farmers go into that business in so small a way that they do not count the cost; but any farmer who has attempted it on an extensive scale has come to the conclusion that it does not pay. Still, 18,000 horses for the whole Dominion of Canada are a mere bagatelle compared with the number our farmers raise in their own economical way, therefore it is unfair to say that the Canadian farmer in all cases pays the duty on horses. I think it was at Rochester that Mr. Wiman told the Americans: "You pay \$150 for a horse, and but for the duty you would get it for \$120." At Dufferin Lake he told the same story, applied to the Ontario farmer: "It is true, you sell your horse for \$120, and but for duty you would get \$150." I leave Mr. Wiman to settle with Mr. Wiman which is right. But isolated cases can never decide this question. We find there is but this small surplus, and it is not fair for any hon. gentleman to say that we must pay the whole of that duty when the surplus is so insignificant. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said one yoke of steers sold at \$40. Well, were those steers exported to the United States? Usually, fat cattle, which are fit for exportation, are sent to England—\$5,000,000 worth of them, as against \$80,000 worth to the United States. Is it fair to represent that those cattle, which are sold to the butcher and slaughtered in a town within a few miles of where they were raised, and consumed by the inhabitants of that town, are charged with any duty? The National Policy has done a great deal to increase the local market for beef. In the town I have the honor to represent, and the country surrounding it, there has been a very good market for fat cattle during the last eight years, the prices having ranged higher than the Toronto prices during those years. At the same time we had cattle coming from Toronto and passing through our town for shipment to the north, and we had the Canadian Pacific Railway in course of construction, and various other circumstances to improve the price. I do not claim all the benefit of the increased prices in those localities for the National Policy; I state frankly that the construction of the railway and the development of the North-West country gave us a much larger market, but the National Policy enabled us to compete with the Americans. Consider the quantity of cattle shipped from Duluth and other American ports to Port Arthur and there distributed all along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The railroad gave us the market, and the National Policy preserved it to a very great extent to the farmers of Ontario. The farmer mentioned by the hon. gentleman had 12 lambs. In all probability they were raised in North Wellington and were slaughtered in the adjoining towns. Is it fair, then, to say that any duty was paid on them? Then he spoke of the question of barley. Strange, very strange indeed, from my knowledge of North Wellington, that in that county the only grain the farmers raised to sell was barley, in a county which seldom can produce the grade of barley which is in demand in the United States, and for which a high price is paid there. But this farmer had five tons of hay, a very large quantity, and we are to suppose that he shipped that hay from North Wellington to the United States, and paid the duty on it. Is it fair to assume that any portion of that hay was exported? We know that hay cannot be shipped any great distance. We find that in towns 20 miles apart, there is often a difference of \$2 per ton in the price of hay. I have known a local crop in the neighborhood of a town to decrease the price there. Therefore, in the article of hay, the farmers have to rely almost entirely on the immediate home market. Then he had thirty bushels of potatoes. I will not

Mr. MASSON.

occupy the time of the House in going over more of these details, but I say that of the \$70 duty which the hon. member for North Wellington taxed his farmer with, in all probability there was not a cent of duty paid. If hon. gentlemen desired to be fair in comparing the Canadian trade with the United States with our trade with Great Britain, they would have found figures readily at hand in the Trade and Navigation Returns. If they look into our trade in agricultural products, they will find that out of a total of \$18,000,000 exports, only \$7,000,000 worth went to the United States. They will find that in animals and their products, out of a total export of \$24,000,000 only \$7,000,000 worth went to the United States and nearly \$17,000,000 to Great Britain and other countries. In the products of the fisheries they will find that out of a total export of \$6,800,000, we send only \$2,700,000 to the United States. So that in their comparisons, hon. gentlemen opposite have not been fair in presenting the evidence as the nature of the case requires. I agree heartily in the opinion that the discussion on this question should be entered into dispassionately and a calm consideration should be given to the evidence on both sides. I quite agree with hon. gentlemen opposite that on the decision of this question depends the future of Canada. I am willing to admit that our very existence is at stake, and that we are called on to decide whether we will continue to deal here with our own finances, or whether we are to look to the White House at Washington for the direction of our fiscal policy. I do not intend to go very deeply into the statistics I had prepared, as at this late hour I do not think it would be wise to further trespass upon the time of the House. I admit that, in 1878, I looked upon reciprocity as of very great value to this country; I will admit that up to a year or so ago, when this great question was first brought prominently to my attention, I was inclined to think that reciprocity would be of great service to our agricultural population. I was inclined to think that the resolutions of our statutes should be carried out to the letter, and reciprocity to the fullest extent in natural products be entered into. I, therefore, entered on the search for evidence with the same preconceived ideas that hon. gentlemen opposite have on this subject, but I did not shut my eyes to the evidence on the other side, and the result has been that the more I have searched into that matter, the more I have compared the markets of this country with those of the United States, the more I have compared the position of the farmers of this country with that of the farmers of the United States, the more I have been convinced that the duty on our natural products is necessary and important in the interests of the farmers of Ontario. As early as 1874, the Hon. George Brown, in presenting the Canadian memorandum, in conjunction with Sir Edward Thornton, admitted that the result of the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty had not been an unmixed evil. He referred especially to such products as wheat, flour and provisions, of which the United States have a surplus as well as Canada, and he said the effect of the United States putting on a duty on these articles had been to turn Canadian products through Canadian channels, and to force the people of Canada to find markets in the Maritime Provinces, the West Indies, and Great Britain, *via* Canadian routes, instead of the same markets *via* New York and Boston. He went on to say that although it had a disastrous effect upon our traffic with the United States for a time, yet that during the seven years which had elapsed then since the abrogation of the treaty, our exports had reached the sum of \$235,000,000, or \$75,000,000 more than the highest amount they had reached during the existence of the treaty. What has been the effect since? We find that what was true then is true now; we have found more profitable markets for our products and an easier method of reaching

them. Then the National Policy came to our assistance and gave us a home market, which is the best market of all, because it brings the consumer and the producer closer together, and the nearer you can bring the consumer to the producer, the better it is for both. I have occupied more time than I intended, but before taking my seat, I will just briefly refer to some of the arguments, or rather assertions, that have been advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite in favor of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, or whatever they may choose to call it. They tell us that the country is not prosperous, and what remedy do they propose? They propose a policy that would lower the prices of our natural products and ruin our cattle trade, which we have been at such great expense in creating. They propose a policy that would destroy our cheese and butter trade with Great Britain, that would close our factories, that would depopulate our cities, towns and villages, that would destroy our home market and render less profitable farming operations in this country. They tell us that our population is leaving us, but how do they propose to keep it here? They propose a policy that would assist the United States in offering greater inducements to our young men to cross the border; they propose a policy that would increase the trade of the United States, that would build up their cities, and hold out a greater bait to our young men to leave this country. They would open the door for a larger exodus, they would close our factories, they would turn our men out of employment, they would shut down every manufacturing industry in the country, they would drive out the people whom we are now trying to retain—that is the remedy that they propose for the evil which they say now exists in our population leaving us. They tell us that our farmers sell their produce low, and they would open all our ports so that the cheap produce of the United States could pour in all along our border, in consequence of the cheap carrying trade which is now established, so that the market of Chicago would be the ruling market for the Province of Ontario. They tell us that we are cursed with combines, and they calmly propose to cast us helpless into the lap of the mother of combines. They tell us that our railways are only paying $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on their investment, and they would turn the course of our trade and tap our railways at every point, so that even the $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. profit would be turned into loss and ruin. Some of them tell us that our manufacturers are monopolists and are rolling in wealth; others tell us that they are not prospering. What then? We will take the view that they are rolling in wealth. If that is an evil, will that be bettered? How do they propose to remedy that? Destroy them. Let in the Americans. Let in wealthier manufacturers. Destroy those that we have, because they are rolling in wealth. But, if we take the other view, that they are not prospering, what do they propose to do? Adopt a policy which would drive men from our cities, take away our home trade, destroy our manufactures, close up our factories, silence our looms, close every forge in the country, in fact ruin our country in order to add to the manufactures of our neighbors across the border. I do not think any such remedies are called for. I do not think it is necessary for us to seek such assistance or to go begging to the United States to take us in. I think we have a glorious country of our own, and I might quote the remarks of the Rev. Father Coffey on that subject, in which he says:

"I fear not to call myself an admirer of America and American institutions. But while I do admire America, while I revere her people, and glory in her history and her achievements, I cannot forget that in the 22 years of national life that Canada has already enjoyed, this great though youthful country has made a progress, moral and material, without parallel in the world's history. Not even the American republic with its proud record of development and progress can point to so many and such gigantic achievements as Canada has in so short a time accomplished. Of this country we have every reason to feel proud.

To Canada we owe a debt of loyalty and devotion that cannot be too fully repaid. We have a country with free institutions, with every protection for all classes of citizens, with civil and religious liberty guaranteed to every section of the population, and its people in the enjoyment of a fairer distribution of wealth than obtains in any other portion of the world. Before the rising generation of Canada devolves the duty of doing its utmost to make Canada that which God and nature intended it should be—a truly great nation. A great nation must Canada become if its people continue to prove true to the Canadian principles that lie at the foundation of all true growth and progress. That they will so prove is my firm belief as it certainly is the sincere trust and prayer of every lover of this brave land—the crown and the glory of the proud and fearless north."

I think it is a spirit such as that, to love and praise our country, that we should endeavor to cultivate. We should enhance the value of our country at home and abroad, and not cry out ruin and desolation, and point to our weak points; but hon. gentlemen opposite are prone to point to all our failings, to all our losses and misfortunes, and at the same time they are prone to praise all the benefits of our neighbors across the border. If they must praise one country and depreciate the other, in the name of all that is sacred why do they not sound the praises and tell the benefits of our Canadian homes, and point to the discrepancies and the drawbacks of the Americans? But no, they tell us of the wheat fields of Dakota, and they do not tell us of the blizzards and the cyclones. They tell us of the rich pastures of another State, but they say nothing of the drought and the grasshopper. But, when they speak of Canada, it is only upon the evils that they can dwell, it is only the losses and the discouraging features of the case that they refer to. If they could but unite, as it is the duty of all loyal Canadians to unite, in pressing everywhere the claims of the country in which they live, so that in every land our praises may be set forth, we would not have the portrait of any hon. member of this House forming the frontispiece of an American immigration pamphlet. We have many communities and many nationalities in our land, and all we want is that a united stand should be made. All we want is for the men of every Province and of every nationality in the various Provinces to unite firmly and to press forward the general work in the interests of the prosperity of our common country. If they will do that, Canada cannot fail to prosper, Canada must prosper. She is a land of rich resources, she is inhabited by noble races. Why, then, should she not prosper? Let

"English, Irish, Scotch and French together here combine
To emulate the deeds their sires have done in Auld Lang Syne;
Let's lay their failings all aside, their virtues and truth maintain,
And in this new Dominion they shall bring forth fruit again.
Then as long as the old St. Lawrence rolls its course towards the sea,
So long shall Canada remain the glorious and the free."

Mr. BOWMAN. I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House at any great length at this late stage of the debate, but I desire to give some reasons which influence me in voting for the resolution of my hon. friend the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Before doing that, I desire to refer to some of the statements which have been made by the last speaker. He made some very extraordinary statements or, at least, they seemed so to me. He said that formerly, before we had the National Policy, the Liverpool market regulated the price of wheat, but that now the National Policy regulates the price of wheat. If the National Policy had secured for our farmers a market sufficient to absorb the entire product of our wheat, the hon. gentleman's statement might have had some shade or shadow of truth in it, but from the Trade and Navigation Returns we find that we export some five million bushels of wheat and 500,000 barrels of flour, and, as long as we export wheat and flour—it does not matter whether we export two million bushels, or five million bushels, or ten million bushels—so long as we have an export trade the foreign market must regulate the price.

Then he seemed to be very much exercised with the idea that, if unrestricted trade were adopted with the United States, it would annihilate the pea crop of the farmers. I do not exactly see how that result would follow. Then he tries to point out what he alleges to be the weakness in the argument of the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Macdonald), when he stated that 45,705 cattle were exported last year to the United States. According to the idea of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson) the hon. member for East Huron should have given the amount realised for these cattle instead of the number; because the amount realised per head for the cattle exported to the United States was not as great as the amount realised per head for the cattle exported to Great Britain, he thought there was a weakness in the argument. Now, I know from certain knowledge that the cattle which we exported to the United States were mostly grass cattle, were store cattle, cattle that were exported for feeding purposes. Why did our farmers export these cattle? Because they found it more profitable to export their peas and barley instead of feeding it to the cattle, and if we had free trade with the United States in raw products, so that our farmers could obtain cheap corn as they did formerly under the Reciprocity Treaty, then they could have sold their barley and peas and they could have bought cheap corn and fattened these cattle and sent them to Great Britain and secured a much greater price for them. Another statement of the hon. gentleman was that it is a great advantage for our farmers and others to be able to sell our products in the nearest market. He laid down the principle that the nearer you can bring the producer and the consumer together, the better it will be for both. Now, that is exactly what we are proposing to do in trying to get reciprocal trade with the United States. We desire to bring the consumer and the producer as near together as we possibly can. Now, without referring any further to the arguments of that hon. gentleman, I will proceed to state to the House some of the ideas which present themselves to my mind on this question. The question of free trade between Canada and the United States has occupied the attention of the people of this country to a very large extent ever since the abrogation of the last Reciprocity Treaty. I think both political parties in this House and in the country are agreed that it is highly desirable that we should have freer trade relations with the United States than we have at present. It seems to me that the only difference of opinion which exists is as to the form which these trade relations ought to take, as to the extent to which we ought to secure free trade with the United States. Well, if we could secure reciprocity in raw products, if we could gain free access to the United States for our farmers, our miners, our lumbermen, our fishermen, and all the producers of raw materials, that, in my opinion, would satisfy to a very large extent the desire for free trade in the Dominion of Canada. But the Government of the United States, as I understand it, have clearly and distinctly told us that for the present, at all events, they will not trade with us on that basis, and consequently it is our duty to see whether we can find some other basis on which they will be willing to trade with us. Failing to secure free trade in raw products, the strong desire which exists in this country for some kind of trade relations with our neighbors, has given rise to the discussion of several other projects. One scheme which has been discussed during the past year is known by the name of commercial union or Zollverein, and the proposal now before the House is known under the name of unrestricted reciprocity—free trade, without the complications which might arise in connection with commercial union. Under commercial union, as I understand it, the tariff to be levied upon foreign goods would have to be agreed upon between the two countries, it would necessarily have to be a uniform tariff, but under unrestricted reciprocity, as proposed

Mr. BOWMAN.

by the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that is not necessary. Under that arrangement Canada can levy her own tariff, and the people of the United States can levy such a tariff as would suit them. The tariff would not necessarily require to be equal, and consequently our revenue would not have to be interfered with so much as some hon. gentlemen would have us believe. The principal objection urged by hon. gentlemen opposite against this scheme of unrestricted reciprocity is that, as they allege, it will lead to annexation. That seems to be their strongest position. They declare, one and all, that it would lead to annexation. Now, if I believed for a single moment that it would have that effect I would hesitate before I voted for it, but I do not believe it would have that effect. I do not believe that it would have a tendency in the slightest degree to produce an annexation sentiment in the Dominion of Canada. Let us examine this statement for a few moments. No doubt hon. gentlemen are all aware that immediately preceding the introduction of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1854, there existed in Canada a very considerable feeling in favor of annexation among certain classes, but so soon as a reciprocity treaty was adopted, so soon as we obtained free trade in raw products with the United States, that feeling died away and we heard nothing more of it. Now, then, if, during the twelve years from 1854 to 1866 the farmers of Canada had free trade with the United States without becoming annexationists, the lumbermen had free trade with the United States without becoming annexationists, the fishermen had free trade with the United States without becoming annexationists, the miners had free trade, and our artisans had the benefit of free trade, indirectly, through the greater prosperity of the farmers upon whom they are dependent for their prosperity, while our laborers have always been permitted to transfer their skill and their labor from one side of the line to the other free, and they have not become annexationists—if all these classes which I have enumerated, constituting by far the larger proportion of the population—I think I am quite within the mark when I say that they constitute three-fourths of our entire population—if such a large proportion of our population had free trade before, and did not become annexationists, why should they become such now? Then the question arises, Who are going to become annexationists under this arrangement? From what classes are the annexationists to come? There is only one other class left, and that is the petted and pampered manufacturers, those who have been enabled, during the past eight or ten years under the operation of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, to enrich themselves at the expense of the public, they are the only class left—and I do not believe that any considerable proportion of that class would become annexationists if these special advantages were withdrawn from them, and they were placed upon the common level of ordinary business men. It seems to me that we have not been so successful as we could have wished in establishing interprovincial trade between the different Provinces; although we have expended large sums with a view to secure that result. Unfortunately for Canada its fertile sections are situated so far apart, the geographical difficulties are so great, that we have not been as successful in cultivating interprovincial trade as we would desire. Those geographical difficulties do not exist between Canada and the United States. Our American neighbors ought to be our most profitable customers under any arrangement such as is proposed by this resolution, and it is quite clear that the nearer we can bring the customer to the producer the better it will be for both parties, and trading with our near neighbors is more profitable and more sensible than trying to find markets lying at a greater distance. The cost of transporting our goods or products to consumers in the United States is not so great as transporting them to more distant countries and returns

are obtained more readily. Dealers can meet from time to time and arrange matters with regard to trade, and the difficulties which exist in connection with trading with distant countries do not prevail to the same extent with a country lying nearer home. The benefit and the great convenience of trading with our near neighbors is illustrated by our coal trade. We have endeavored by carrying coal from Nova Scotia to Quebec and Ontario, even at a loss, to encourage that trade, but in spite of all that has been done to foster the trade, Ontario has all along brought her coal from the United States because the cost of transportation is less, and it was more convenient to purchase that article from our near neighbors. But the Minister of Marine tried to controvert the argument made on this side of the House in favor of trade with our near neighbors by trying to show that the nearer market was not in many instances the best market, and another statement made by that hon. gentleman was that our most profitable trade can be done with those nations which do not produce at all or only in limited quantities the articles we have to sell. I do not think that always follows. The hon. gentleman referred to France, and stated that if the near market was the best France ought to be the best customers for British goods and by implication he stated that the distant market of India and other foreign countries was more profitable for British productions. I find by the Statesmen's Year Book of 1885, that the trade of Great Britain with France, a nation which competes to a very great extent with Great Britain in foreign markets in manufactured goods—the imports from France to Great Britain in 1883 were \$190,000,000, while the exports from Great Britain to France were \$85,000,000, or the exports from Great Britain to France amounted to \$2.25 per head, while the exports to India were only 86 cents per head, taking the population at the lowest number given in the census returns. Then take two other countries lying very near to Great Britain, Belgium and Holland. Those countries are among the most profitable and largest customers for British goods, and there is this remarkable circumstance connected with those countries, that Belgium and Holland seem to manufacture and produce precisely the same class of goods which they purchase to a very large extent from Great Britain. I find that Belgium, a country lying very near to Great Britain, with a population of five millions and three-quarters, exported to Great Britain in 1883, \$80,000,000 worth and took in exchange from Great Britain \$40,000,000 worth or \$7 per head for the whole population. Holland, with a population of four millions and a quarter, exported \$124,000,000 worth and took British goods in exchange to the extent of \$45,000,000 worth, or \$11 per head. So those countries lying near to Great Britain, and producing even the same classes of goods, were purchasers to the amounts of \$7 and \$11 per head, according to the population respectively. There is one very remarkable feature connected with the trade between Great Britain and those two countries, a feature which I think has some bearing upon the trade, which we think can be done under reciprocal trade between Canada and the United States. I find, for instance, that Belgium exported to Great Britain woollen yarns to the amount of \$7,000,000, and that Great Britain in return sold to Belgium in 1883 woollen goods to the value of \$6,000,000. Belgium, during the same year, sold to Great Britain flax and cotton goods to the value of \$6,500,000, and Great Britain in return sold to Belgium \$11,000,000 worth of cotton goods. I find also that Belgium sold to Great Britain in the same year iron goods to the value of \$3,500,000 and Great Britain sold to Belgium in return iron goods to the amount of \$2,100,000. So the House will see that there exists between those two countries a very large reciprocal trade in the class of manufactured goods which both countries produce; so it does not follow that we can always sell most profitably

to the country which does not manufacture or produce the goods we have to sell. The trade between Great Britain and Holland is of the same character. Holland exported to Great Britain iron and steel goods to the value of \$6,000,000, and Great Britain sold back to Holland \$5,500,000 worth. I find also that Holland sold Great Britain woollen goods to the value of \$8,000,000, and Great Britain sold back to Holland \$6,300,000 worth of the same kind of goods during the same year. Holland sold to Great Britain \$4,000,000 worth of cotton goods, and Great Britain sold to Holland \$13,500,000 worth. So here are countries lying near to Great Britain, manufacturing the same kind of goods as Great Britain, and those two nations exchange the same kind of goods to a very large extent. And if that can be done between those two countries I do not see any reason why we in the Dominion of Canada, under reciprocal free trade with the United States, should not be able to sell a large quantity of manufactured goods to our neighbors as well as to purchase from them. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is admitted by every one that free trade with the United States in the produce of the farm, would be of great benefit to the class of our people engaged in that industry. I think it is admitted by every one that our farmers would be largely benefited by freedom of trade between Canada and the United States. It is, I believe, a fact, which cannot be denied, that the British market is not as valuable at the present moment to our farmers as it was five years ago, and I think if we take into consideration the large increase in the production of wheat and cattle in other countries of the world which has taken place during the past five years, we must come to the conclusion that the depreciation in the value of the British market to our farmer, has become permanent. Therefore, I think, it is the duty of this House and of the Government to secure as valuable a market for our farmers with our American neighbors as is possible. Even under present circumstances and with a heavy duty against us our farmers sell a very large proportion of their products in the American market. I find from the Trade and Navigation Returns that in 1878 we sold 13,851 head of cattle to our neighbors, in 1880 the number had risen to 21,317, in 1885 it had increased to 30,593, and in 1886 we exported 45,765. Again in 1886 we exported 18,225 horses and 363,046 sheep, and poultry to the value of \$93,719. Of eggs we exported 13,000,000 dozen, valued at \$1,821,364; wool, \$1,297,876; of barley we sent 9,437,000 bushels; peas, 405,000 bushels; and potatoes, 1,276,000 bushels. Now, if our farmers can find their best market in the United States for such a large proportion of their products with a heavy duty against them, I think we have every reason to believe that they would sell them to much better advantage if the duty were removed, and to show you still further the value and importance of the American market to our farmers I would just quote our total export from the Dominion to the United States last year. They were as follows:—Ontario exported \$20,271,000; Quebec exported \$4,394,000; Nova Scotia exported \$2,733,000; New Brunswick, \$1,763,000; Prince Edward Island, \$667,000; Manitoba, \$212,000; British Columbia, \$2,230,000, making a total export from the Dominion to the United States of \$32,273,033, as against \$38,714,351 to Great Britain. So that you see, Mr. Speaker, that even under present circumstances the American market is quite as important as the British market to our farmer. Now then, the question comes up if the duty were removed, and if we were to secure free trade with the United States, would the price of the products of the farm increase at the same time, or would the taking off of the duty reduce the price so that the farmer would get no more than he does now. If it can be shown that the removal of the duty would not enhance the price to our farmers, then there is no practical object in getting the duty removed. I think it could be clearly shown that

the removal of the duty would not reduce the value of our products in the United States market, and that consequently our farmers would just get as much more, or nearly as much more, as the duty amounts to. I find from the United States statistics that the farmers of that country produced last year 61,000,000 bushels of barley, and that we sold to them 9,000,000 bushels. Now then, does anyone pretend to say that if the duty were taken off the 9,000,000 bushels exported to the United States it would have the effect of reducing the price of the 61,000,000 bushels on the other side. The people of the United States require not only their own production but they require our 9,000,000 bushels as well, and consequently I do not believe that the price of barley would be reduced by a single cent per bushel if the duty were removed. Then speaking of our horses. There is a very large demand for horses in the United States. I think I am quite within the mark when I say that at least 95 out of every 100 horses sold in the United States are raised by the American farmer, and, as everyone knows, there is no duty against their own horses. The remaining five out of every 100 is exported from Canada to the United States. Suppose the duty were to be taken off the horses exported from Canada to the States, does anyone pretend to say that the taking off of the duty from the five horses out of every 100 sold there would have the effect of reducing the price on the remaining 95 raised in their own country. I do not think it would have that effect. The demand for horses and the price for horses would remain the same in the United States, and the result would be that our farmers would get from \$20 to \$30 more for every horse exported to our neighbors. Even if the Canadian farmer did not get the whole benefit of the removal of the duty, it is quite clear that the \$20 or \$30 duty would be divided between the farmer and the trader, and I think the farmer would get by far the larger share. Now, it has been alleged by some speakers on this side of the House that, in consequence of the reduction in the market price of the farmers' produce, the price of land in Canada has fallen within the last five years. It seems to me that it is hardly necessary to discuss this question. Everyone who has investigated the matter for himself in his own neighborhood, cannot help but come to the conclusion that the price of farming land has depreciated very considerably during the past five years. My own observation leads me irresistibly to that conclusion. It is evident that the loaning companies of the Province of Ontario do not loan as large an amount per acre on farm property to-day as they did five years ago, for the reason that they know very well that farms are not worth as much in the market as they formerly were. In my own county of Waterloo, where farming lands have held their value better than in most other counties, there is a very considerable depreciation in the values of farms. I know of one farm, for instance, in the township of Wellesley, which was sold two years ago for \$5,500, and about two months ago it was sold again for \$4,200, not by a forced sale, but on very favorable terms. I know another in the township of Wallace, which was valued by competent valuers five years ago at \$9,000, and which was sold two months ago for \$7,300. I know of a considerable number of farms in my own riding which could have been readily sold five years ago, but for which purchasers cannot now be found at the old figure, so that their owners, being unwilling to reduce the price, are unable to sell them. Some of the speakers who have preceded me have dwelt considerably on the question of the prosperity of our farmers. It is alleged by hon. gentlemen opposite that our farmers are just as prosperous now as they were ten years ago. I do not agree with that statement. I think we have very conclusive evidence all around us that our farmers are not as prosperous as they were five or ten years ago. I know that in my own county our farmers are under the necessity of borrowing money

Mr. BOWMAN.

from the loan companies much more largely than they did five years ago. Until within the past two years it was impossible for any of the loan companies to secure a loan in the north riding of Waterloo. I am connected with a company in Waterloo, which lends money to a pretty large extent, and until very recently we were unable to secure any loans worth speaking of in our neighborhood; but within the last two years we have placed more loans on farms in our immediate neighborhood than we did for ten years before. The reason of that is quite plain. While our farmers were getting better prices than they are now, they always had plenty of money, and there is no part of the country where the farmers have as much money as they have in North Waterloo. Previous to the great reduction in prices they had so much money that they were accustomed to lend it to neighboring farmers who wanted to borrow; but during the last two years they have not had any to lend, and the consequence is that the farmers who need money have to go to the loan companies for it. On this point I will just read a single extract from the *Trade Review* published at Montreal:

"It cannot but be concluded that Ontario is possessed of that important element, an enterprising population; but comparing the two periods, 1873-79 and 1879-85, it is found that the ratepayers in rural municipalities increased by 40,367, or 16½ per cent in 1873-79, and only by 13,360, or 4¼ in 1879-85. For the two periods the area of assessed lands in 1873-79 increased by 1,001,233 acres, or 5 per cent.; in 1879-85, by 622,978 acres, or 3 per cent. It may and must strike the reader that the comparison which has been made, demonstrates that Ontario has been going back instead of advancing."

The emigration of our people to the United States is another question which has been considerably discussed during this debate, and I think it is admitted on both sides that the emigration has been for years past and still is very large—much larger than any of us desire to see. I think it is generally admitted that the adoption of reciprocal free trade with the United States would benefit every class of people in this Dominion, except, as some hon. gentlemen opposite allege, our manufacturers. It is stated by the opponents of this resolution that our manufacturing industries would be wiped out, as they could not compete with those of the United States—that the result of the adoption of this policy would be that our markets would be filled with American goods, and that we would not be able to sell an equal quantity among our American neighbors. Now, if I believed that it would have the effect of wiping out our manufacturing industries, or even seriously injuring them, I would not cast my vote in its favor, because I quite agree in the importance of having manufacturers in our country as well as farmers. But I am inclined to the opinion that it would not seriously injure any considerable number of our manufacturers, while I believe it would benefit a great many. One hon. gentleman, I think it was the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), said this afternoon that he was satisfied that at least 99 out of every hundred of the manufacturers in this Dominion were opposed to reciprocity with the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. So they are.

Mr. BOWMAN. I do not agree with that statement. I believe quite a respectable number of our most intelligent, our most progressive, our most enterprising and successful manufacturers are in favor of this resolution. I have had some opportunities of acquainting myself with the opinions of the manufacturers of my own riding; and I think that I am quite within the mark when I say that there are no two towns of the same size in the Dominion in which there are so large a number of manufacturing establishments in operation as there are in the towns of Berlin and Waterloo. Our manufacturers, as a rule, have been very successful, more successful, perhaps, than they have been in some other parts of the country, and I am happy to be able to inform this House that some of them, at least, are in favor of this pro

position. It is quite natural, however, that some of our manufacturers in my part of the country should be opposed to this resolution just as they are in other parts of the country, but we have in my riding a large number of millers who believe that under reciprocity they could compete with the United States millers in their own markets. Take the town of Waterloo as a centre. Within a radius of twelve miles of that town there are no less than twenty flour mills, some of very large capacity. A number of them are owned by some of the most enterprising and progressive millers of the Dominion, who were the first to introduce the new process of milling, and who sold a large quantity of flour to our American neighbors during the period when the Reciprocity Treaty was in force, and even during the earlier years of the protective tariff. Of these twenty millers, I know that at least fifteen are strongly in favor of reciprocity with the United States. Then we have two factories in the town of Waterloo, who manufacture agricultural implements on a pretty large scale. I have not taken the trouble to ascertain the views of the proprietors of one of them, but the leading proprietor of the other told me a few days ago that he was quite willing to accept reciprocal free trade with the United States, as he could sell his wares among our neighbors to a much larger extent than he can at home. Then we have in Waterloo one of the most successful and largest woollen manufacturers in the Dominion of Canada. It may sound like boasting of the capacity of our own people, but I will say that there is not another woollen factory in this Dominion, the proprietors of which have made as much money on their capital invested as have the proprietors of this Waterloo establishment. Its president and foreman, on two occasions, visited some of the leading factories of the United States, examined their machinery, methods of operation, cost of management, and products, and they both declared most emphatically that they are fully prepared to compete with the United States manufacturers. The president said to me a few days ago: Give me access to the American markets, and I will then run four factories just as well as I do one now. Another enterprising and successful firm in Berlin, Messrs. Brown & Erb, is engaged largely in upholstering. I asked Mr. Brown the other day his opinion on this question, and he said: I go in for free trade with the United States, and if I can get free access to the American markets I could have half a dozen travellers out through the western States selling my goods. We have another industry in Berlin and Waterloo, which is not represented, perhaps, in any other part of the Dominion, that of the manufacture of buttons. One of these manufacturers, the manufacturer at Waterloo, has recently commenced to ship his goods to Buffalo, while the other, the largest manufacturer in the town of Berlin, has, during the past two years, sold in the United States markets no less than \$120,000 worth of buttons, paying the duty upon them, and the managing proprietor told me that with such a duty as we now have in Canada on German buttons, he is prepared to take his chances in the American market. It matters not what may be said on this question, the fact that they have been able to sell this large quantity of buttons in the United States during the last two years is the best evidence we can have that they can compete with the Americans. One objection urged against the adoption of this resolution is that under free trade with the United States, our manufacturers would have to change their methods of operation, and that instead of manufacturing a large number of articles in different lines they would have to confine themselves to one or two lines, and that large factories would have to be established to compete with those in the United States. The effect, it is argued, would be that our factories would all be centred in the large cities, and that the smaller towns would lose the industries they now possess. I do not believe this policy would have that effect.

It has not had it in the United States. We find the largest manufacturing establishments in the United States are not to be found in the great cities of New York, Philadelphia, Chicago and other large cities, but in the smaller towns, in places that were scarcely towns at all until those establishments were located there. A similar result would follow here. I believe that our manufacturing establishments would remain just where they are, largely located in such towns as Guelph, Galt, Berlin and Waterloo, and not in the larger cities. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have great faith in the resources of our great Dominion. Whenever we speak about reciprocity with the United States, they begin to speak of our great resources. Hon. gentlemen on this side place just as high a value upon the resources of this Dominion as they do. We appreciate just as highly as they the great natural resources we possess, but we desire to adopt a policy which will enable us more successfully to develop these resources. We desire to adopt a policy which will give us a free market in the United States for our lumber, coal, fish, and other products. We desire a policy which, by enabling the people of Manitoba and the North-West to buy and sell in the nearest, the most convenient, the most profitable market, will do more to develop that magnificent country than the policy of restriction, monopoly and disallowance of hon. gentlemen opposite has done in five or even ten years. We desire to adopt a policy which will give a free market to the farmers of Ontario and Quebec and the fishermen of the eastern Provinces. We desire a policy which will enable us to develop the resources of our Dominion and make of Canada a peaceful, prosperous and independent nation; and for the reasons I have just given, it is my intention to vote for the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. McKEEN. Mr. Speaker, this discussion has taken such a wide range and has extended over so many days, that perhaps there is little new that can be said, but the subject is so wide a one, embracing as it does our national and industrial interests of every kind, that, while the resolution is before the House, it should be thoroughly investigated from every standpoint. To my mind, the best way of doing this is for the representatives of this country to show how the industries with which they are more practically acquainted would be affected by the proposed change. Evidence of that kind is likely to tell more powerfully than glittering theories, or what are called broad views. There is, of course, a wide difference of opinion on this whole subject in this House, a good deal of which may arise from the different views that are taken of the actual condition of the country. We were told by the hon. and learned member from South Oxford, in his able speech on the resolution under discussion, and his utterances have been, more or less, endorsed by the hon. members supporting him, that business is depressed; that there is an exodus of our population; that we are hopelessly in debt, and that irretrievable ruin must inevitably follow a continuance of our present policy, and I notice there is a disposition on this side of the House to denounce those who talk in this deprecating strain, as disloyal and pessimistic; but I submit, Sir, that there is some excuse for these gloomy views, and that in justice this ought to be considered. We should remember that these gentlemen are Her Majesty's loyal Opposition, and that, in their way, they are doing some service to the country; we should also remember that these hon. gentlemen have, time and again, told the electors that the Government of this country would be more honestly, economically and efficiently administered if entrusted in their hands; and that ruin, desolation, moral and financial bankruptcy must follow, should confidence be placed in the present Administration; and yet the country has, again and again, refused to listen to their denunciations or entrust them with power.

Let gentlemen on this side of the House place themselves in the position of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I venture the assertion that their tone will be less jubilant than it is at present. In fact, when they were out of power for a short time, the wail over the condition of the country was almost as loud as it is now, but the wail then came from some of those who now see nothing but blue skies. Everyone knows that there was cause for lamentation then, and so the country decided. The misery and starvation consequent upon that great depression, led to the adoption of a policy which has developed our own resources, which has made us commercially independent, and which has won for us the respect of our neighbors, on both sides of the Atlantic. But just as much of the lamentation cry might have been discounted during the lean years, to which I have referred, so I am sure that reasonable men on the opposite side will admit that much of what we now hear as to the country being depopulated and on the verge of ruin, must be taken subject to a heavy discount. Were these hon. gentlemen sitting on the Government benches, they would speak in more cheerful tones, they would then show us the other side of the shield. I claim that the exodus referred to is not peculiar to this country. There has always been, and there is now on a larger scale than ever before, a movement of population from northern to southern and western countries; from countries with a limited variety of industries to countries which are more populous, and which offer more avenues to wealth. There is an exodus from northern to southern and western Russia; from Norway and Sweden, which are not at all over-populated, to southern and western countries; from New England to the south and west, and if Canada became part of the United States, it is not improbable that this exodus would not only continue, but would proceed with increased volume, as travelling facilities become greater. It has already been shown by hon. gentlemen who have preceded me that there has been for years past a movement of population from the northern and eastern States towards the west and south, and to such an extent has this been going on, that, as has been demonstrated by my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), and others, that the Eastern States similarly situated as to climate, soil and production with our own Maritime Provinces, show a much less decennial increase in population, than do the Provinces. Allusion has been made to Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont, which have been compared in point of increase of population with the Maritime Provinces. For example the official census shows that the State of Maine in 1870 had a population of 626,415, and in 1880 had a population 648,936, an increase of 22,521, equal to an increase of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in the decennial period. Now take Nova Scotia, which had, in 1871, a population of 387,800, and in 1881, 440,572, an aggregate increase of 52,772, equal to an increase per cent. of 13.6 against 3.5 in Maine. Again, looking at the State of New Hampshire, which had in 1870 a population of 317,277, and in 1880 had 346,991, giving an aggregate increase of 29,714 or 9.3 per cent.; compare this with New Brunswick which had in 1871 a population of 285,594, and in 1881 had increased to 321,233, being an aggregate increase of 35,639, equal to 12.5 per cent. as compared with New Hampshire giving 9.3. Once more, take the State of Vermont, which had in 1870 a population of 330,575, and in 1880 it numbered 332,286, giving an aggregate increase of 1,711, equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent.; now contrast this with the tight little Island of Prince Edward, which had in 1871 a population of 94,021, and in 1881 a population of 108,891, making an aggregate increase of 14,870, equal to 15.8 per cent., against $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent. in Vermont. But flattering as these comparisons are to our own old Maritime Provinces, there exists cases of still greater disparity in favor of Canada. Take for example the following cities of the United States: Bangor, Maine, a city regarded as of considerable impor-

Mr. McKEEN.

tance, had in 1870 a population of 18,289 and in 1880 it was 16,856, or a decrease, in ten years, of 1,433. Burlington, Vermont, had in 1870 a population of 14,387 and in 1880 it had gone down to 11,365, a decrease of 3,022, and yet these two cities have had for the last 120 years unrestricted trade with the whole United States, so with other numerous towns in the Eastern States, such as Belfast, Camden, Ellsworth, and others of Maine, Adams in Massachusetts, Burlington in Vermont, and Fond du Lac in Wisconsin, &c. Not only in the old Eastern States but away to the west and south all over the Union are there dottings of this character. Whilst speaking of cities, supposing we compare Portland, Maine, with Halifax, similarly situated, and, at the present moment, to some extent rival ports. Well, in 1870, Portland had a population of 31,213, and in 1880 it was 33,810, a total gain in the decade of only 2,597, equal to 8.3 per cent. Halifax city had in 1871 a population of 59,552, which in 1881 had increased to 36,100, a total gain of 6,518, and equal to 22 per cent., against an increase of 8.3 per cent. of Portland in the same period. But, Sir, is it not a little singular that whilst our friends opposite appear only to find depletion and exodus of the population of Canada as they estimate it, they never appear to take into account the compensations which Canada receives in continuous additions to her population by immigration, whether it is that our friends knowingly ignore this important factor to the credit side, or unintentionally neglect it, I cannot say; but the fact remains, that we have in Canada very much more than compensation for the outward movement of population. For example, I find from the official statements of the Department of Agriculture that for the calendar year of 1887, 3,354 subjects of the United States came across the border and settled in Canada; and Canadians who had lived, and apparently settled, in the United States for a number of years, returned to their native Canada during the same year to the number of 19,677; and in this way Canada has drawn off from the population of the United States to herself, 23,011 persons. Nor is this all; for in addition Canada has received from Europe, by immigration, for the year mentioned, 84,526 settlers, who have added to the wealth of the country by bringing with them \$3,879,908. All these circumstances, highly satisfactory as they are to all Canadians, are by no means the only, or even the greatest or most important, factor by which the population of Canada is being surely and steadily augmented, neither need there be any alarm at an alleged exodus. In point of natural increase our families are much larger in Canada than in the United States. We can spare thousands annually, and yet increase in numbers and wealth. Besides, the thousands who go, do a work for their native land. The example of their industry, frugality, intelligence and virtue inspire our neighbors with respect for the country that rears such sons and daughters. The point for us to consider is, not how many go, but how many remain. It is a certain fact that the population of Canada is increasing. The financial position and public debt of the country has been a fruitful subject of deprecation with our friends of the opposite side, and the matter has been so fully discussed *pro* and *con* that I do not intend to impose on the indulgence of the House by adding materially to the array of figures already presented on both sides. It must be admitted that the debt of our country has increased, but the points to be asked are, have we not value for it? and, is it not wise, at times, to incur debt? We have the grandest canal system in the world; railways connecting the whole country together, such as no other country with so limited a population ever constructed; lighthouses; public works of all kinds which have developed the country. Our most progressive farmers borrowed money at 6 per cent. or 7 per cent. to improve their property, may it not be wise that the country should borrow at half that rate for the same pur-

pose? Of course there is a limit here that should be regarded. Comparing our financial status with that of other countries, Canada occupies the proud position of standing at the head of the list of all countries whose securities are sought for in the great money markets of the world. Comparing, in like manner, our public indebtedness with that of our neighbors, it does not appear to be the terrific, grinding, destructive volume our friends have, year after year, been seeking to make it. Compared with other countries, it is found that the debt of England represents exactly \$110 per head; the debt of Austria \$60 per head; the national debt of the United States, to which our friends opposite bid us look with admiration, is \$30 per head, to which has to be added the State debts of \$17 per head (debts which, in Canada, are provided for in behalf of the Provinces of the Dominion) which brings the debt of the United States up to \$47 per head. In Canada the debt is \$45 per head, against \$47 in the United States. In addition to this, the municipalities of the United States are burdened with very much heavier debts than are the municipalities of this country. Again, the debt of the Australian colonies is \$195 per head, against \$45 in Canada. Then, looking at our public debt, comparatively, in relation to its percentage on the national wealth, it is found that the debt of the United Kingdom is 9 per cent. of the wealth of the country; in France it is 11 per cent., and the public debt of France and Spain amount to 24 per cent. of the national wealth. Now, Sir, contrast these with the debt of Canada, which is a fraction below 6 per cent. of the country's wealth. In addition to this the additional and very important fact is to be added, that in no country in the world is the aggregate of wealth and the comforts of life so equally distributed amongst the whole people as in Canada. Then, Sir, it must be conceded that this country of ours is on the whole a most desirable country to live in, and a country most attractive to freemen of industrious habits. I invite the most casual observer of passing events to contrast the happy peacefulness prevailing amongst the industrial classes in this country, in comparison with the working classes of the United States, and the amity and good feeling which prevail in Canada between capital and labor, in comparison with those relationships in the former country, as demonstrated by the almost continuous, huge strikes and dangerous strifes that prevail there. Permit me to invite the attention of the House for a few moments to the condition of affairs in Nova Scotia. What undoubted evidence have we as to its actual condition? Without recalling what has already been brought forward by hon. members who have preceded me, I quote from authorities which hon. members of the Opposition cannot but regard as conclusive. I hold in my hand a pamphlet issued under authority of the Government of Nova Scotia in 1886, and being official in character, should be a sufficient guarantee as to the facts it assumes to furnish. The extract from this official publication quoted by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) in the course of this debate, shows that Nova Scotia is a most desirable country for farming enterprise, and that practical farmers with small capital may easily possess themselves of good and comfortable homes, and by energy, industry and enterprise, may make for themselves fortune and position in that country in a few years, such as they could not obtain in a lifetime in Great Britain. And in addition, the same high authority informs intending emigrants from Europe, as follows, on page 27:—

"The information contained in the foregoing pages may be relied on as a correct and unexaggerated description of the Province of Nova Scotia, and will, we believe, be found sufficient to enable any man of ordinary intelligence to form a very good idea of the general character of the country, its climate, resources, &c., and to see that for a man of energy and industry, combined with a small amount of money capital, no other part of America offers the same inducements, or presents the same advantages."

And yet, again, in reference to the condition of laborers' wages in Nova Scotia it says, on page 28:

"Skilled labor is in demand in the Province, no matter whether it consists in the art of digging a ditch properly, or in manufacturing and putting together the most delicate kinds of mechanism. All classes of working people who understand the particular business in which they have been educated, either theoretically or practically, may succeed here if they are willing to put their knowledge to practical use. In short industry in any business will, in Nova Scotia, meet with a sure reward."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this witness is true, there is a reasonable amount of prosperity in Nova Scotia, the unskilled laborer, the farmer, the minor, and mechanic and the fishermen have good prospects ahead. The witness is true, and the people, like people everywhere else, desiring a larger measure of prosperity are fairly well satisfied. The people of Nova Scotia and of the Island of Cape Breton, in particular, have proved pretty conclusively, that they are satisfied, and that the Government is doing its best to promote their prosperity. But we have been told by the hon. member for South Oxford and by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., that the people of Nova Scotia were bribed by the hon. Minister of Finance, that were it not for the large Government grants given to this Province, he, the hon. Minister of Finance, would not have a corporal's guard supporting him in this House. Sir, I admit having listened to the speeches of these hon. gentlemen with a good deal of interest, and am willing to make large allowance for statements made in the heat of debate or hastily spoken; had these charges been made last year, when these gentlemen were suffering from the disappointment of defeat, when the causes of their defeat and their consequent inability to provide the position and offices which had been so freely promised their supporters had to be explained to the country, they might fairly have been regarded as of trifling moment; but now, Sir, the slanders are becoming monotonous, and judging from the recent records of the election courts can only be characterized as Pharaissical. We are reminded of the old adage, "that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones." I cannot, however, in justice to the people I represent allow such gross aspersions to pass unchallenged; in so far as these reflections bear upon the people of Nova Scotia proper they have been fully met and dispelled by the hon. junior member for Halifax, who in the course of his eloquent speech told this House that the gold had never been coined that would buy the people of Nova Scotia. In so far as the people of the Island and County of Cape Breton are interested, a little sober reflection would, I think, have shown both these hon. gentlemen, that they had fallen into a grave error in making the groundless aspersions of bribery which they have thrown at the people of Cape Breton. Will these hon. gentlemen inform the House, what was the bribe that bought the people of Cape Breton Island in 1882? When after four year's experience of the present Administration and the National Policy, they sent up to Ottawa a solid phalanx to support the Government? Can they point to any particular or especial grant then made to seduce the electors? What were the bribes by which the people were seduced in 1887, when after another four year's experience they sent up four supporters of the Government's fiscal policy against one in Opposition? Do these gentlemen refer to the railway then in course of construction through the Island. Why, Sir, this was a public work which had been before this House for years, even so far back as the administration of hon. gentlemen Opposite, and when it was being openly requested upon the consideration of this Government and the House, the claims of Cape Breton to a railway received the sanction and support of no less than the hon. absent leader of the Opposition, who said, that he fully sympathised in the justice of Cape Breton's claim to a railway. Was that bribery of the people of Cape Breton? And did the hon. leader of the Opposition propose to take a hand in this bribery? Surely

not, and if the Government found that in this matter they had the rather extraordinary occurrence of the support of the gentlemen opposite to the measure they, the Government, could have no better assurance of the entire concurrence of the country. Sir, if the Government were guilty of bribing the people of Cape Breton with a railway, it does not lie with the hon. members for South Oxford and Queen's to expose the association of their own side in that bribe. I might here confidentially state to those hon. gentlemen the bribe by which the allegiance of the people of Cape Breton was charmed away from the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs to supporting the present Government. This bribe, Sir, was the National Policy, which is giving our people increased prosperity, which has given us comforts and comparative plenty instead of misery and starvation. This, Sir, is the bribe, if bribe it may be called, which has won from our people their support to the present Minister of Finance. Now, Sir, what are the principal facts regarding this public work? The Island of Cape Breton, one of the oldest colonies of North America, having an area double that of Prince Edward Island, has within its limits the most valuable coal deposits in the Dominion, valuable mines of iron, copper and other minerals, some of the finest harbors in the world, and the nearest ports of the Dominion to Europe, and an extent of coast line and fisheries unsurpassed by any physical division of equal area in the world. This island, Sir, has not to-day, with all these natural resources, and a thrifty industrious population of 90,000, has not, I repeat, one mile of Government railway within its bounds in operation. True, it has about sixty-five miles of private railways engaged in operating the collieries, but not one mile of public railways. So, unconscious are we in Cape Breton of having yet received what is our just dues that our people of all shades of politics are at this moment petitioning this Government and Parliament, and also the Provincial Government, and Legislature of Nova Scotia, to grant us subsidies such as will enable us to extend the present line in course of construction from Canso to Sydney south-eastwards, so as to form connection between all the working collieries and the Government railways, and between these and the winter port of Louisbourg on the south and the magnificent waters of East Bay to the west. I may here add that the extension to Louisbourg will give to this country the use of the most easterly winter port in the Dominion, for communication with Newfoundland and Europe. In short, we have won but an instalment of what should have been given to the Island long ago, and which both parties in this House have admitted to be justly due us and in the interest of the country. Now, Sir, in view of these facts I wish to ask if the hon. members for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Queen's (Mr. Davies) are prepared to re-assert that nine-tenths of the entire clergymen of Cape Breton County, who supported the Government in the last general election, gentlemen whose mission it is to elevate the standard of morality and truth, were bribed by consideration so contemptible. The question is now being asked to this House would not unrestricted reciprocity with the United States improve the present prosperity of this country? As being personally interested in the coal industry, and in which also the interests of the County of Cape Breton, which I have the honor to represent, are largely involved, I propose to show from figures under my hand how this industry will be affected by the proposed change. In this matter we have already had experience of the operation of a free market with the United States which was open to us under the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 to 1865. We have also an opportunity of contrasting the trade of this period, with periods preceding and subsequent to these dates; and also contrasting both with the development of the coal trade under the present National Policy. First, I propose giving the figures of our coal trade with the United States un-

Mr. McKEN.

der each of these periods. Taking the four years preceding the treaty, that is, 1850 to 1853 inclusive, we exported from Nova Scotia to the United States a total of 442,753 tons or an average annual export of 110,688 tons. Taking the first seven years of the treaty, 1854-60, which preceded the civil war in the States, we exported a total of 950,586 tons, or an annual average of 135,788 tons equal to an increase average of 22½ per cent. over the preceding not treaty period. During the civil war, 1861 to 1865, we exported a total of 1,492,534 tons or an annual average of 298,507 tons for the five war and last treaty years, equal to an average increase of 119 per cent. on the non-treaty period. It is important to note here that increase of sales in the war period was abnormal and not due to any ordinary course of trade, which is proved by contrasting with the increase of the first seven years of the treaty. The year 1865 closed the treaty and also the war, and from 1866 to 1871 our coal entering the United States markets paid a duty of \$1.25 per ton. And in the sixth year period, 1866 to 1871, we sold to the United States a total of 1,561,972 tons or an annual average of 260,329 tons, being a decrease of only 13 per cent. on the sales of the war period. It is here important to bear in mind that under that high tariff of \$1.25 per ton the United States bought more largely of our coal than at any time, either before or after, except in the war period, and was, as we have seen, but a comparatively small reduction on that. Again, in 1872 they reduced their duty to 75 cents per ton, and in the first three years of this reduced tariff, viz., 1872 to 1874, our total sales to them amounted to 557,187 tons or an annual average of 185,729 tons, equal to a reduction of 28½ per cent. in these first three years of a reduced tariff, as compared with the higher tariff period of \$1.25 per ton. Now, taking the period of 12 years following, that is from 1875-86 inclusive, still under the lower tariff, our total sales to them in these 12 years aggregated 1,018,584 tons, or an annual average of 84,882 tons, equal to a decrease of 54 per cent. as compared with the preceding three years, 1872-74, and compared with our sales to them under a duty of \$1.25 per ton these 12 years under the lower tariff show a falling off in sales equal to 67 per cent. How do these incontrovertible facts and figures strike our friends opposite? How do they propose to account for these circumstances in relation to our coal sales to the United States. With the hon. member for South Oxford in 1878 tariff was nothing, and they were helpless to aid the depressed commerce of the country. Evidently they must find the solution of the circumstances which I have enumerated in something else than tariff, and I will here take the liberty of informing them that the solution is to be found in the wondrously rapid development of the coal production of the United States following the close of their civil war. Let me invite the attention of the House for a few moments to this. First, I find in looking over the coal areas possessed by different countries that the area in Great Britain is 11,900 square miles, in Nova Scotia, 18,000 square miles, and in the United States, 195,403 square miles, and, moreover, that this enormous deposit in the latter country is very fairly distributed over the entire face of the country, being found divided amongst 31 States and Territories out of a total 47 States and Territories. Now, I invite attention to the development of this rich possession of our enterprising neighbors. In 1864 the total coal production of the United States was 16,472,410 tons, and in 1870 it was 32,863,690 tons—an aggregate increase of 100 per cent. in the first six years following the close of the war. In 1871 their production was 34,081,415 tons, and in 1878 this production reached 49,130,584 tons; that is to say, in the 13 years from 1871 to 1878, inclusive, their aggregate increase was 63,399,029 tons, equal to 195 per cent. increase over that of 1871. Then in the next eight years, 1879 to 1886 inclusive, we find that the production in 1879 was 59,808,398, and that

this went up by yearly bounds of tens of millions until in 1886, for which I have been able to procure returns, the production attained the overwhelming volume of 106,780,033 tons, an aggregate increase in these eight years over the preceding eight years of 57,650,449 tons, or an increase of over 117 per cent. And again, from the official figures just quoted, it is seen that the increase of the production of the coal mines of the United States for the year 1886, as compared with the production of 1864, gives an aggregate of 90,307,623 tons, equal to an increase of 548 per cent. in 23 years. This wonderful development of the coal production of the United States, taken in connection with the increased railway facilities to the Eastern or coast towns and cities in the Union, proves conclusively that these markets are wrested from us beyond hope of recovery. But if further evidence of this fact be required, I beg to call the attention of the House to the recent statements of Hon. Congressman Scott, reputed to be one of the largest coal operators of Pennsylvania, who in his advocacy of having all coals placed upon the free list, said, that the coal owners of the United States could afford to admit provincial coals into their markets duty free, because for every ton of theirs thus displaced, they would sell ten tons in the markets of Canada. In addition to this, I have the opinions of the United States mercantile houses, which for the past 30 years have handled all the provincial coal sold in their country. I have recently been in communication with these firms and they are unanimous in the expression of the opinion that under any conditions of trade it is impossible for us of the Province of Nova Scotia to regain any important footing in their markets. Sir, with the permission of the House, I beg to read a letter which I hold in my hand in further confirmation of this, from one of these firms which is an authority on the subject. This letter was written in reply to one from a friend of mine, asking what would be the effect of the admission free of coal from Nova Scotia into the United States. It is as follows :—

“DEAR SIR,—You ask my views respecting the effect of a removal of the duty upon Nova Scotia coal upon the trade in the United States.

“At present the importation of coarse coal from Nova Scotia amounts to nothing. I think it was less than 1,000 tons during the year 1887 at this port, and very little, if any, at other ports, excepting at Portland, from the Bay of Fundy Mines, for the Grand Trunk Railroad.

“The prices of our domestic bituminous coals are so low that they practically shut out all the product of the Provinces, even without a duty.

“Cumberland coal from Baltimore, Clearfield from Philadelphia, and West Virginia coals from Norfolk and Newport News, are all of superior quality for our uses to any coal from Nova Scotia, and will bring 50 to 75 cents per ton more in our markets. At the same time, the cost at ports of consumption has been less than the cost of the best coals from Nova Scotia delivered here. At New York, and all ports south and west of here, the margin of cost is in favor of domestic coals, and against the cost of Nova Scotia, as freights would be lower for the former and higher for the latter than for Boston and Eastern ports.

“Take for example Cumberland coal in 1887 :—

	Per ton.
Cost f. o. b. at Balto.....	\$2 60
Current freight through the shipping season.....	1 10
And discharging	0 25

From vessel here—cost..... \$3 95

“The Clearfield and Kanawha coals sell at 15 to 25 cents per ton lower. Large season contracts were made last year to fit consumers’ wants, at \$3.75 to \$3.90 per ton, delivered.

“In contrast with the above—

	Per ton.
Acadia coal (the highest cost in Nova Scotia), f. o. b. at Pictou	\$2 50
Current freight in 1887.....	1 90

Cost here..... \$4 40

“Albion costs \$2.25 f. o. b. (and is worth at least 25 cents less), costs \$4.15 here. The Cape Breton coals contain more sulphur than any of the above-named coals, and the former trade here from that quarter was for gas purposes, which is now monopolised by the rich gas coals from Pennsylvania and West Virginia. The removal of the duty would not secure that trade. For other purposes Cape Breton coals will not bring so much in our markets by 50 to 75 cents per ton as our domestic coals.

	Per ton.
Cost at Cape Breton—lowest	\$1 50
Current freight in 1887.....	1 75

Delivered here..... \$3 25

The small quantity brought here (mainly culm at 30 cents per ton duty) comes forward by small trading vessels at low freights. Sales of say, fifty thousand tons here, would require tonnage outside of the ordinary trading vessels, and would enhance freight 25 to 50 cents per ton, to be added to the foregoing figures.

“In my opinion, the removal of the duty would furnish a market for a limited quantity only, say not over 50,000 tons, and I cannot at present see where half that quantity could be disposed of. I wish it were otherwise, as my long connection with the Nova Scotia coal trade, more than forty years, would increase the business of my firm very much if sales from your quarter could be made, and would give us an advantage over all our competitors in the coal trade.

“Another view of the case: The removal of the duty here by reciprocity would necessitate the same action by the Canadian Government, and admit our domestic coals from Pennsylvania and Ohio into Canada, to the exclusion of your coals, and very seriously impair trade from your mines.

“A large quantity of coal is at present sent into the Upper Provinces, paying a duty of 60 cents per ton. If made free of any duty, such shipments would practically monopolise the trade in the Upper Provinces. If the free trade were made to apply to English coal, as would naturally be the case, a considerable quantity would be brought out in trading ships and steamers at ballast rates, and the sales from your mines would be confined to the local trade in the Lower Provinces.”

This demonstrates that, in so far as the coal trade between this country and the United States is concerned, the relative circumstances of the two countries are entirely changed since the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty; and the enormous production of the latter country has forced this change, not only upon the coal trade but apparently upon other industries as well. For instance, the official returns show that the total export of farm produce from the United States in 1860 was but \$40,000,000, while in 1886 this class of exports reached a value of \$500,000,000. It therefore does not appear very likely that any very extended market will be found in the United States for Canadian farm produce in opposition to their own enormous surplus. However this is a branch of the discussion which I leave entirely to the hon. members who have a more practical acquaintance with it. Now, if hon. gentlemen will bear with me a little while longer, I will give a short sketch of the Nova Scotia coal trade during the period of reciprocity versus that of the National Policy. For the five years, from 1869 to 1873, our total sales were 3,343,510 tons, or an annual average of 668,702 tons. For the five years, 1874 to 1878 inclusive, our total sales were 3,480,705 tons, or an annual average of 696,141 tons, equal to an increase in the latter period over the former of 4 per cent. Then, again, taking the eight years, 1879 to 1887 inclusive, our total sales were 10,635,489 tons, or an annual average of 1,329,436 tons, giving an average increase for the eight years under the National Policy, compared with the preceding four years, equal to 91 per cent. And comparing the Reciprocity Treaty, under the peculiarly favoring abnormal circumstances, with the National Policy period, we find that the sales of the former period give us an increase of only 46 per cent. as against 91 per cent. under the National Policy period, so that this makes it clear as noon day that reciprocity under more favorable circumstances than now exist, failed in giving us anything like the prosperous results which the National Policy has produced upon this industry, and perhaps the best feature of this increase is that under the National Policy our coal sales to the upper Provinces have increased from 80,000 to 650,000 tons, being 50 per cent. in excess of what we sold to the United States under reciprocity. Now, Sir, with this large increase of up-borne interprovincial trade, who will venture to assert that there has not been something like a corresponding downward trade? These facts should disprove the assertion which has been made by our opponents in Nova Scotia, that we buy \$10,000,000 worth of goods from the upper Provinces which are paid for in gold said to have come from the United States. And

yet, Sir, in the face of such incontrovertible facts as these, we have hon. gentlemen opposite assuring us that the National Policy has not increased our coal sales by a single ton. Now, Sir, at the risk of trespassing on the time of the House I would refer to another point which has been urged as showing that the National Policy did not assist our coal sales inasmuch that more coal is imported into Canada than before it. Now, Sir, I have already shown that our inter-provincial coal consumption has increased largely from our native resources, and if there be an increased importation of the article, what does this fact point to? Why, Sir, it can lead to one and but one conclusion, that is, that as coal is mainly consumed as a motive power, the National Policy, as a financial reform, has accomplished all that is claimed for it. It has already been shown that it took a number of years for the United States, under a high protection tariff, to drive our coal out of their markets. Now, Sir, is it too much to assume that, with the further and more rapid development of our mines, under the protection extended to us under the National Policy, and by the increased facilities of transportation of our coal through canals, and the opening up of railways, in a few years hence we may capture from the United States the large and important export trade they now have with us in coal, and which they are strenuously exerting themselves to increase? We find them competing with us in our own markets, quoting prices at Montreal and other points of competition at rates less than I am led to believe they sell for in their own country, after deducting cost of transportation. In closing my remarks under this head, I may say that, upon the ground stated, I believe our coal industry, under unrestricted reciprocity, would be seriously injured, and this injury would be felt by all classes, particularly such as the farmers of Prince Edward Island, who find one of their best home markets for their produce in our mining towns on the coast of Cape Breton. I may say here that we are also importing largely of farm products, such as hay, butter, oats and cheese from the Montreal markets to supply the requirements of our mining population. There is another industry on which I shall touch but slightly, as it has been dealt with ably by hon. gentlemen who preceded me and who are better acquainted with it than I am, and as it will be also treated by hon. gentlemen who will follow me. I refer now to our fishing industry, which is one of the most important of this Dominion. It has been said that this industry has been seriously injured, that it is becoming demoralised, and that our fishermen are unable to obtain remunerative wages, owing to the present depression of trade. If you will allow me I will quote a few figures from the Fisheries report, showing the number of men employed, the capital invested and the values of the products of Nova Scotia for the years 1881 to 1886 inclusive:

Year.	Men Employed.	Value of Fishing Material Capital Engaged.	Value of Product.
		\$	\$
1881	27,526	1,959,259	6,214,756
1882	28,503	2,127,589	7,131,418
1883	29,100	2,360,989	7,689,375
1884	29,997	2,670,938	8,763,779
1885	29,905	2,545,255	8,283,923
1886	27,490	2,370,537	8,416,361

If we take the last two years of free fishing to the United States fishermen within our three-mile limit, viz, 1883 to 1884, we find that, taking the value of the fishing product and the number of men engaged, it amounted in 1883 to \$261 per man, and in 1884 to \$292 per man. Then, take the

Mr. MCKEEN.

year 1886, the first of Canada's protecting her shore limits, and when a duty was simultaneously imposed upon our fish in the United States. It is found that the fishery product of Nova Scotia is \$306 per man engaged, showing that the protection afforded our fishermen is already being realised. The above figures, which have but recently been brought to my notice, bear out the views of intelligent fishermen with whom I have conversed upon this subject in my own county, and who are emphatically of the opinion that the protection to our three-mile limit is of more value to them than free American markets ever can be. I very much regret that the Fishery report for 1887 is not yet published, as I have strong reason to believe it will show superior results to the years above quoted. We find from the trade returns that the exports of fish and fish products from Nova Scotia from 1882 to 1887 inclusive, were as follows:—

Year.	United States.	Great Britain.	West Indies and other Countries.	Totals.
	\$	\$	\$	\$
1882	1,353,773	635,437	2,448,454	4,437,664
1883	1,883,546	564,582	2,639,370	5,087,498
1884	2,145,622	555,739	2,614,698	5,316,057
1885	1,990,309	633,085	2,120,482	4,743,876
1886	1,180,103	608,621	1,984,942	3,773,666
1887	1,358,024	717,485	1,823,568	3,899,077

An analysis of this table shows that in any one of these years where there is a comparative falling away of the value of fish sales to the United States, there is a corresponding and compensating increase of sales to Great Britain, West Indies and other countries, in relative proportion to the total export for the year. This may be briefly illustrated by the following figures deduced from the tabulated statement. In 1882, our total fish exports were distributed thus: To Great Britain, 14.4 per cent.; to West Indies, &c., 55.1 per cent., and to the United States, 30.5 per cent. In 1884, the last year of our fish being admitted duty free into the United States, the distribution of our total export was, to Great Britain, 10.46 per cent.; to West Indies, &c., 49.18 per cent., and to the United States, 40.36 per cent. In 1887, with our fish paying duty in the United States markets, the distribution of our total exports by sales was, to Great Britain, 18.4 per cent.; to West Indies, &c., 46.8 per cent., and to the United States, 34.8 per cent. Thus it is seen that in 1882, with no duty paid, our sales to the United States were 30.5 per cent. of our whole export, and that our fish sales to them in 1887, paying duty, are 34.8 per cent. of our total exports, against 30.5 per cent. under free entry in 1882. Also that in 1884 our sales to Great Britain were 10.46 per cent. of the total fish export, and that in 1887 it went up to 18.4 per cent. against 10.46 in 1884. From this brief analysis of the exports of fish and fish exports from Nova Scotia the fact is established that the United States are compelled to buy our fish and its products according to their needs, independently of their self imposed duties, because they have not the sources of supply within themselves. Another point demonstrated by these trade returns is, that we are not by any means so dependent upon the United States for a market for our fish as hon. gentlemen opposite would have us suppose. Looking back over the fish exports of 1887, it is perceived at a glance that Great Britain, the West Indies and other countries, exclusive of the United States, purchased in this year, 65.2 per cent. of our total export. In fact, the price of Nova Scotia fish, for export, is determined by the markets of the West Indies and Mediterranean ports. The fish exporters of Boston and New York are themselves dependent upon provincial cured fish to make up their

export cargoes for the markets of tropical countries. Now, let us summarise this and it is found that in the last two years of our fish being admitted free into the markets of the United States that the product of our catch yielded \$261 per man, and in 1884, \$292 per man, and that 1886 gave a product equal to \$386 per man engaged, and against \$292 in 1884, so that there is little cause for the statement that our fishery industry is becoming unremunerative. Again the value of the fishery product for 1885 is to the value of the fishing material employed, viz., vessels, boats, nets, &c., in the ratio of 325 per cent. In 1886 the value of the fishery product is to the value of the material employed in the ratio of 355 per cent., that is a return of 355 per cent. in 1886 as against a return of 325 per cent. in 1885. Thus, these two facts, the dividend per man engaged and the amount value realised for the capital engaged, proves conclusively that as our coal sales in the United States increased largely under a duty of \$1.25 per ton, whilst our neighbors had not a supply of their own product equal to the demand, and that our coal sales fell off rapidly under a duty of only 75 cents per ton, precisely is this repeated in the case of our fish, which is increasing in value to our fishermen, in spite of the duty, and will continue to do so, as long as the Americans have not a supply equal to the demand, within their own borders. In conclusion, looking at the proposed unrestricted reciprocity from another point of view, have we any substantial reasons for supposing we can obtain unrestricted reciprocity if we ask it? Have we not time and again in the past made overtures for reciprocity, and every time received nothing better than diplomatic snubs in return for our humility? Hence, may we not reasonably conclude that if our neighbors would now listen to a proposal, such as contained in the resolution before the House, it would only be on account of the changed condition of circumstances within themselves. That it would be because of their now enormous surplus of production in the lines of almost every industry and art known to civilisation. They would reckon upon controlling our markets as well as their own in all things, and make our people their customers, not they ours. Nay, farther, suppose the great extensive trade which the advocates of this scheme picture us under their proposals become reality, and that our exports went out from us, and imports reach us under an unrestricted reciprocity, what of our revenue necessary for public purposes? With the loss of income from customs, how is the public revenue to be sustained? Evidently but by one method, and that is by the old time and universally hated method of direct taxation. Upon this point I entirely concur with the hon. senior member for Halifax, when he says that no party in this country would stand twenty-four hours if they went to the people with direct taxation on their banners. And I say deservedly so. Judging from what I have heard of this debate, I am quite persuaded that we could not enter upon this proposal of unrestricted reciprocity without demoralising our manufactures and general industries, and dissipating the capital invested in them. Those industries which have been built up and established by years of patient toil and in the face of strong opposition. It would endanger the sweeping away of those numerous enterprises that give happy homes of plenty to thousands of industrious toilers and their families. Industries, Sir, which have given Canada a place in the front ranks of civilised nations. I say, Sir, let us beware how we pull down the house which it has taken ten years to build. For my constituents and for myself we stood by it in laying the foundation stone, and speaking for them as I know them, I say we will stand now by its defence and security.

Mr. LAURIER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At this hour, I do not object to the adjournment, especially as I take it, from my hon. friend's moving the adjournment, that we will have the pleasure of hearing him to-morrow, and I should like to hear him at his very best, and I know what that very best is; but I think it is time that we should be getting to an end of this debate. I think this is the fifteenth day, and we have—and I do not regret it—set aside all other business in order to discuss this question exhaustively. Still, the Session is creeping on, and we are getting to the busy season, and I should be glad if the hon. gentleman could come to some arrangement by which we could close the debate to-morrow night.

Mr. LAURIER. All I can say is that we are just as anxious on this side of the House as the hon. gentleman is on his side, to come to an end of the debate, but I do not think I would be justified in pledging myself and pledging this side of the House that we shall come to an end to-morrow. We shall endeavor to bring the debate to as speedy a close as possible, in all probability I can say this week—not to-morrow, but the day after to-morrow, at all events. We shall do our best to have as busy a sitting to-morrow as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course we must have a long sitting to-morrow. We have been very careful of our health thus far, and I think we can afford to sit late to-morrow. I would like very much to come to an arrangement by which the debate shall be closed to-morrow.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, we will try and do what we can. I would be very happy to communicate with the hon. gentleman to-morrow, and see if we can come to a conclusion, but I would not like to pledge myself at this moment, without knowing how many of our friends on this side desire to speak.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman is not able to come to an arrangement of that kind, because it would compel us to sit late, as we must get on with the public business. We have given the whole time, for the last fortnight or three weeks, to this question, and we did that in consequence of the importance of the motion itself, especially, in consequence of its being moved by a gentleman holding the high position of the hon. mover. If we had not done so, the debate would have gone on during the opening days of the Session, and we would have done a great deal of business. Therefore, I think I can appeal to the hon. gentleman opposite to assist us in closing this debate.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure we all fully recognise that the Government have given all the assistance we could desire in this debate, and so far we are grateful, but at this moment I do not feel justified in promising definitely. At all events, I will do my best.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would like very much if the hon. gentleman would cross the floor to-morrow and give us some information as to what can be done.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, knows pretty well how many members on that side still desire to speak?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that, but I dare say the hon. gentlemen who sit behind me, if we came to an arrangement, would respect that arrangement.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.50 a. m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 5th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE GLENGARRY ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that I have received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court a certified copy of the judgment of the said court in the election of a member to the House of Commons for the Electoral District of the County of Glengarry, wherein Patrick Purcell was appellant, and Alexander Kennedy was respondent, the appeal being allowed, and the ruling, finding and determination of the Hon. Mr. Justice Rose were reversed and set aside.

Upon the Orders of the Day being called,

FRENCH TRANSLATION OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. I wish to enquire who is responsible for the delay in the distribution of the French version of the Debates of the House. At the present moment there are 542 pages of the English version, whereas only 176 pages have been translated into French. I am informed upon reliable authority that last year, at the same date, not a single page was in arrear. New translators have been appointed, but whether they are responsible for that, I do not know.

Mr. SPEAKER. The chairman of the Debates Committee ought to answer this question. The House well knows the publication and printing of the Debates in English, as well as their translation into French, are in the hands of a committee.

REPRESENTATION OF RUSSELL.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the First Minister whether a writ for the election of the County of Russell has yet been issued, and whether a returning officer has been appointed, and who he is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The writ has been ordered, and I have no doubt it has been issued by this time.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to enquire of the Government if it is their intention to lay upon the Table of the House the report that was made by the Minister of Customs in reference to the reduction of duty on those articles upon which the duty had been removed by the American Government? I understand that, some time ago, the American Government, through their consul, made a report—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will please make a motion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will attend to that when I get through.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no question before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was really speaking to a question already.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I move the adjournment of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, you cannot, now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have only a few words to say, Mr. Speaker, on that motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to a point of order. The Orders of the Day have been called.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, the Orders of the Day were called.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted). That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879, and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other, and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, There is one feature which has universally characterised this debate, in so far as it has been participated in by our colleagues on the other side of the House. Again on this occasion, as on every other occasion, whether in the time of Reformers who have passed away or whether in the time of Reformers still living, the cause of reform has been met with the cry of disloyalty. It might be tempting to retaliate, and to show what is the true inwardness of that exuberant loyalty which ever gushes forth from the other side of the House when facts or arguments are deficient to meet the case at issue. It might be tempting to retaliate and to show that the loyalty of those monopolists who to-day clamor the loudest, has no other foundation except the selfish one that the contemplated reform would put an end to, a state of things, which, however lamentable it may be to the country, is eminently profitable to some individuals. It might be tempting to show that loyalty has always been, is, and always will be the last refuge, the supreme argument of those ingrained Tories who imagine themselves born to rule, and who, having long been associated with Government, cannot contemplate the displacement of what Government means for them—patronage, office, subsidies and monopolies—without thinking such a displacement would be rank treason. On the other hand, I have no reason to doubt the sincerity of those prophets of evil who, at every step taken forward by this young country, never fail to see an impending rupture of British connection, and have a long series of sinister predictions, hitherto not fulfilled, have failed to make wiser or braver. Sir, I consider it would be perfectly useless to attempt any argument upon those monopolists or ingrained Tories whose supreme end and object in politics is to enjoy the fleshpots of office and whose loyalty springs from the stomach, but to those well meaning though timid men who inclined to a change, still

dread change, I would at once say: You who object to reform because you fear the good results will be accompanied by some evil result—are you satisfied with the condition of this country that nothing is to be risked for its advancement? Is it your opinion that if there be to the south of us accessible fields of wealth, we should be deterred from the ennobling spirit of enterprise by the cowardly consideration that possibly increased prosperity would seduce us from our allegiance? Is yours the position of the man who would starve himself to death lest by eating food he might swallow poison? Away, away, I say, with ignoble fears and cowardly considerations. I also appeal to loyalty. I appeal to the loyalty of all we owe to our origin, to the blood that flows in our veins, to the example of our ancestors and the memories they have left behind them, and he, I say who will stand truest to those examples will also stand truest in his allegiance to Queen and country. Let us remember that the great nation from which the greater number among us derive their origin, and from which we have the institutions on which we pride ourselves, is so great to-day because, at all periods of her history, her people never shrank from performing the duty which the hour demanded of them, without fear of the consequences to themselves or to the country. Let us remember that our country, if it has attained the proud position which to-day it occupies, owes it to the unceasing efforts of Reformers of former days, whose every effort was assailed with the same taunt of disloyalty that meets us to-day. Let us look at our position such as it is, let us look at our position squarely and manfully, and if the result is that our position to-day demands reform, let us, I say, strike for the reform, determined in advance that if in this as in every other matter evil is to be mixed with good, it will be time to grapple with the evil when the evil arises. Once more I say let us look at our position, not such as it ought to be, but such as it is, not such as it is depicted in the speeches of Ministerial orators, but such as we hear it every day depicted in the unvarnished talk of the people. With a varied and fertile soil, with a healthy northern climate, with immense agricultural resources, with abundant mineral wealth, with unsurpassed lumber facilities, with the most productive fisheries in the world, this ought to be a land of universal prosperity and contentment. What is the position to-day? I said a moment ago that we have good reason to be proud of our country, proud of her people, proud of her history, proud of her institutions, proud of the position which she has already obtained among the nations of the world; but blind would he be who would fail to see that there is in her otherwise young and healthy body a deep wound that is depleting the very sources of life. When we contemplate that this young country with all her capabilities is losing her population, that every day hundreds of her sons are leaving her shores to seek homes in a country not more favored by nature than our own, the conclusion is inevitable that something is wrong which must engage the attention of every one for whom patriotism is not a vain and empty word. Yet with these facts full in view the Government, speaking by the mouth of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, invites Parliament to declare that there is absolutely nothing to do, but to keep on the policy under which such a state of things is possible, and we have seen member after member of Parliament rise in his place and declare indeed that there is nothing to do, that everything is for the best. I will not lose one single moment in discussing that point, but I place the assertions made on this side of the House against those made by hon. gentlemen opposite, and leave the decision to the judgment of the people of the country, in the judgment of all the people without exceptions, and all, with the exception, perhaps, of the monopolists, will say that there is something wrong in the condition of this country, that there is something which demands the attention of

Parliament and of every one who claims to be a patriot. We have been told, and it is insisted on, that we are a prosperous country, that we are a happy country; and one hon. member, my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), if I remember aright, in dwelling on the great prosperity of this country stated we had no starvation amongst us. Well, Sir, prosperity is a relative term applied to nations as well as to individuals. A man in private life may have affluence with a certain income in a certain condition of life, and yet be in want with the same income in a certain other condition of life; and so it is among nations. If you judge us, if you gauge the condition of this country by the standard of older continents I would be quite ready to admit that we may be said to be a prosperous country. I grant this at once—(and gentlemen opposite are welcome to the admission if they can find any comfort in it). We have no starvation in this country. We have not any threat of famine, we are not in the condition of China in which country four provinces, some years ago, were carried away by hunger, and we are not in the condition of Ireland. We lose our people, but still we have not lost one-third of our population, as Ireland did in the space of two years. But, Mr. Speaker, the objection and the answer do not meet the point nor do they meet the charge. To a young, healthy, and energetic and active population on this continent, it is not sufficient that they should be above starvation. Their aim is higher. The charge is not, Sir, that there is a scarcity of natural productions, but the charge is, on the contrary, that there is an abundance of natural productions, but that there is no issue and no outlet for the surplus beyond what the people consume. The charge is that manufacturing production is limited to our small and limited requirements, and, therefore, far below the producing capacity of the people. Sir, the people of this country have a right to expect that every child belonging to this country will, when he comes to manhood, find the same labor, and returns for his labor, that he would find on the other side of the line. The people of this country, especially the tillers of the soil, have a right to expect that their labor will always command the highest price obtainable in the best and most favored markets of the world. They have a right to expect that the money which, by the necessities of their vocation, they are forced to invest in real estate will always retain its value, and when they find that there is no labor for every child born in this country, when they find that their labor is insufficiently remunerated, when they find that real estate does not keep up its value but decreases in value, when they find that notwithstanding all attempts made we have not yet succeeded in having 5,000,000 of people on this continent, and when they find that at least 1,000,000 of Canadian born children are to-day citizens of the United States, or are working in the United States, I say again that they must come to the conclusion that there is something wrong somewhere which has to be remedied. Under such circumstances there is to-day a sentiment of irritation and discontent which must be checked, or it may become very serious in a short time to come. We have been told by gentlemen on the other side of the House that what we say to-day is not new. The hon. the Minister of Interior, speaking on that subject in answer to my friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), stated that the statements made by my hon. friend were not new, and that they had been made in the elections of 1882 and 1887. Sir, it is perfectly true that those statements are not new. They have been made in 1882, and they have been made at the election of 1887, and my hon. friend might further have added that they were made in the elections of 1878. He might have added that he and his friends came into power because from 1876 to 1878 they blamed the Government of the day, of that time, for the emigration which I admit was then taking place. They blamed the Adminis-

tration of my hon. friend on my left and stated that if they came to power they would put a stop to this emigration, and when they came to power they were pledged by their own words and their own writings to put a stop to that emigration. Now, Sir, in order to make that point more clear let me refresh the memory of gentlemen on the other side about their speeches anterior to 1878, and I cannot do better than to quote the speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Government, and the leader of the Opposition of that day, delivered at Parkdale in the month of July, 1878. These are his very words :

"Here we are not only suffering depression in every trade and industry but our people are leaving the country to seek employment in the mills and manufactories of the United States."

An hon. MEMBER. Read that again.

Mr. LAURIER. I will not read it again, but I will continue :

"Was it not a crying shame that though this country had a fertile soil, a healthy climate, a strong and well educated people, and good laws, 500,000 of our own people should have crossed our borders in those years and taken up their abode in the United States because they could not find employment here for their skill and energy and enterprise in consequence of the false policy of our rulers."

Sir, if it was a crying shame in 1878, that 500,000 of our fellow-men should have crossed our borders to the other side of the line, by what epithet strong enough can we characterise the policy of those men who, bound to put a stop to that sort of thing and bound to stop that exodus, have brought it up from 500,000 to 1,000,000. I do not say this, Mr. Speaker, with any view of recrimination. I speak to say that the evil is one of long standing, which must tax our energy and for which we must find some remedy. I have said, Mr. Speaker, that there is discontent prevailing in this land. The causes are at once political and economical. There can be no doubt at all that, in the political aspect, a great deal of the discontent which prevails is largely due to the manner in which Confederation was forced on some sections of the country, and to the manner in which Confederation has been made a tool and an instrument in the hands of gentlemen on the other side to embarrass and to harass some other sections of the country. There can be no doubt that in the east of this Dominion the fact that one Province at least was dragged into Confederation against her will, has opened in the hearts of the people of that Province a wound which after twenty years is as galling as it was the first day. There can be no doubt at all that in the west the unjust, the unfair, and the tyrannical manner in which the Constitution has been abused and violated by the Government, in order to force upon the people of that section of the country an abhorred monopoly, has created a bitterness in the hearts of those people which would have had the most fatal consequences perhaps if, fortunately, the Government, acting as they did yesterday in the matter of the admission of American importations upon the free list, had not in that other instance also reversed that policy and surrendered. There is no doubt at all that in the Province from which I come the numerous attempts made by the Government upon the political autonomy of the Province have created distrust and disappointment in the minds of the people. And at the same time there can be no doubt, and we can readily believe it, that if the country had been as prosperous as it should have been, or as prosperous as it is represented to be, a good deal of the discontent which now prevails would have been alleviated; for political causes alone seldom produce serious discontent, unless they affect injuriously the economic condition of the people. If our country had been as prosperous as it is represented to be, if Nova Scotia had found in Confederation the prosperity which was promised to be her lot in it, she would long ago have been reconciled to Confederation. If Manitoba had continued to enjoy the prosperity with

Mr. LAURIER.

which she opened her career, she would be to-day as cheerful a member of the Confederation as she was ten years ago. But all our efforts at increased prosperity have always been baffled. We never have had the measure of success which we expected from our efforts, and what is the reason? The reason is that we have not yet found the economical condition necessary to make the country as abundantly productive as it should be; that the consuming power of the nation is not adequate to its producing power; and that we have not yet found channels for the increased energy and activity of our people. Under such conditions, when the labor of the people will never yield as much as it would yield under a different economical condition, it is impossible to expect that there will be contentment in the land, or pride in the institutions of the country. The lumberman, the farmer and the manufacturer toil, but their efforts are comparatively barren; and if you ask them what is the economical condition they want in order to make their efforts as fruitful as they should be, they will tell you, that it is space—a broader field in which to operate. The fisherman will tell you that if he could send his fish free to Boston and Portland, he would ask nothing more; the farmer will tell you that if he could send his productions to the cities and towns on the other side of the line, which are almost within arm's length, he would ask nothing more; the lumberman will tell you that if he had access to that immense range of territory which needs the products of our forests, he would ask nothing more; and the manufacturer will tell you—the genuine manufacturer, not the monopolist—that all he asks is a fair field and no favor, and that if you remove the barriers which stand in his way, he is ready to compete with the Americans in their own market. During the last summer Mr. Butterworth, who is well known in this country, and who has taken the same view that we take as to the trade relations that should exist between Canada and the United States, speaking on this question in Detroit, made a remark which seemed to me at the time to be singularly true historically. He said this :

"The history of all nations has been a record of efforts to broaden the area of their trade and commerce."

The more we think of this remark, the more we shall be convinced that it is eminently true. Indeed the records of mankind show that as soon as a nation has obtained its freedom, the energy of the people which had hitherto been consumed in political agitation, is at once turned to labor and industry. Very soon the producing power of the people exceeded their consuming power, new channels had to be sought, and from that time the history of that nation became a record of efforts to broaden the area of trade and commerce. Such was the history of the Italian republics in the middle ages, after they obtained their freedom. They gradually extended their trade beyond the walls of their cities until it covered all the lands washed by the Mediterranean and the neighboring seas. Such was the history of Holland in the seventeenth century. After she had freed her neck from the yoke of Spain, although having a population of only 2,000,000, she gradually developed the largest trade of the age. Such was the case with England. For many years the English people were absorbed in political agitation, and during those years their trade did not increase; but having at last curbed the power of the Throne, asserted the supremacy of Parliament, and secured her political freedom, from that time the history of England became a record of the broadening activity and energy of the British people. The trade of England increased its area until it subdued continent after continent, and to-day it has no limits but the limits of the earth. The history of other nations has been our history. For years and years our people were absorbed in a political agitation for freedom, and during those

years the country made but little progress; but when at last we obtained responsible government and legislative independence, what took place elsewhere happened here. The energy of the people, which had been previously absorbed in fruitless political agitation, was turned to toil and labor, and from that moment we had to seek for channels and outlets for our surplus energy. The forest, the mine and the sea are the fields to which the labor of our people has been directed. Ours is above all an agricultural country; and as we have abundance of lands at our disposal, vast tracts were every year added to the cultivated soil; and as the number of the tillers of the soil increased and the bulk of their productions became enlarged, there arose correspondingly a demand for new channels and outlets, and from that moment the history of this country became a history of efforts to broaden the area of our trade and commerce. If there is one fact which more than any other has characterised Canadian politics since the concession of responsible government, it is that it has always been the efforts of the Canadian people to find new outlets and channels for their increasing energy. I do not mean to say that those efforts have been systematic or premeditated. On the contrary, they have been irregular and spasmodic, now in one direction and then in another, but they have been a continual and instinctive aspiration to pass from an unnatural to a natural economical position, just as a man who finds himself in a vitiated atmosphere will turn in every direction to get a breath of the fresh air without which he cannot live. As soon as the agitation for responsible government had abated, as soon as our friends, the Tories—who, loyal in those days as they are in these days, endeavored by riot, bloodshed and fire to intimidate Lord Elgin and prevent the establishment of the new regime—had been forced to submit to the inevitable, the first act of the Government of the day—and it was a Liberal Government—was to seek new channels for the productive energies of the people. The Government found the natural channels of trade blocked and closed. There was to the south of us a great and progressive nation of kindred birth, from which we were separated by mountains of prejudice and some artificial barriers; and the efforts of the Government were directed to removing some of the prejudice and breaking down some of the barriers, and the result was the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, which, although limited in its operation and scope, everyone will admit during its duration marked the golden age of our trade and commerce. That was our first effort towards broadening the area of our trade and commerce. It was eminently successful. However, the treaty was of short duration. As soon as the limit of its term was reached, the American Government gave notice that they would not continue it. Why? Was it because the treaty was not equally advantageous to the Americans? No; it is admitted that the treaty was just as advantageous to them as to us. The notice was given simply on account of the irritation caused in the United States by the unfriendly attitude maintained by England and Canada towards the United States during their great struggle for national life. That the repeal of the treaty was a blow to our commerce, no one has denied, and it has been the constant and unvarying effort of Canadian statesmen ever since to obtain a renewal of that treaty. Indeed, so much is that the case that, at a later day, when protection was adopted as the policy of this country, one of the reasons for its adoption was that thereby we might force the Americans to give us reciprocity. The resolution which formulated the policy of the Government upon that occasion has often been quoted, but it will bear being quoted again, because it is pregnant with meaning in the face of the amendment of the Government on the present occasion. The resolution is as follows:—

"That this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home."

How far the policy has been successful we all know, but no doubt hon. gentleman opposite will say it has been in that respect eminently successful.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It only sent a million away.

Mr. LAURIER. The resolution goes on as follows:—

"That will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active inter-provincial trade, and moving—as it ought to do—in the direction of a reciprocity of tariff with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade."

Now, if I give an unfair construction to the words of my hon. friend, I will ask him to correct me in due time, but if words have any meaning, what was the meaning of the concluding paragraph of this resolution? Did it mean anything else but that, however desirable protection might be for Canada against other countries, reciprocity, so far as the United States were concerned, was the thing which was desired and desirable. Now, Sir, in view of this resolution, I say that the amendment moved by the Government is not logical. What is the object of that amendment? Its object is to keep the National Policy intact in its entirety. The final object of the National Policy, as declared in the resolution I have just read, was to obtain reciprocity. It is evident that in this object it has not succeeded, and, therefore, the conclusion is unavoidable that something else must be tried. So ended our first effort to broaden the area of our trade and commerce. But at that time we had something else in contemplation. When notice was given of the abrogation of the treaty, the country was engaged in the discussion of the great question which ended in the Confederation of the Provinces, and there is no doubt whatever that in the minds of those who participated in the bringing about of that great event, the hope existed that Confederation would prove, not only a great political reform, but a great economical reform as well. It was urged on the floor of Parliament at that time that the Provinces, by adopting among themselves free trade, would find an adequate outlet and channel for their surplus energy. The Hon. George Brown, who was at that time a member of the coalition Government, enlarged upon that idea at great length and with great force. After having stated in the debate that the first object of Confederation was to affect a great political reform, he went on to say:

"... But secondly, I go heartily for the Union, because it will throw down the barriers of trade and give us the control of a market of 4,000,000 of people. What one thing has contributed so much to the wondrous material progress of the United States as the free passage of their products from one State to another? What has tended so much to the rapid advance of all branches of their industry as the vast extent of their home market, creating an unlimited demand for all the commodities of daily use, and stimulating the energy and ingenuity of producers? Sir, I confess to you that in my mind this one view of the Union—the addition of nearly a million of people to our home consumers—sweeps aside all the petty objections that are averred against the scheme (What, in comparison with this great gain to our farmers and manufacturers, are even the fallacious money objections which the imaginations of hon. gentlemen opposite have summoned up?) All over the world we find nations eagerly longing to extend their domains, spending large sums and waging protracted wars to possess themselves of more territory, untilled and uninhabited. Other countries offer large inducements to foreigners to emigrate to their shores—free passages, free lands, and free food and implements to start them in the world. We, ourselves, support costly establishments to attract immigrants to our country, and are satisfied when our annual outlay brings us 15,000 or 20,000 souls. But here, Sir, is a proposal which is to add in one day near a million of souls to our population—to add valuable territories to our domain, and secure to us all the advantages of a large and profitable commerce, now existing."

Now, everybody will admit that every word spoken here was perfectly true, that not one iota can be taken out of this passage as containing a single error. Still the theory here advocated did not succeed, and it failed, not because of any error that could be pointed at, but because of other circumstances which were overlooked at the time. I have quoted this in order to show that as far back as 1865, one of the master-minds which this country has produced, was of opinion that it was essential to the trade of the country that we should add to the consuming power of our population. The same idea was enlarged upon by Mr. Galt in the same debate, and he stated, with all the authority which at that time attached to his name as Minister of Finance, that in Confederation he expected to find a substitute for the American market, which we lost by the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty. He said:

" * * * If we require to find an example of the benefits of free commercial intercourse, we need not look beyond the effects that have followed from the working of the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. In one short year from the time when that treaty came into operation, our trade in the natural productions of the two countries swelled from less than \$1,000,000 to upwards of \$2,000,000 per annum, and now, when we are threatened with an interruption of that trade—when we have reason to fear that the action of the United States will prove hostile to the continuance of free commercial relations with this country—when we know that the consideration of this question is not grounded on just views of the material advantages resulting to each country—but that the irritation connected with political events exercises a predominant influence over the minds of American statesmen, it is the duty of the House to provide, if possible, other outlets for our productions. If we have reason to fear that one door is about to be closed to our trade, it is the duty of the House to endeavor to open another; to provide against a coming evil of the kind feared by timely expansion in another direction; to seek by free trade with our own fellow-colonists for a continued and uninterrupted commerce, which will not be liable to be disturbed at the capricious will of any foreign country."

Here, again, there is nothing to say against the theory that was then advanced, but the great expectations which were then entertained did not turn out to be true. Although every Government since that time has endeavored to bring together the east and west of Confederation, to bring about the interchange of the commodities of the east with those of the west, to-day we have not succeeded in developing any trade except a very insignificant one between the east and the west, and the glowing pictures which the men of 1865 drew as to what was to follow their endeavors to bring about that interchange of trade, have remained pictures. What was it that was left out, what was it that was omitted from their calculations? The fact which was omitted was, as has often been pointed out since, the geographical position of the different Provinces of the Dominion. The men of 1865 forgot that no legislative act, no executive decree could suppress the long distances which separate the east from the west; they forgot that nature had interposed, against profitable trade relations between the east and the west, obstacles which no legislation could overcome. Sir, experience is the test of all theory, and, in the view of the experience which we have acquired during the last twenty years, let me show how deluded the men of 1865 were in regard to the hopes which they then entertained. Mr. McGee spoke in the same debate, and he emphasised the same idea which had been already expressed by Mr. Brown and Mr. Galt, and he particularised his meaning by instancing a particular trade, the coal trade of Nova Scotia. After having depicted, in his glowing language, the coal fields of Nova Scotia, he went on to say:

"These exhaustless coal fields will, under this plan—which is in fact our Reciprocity Treaty with the Lower Provinces—become, hereafter, the great resource of our towns for fuel. I see the cry is raised below by the anti-Unionists that to proceed with Confederation would be to entail the loss of the New England market for their coals. I do not quite see how they make that out, but even an anti-Unionist might see that the population of Canada is within a fraction of that of all New England put together, that we consume in this country as much fuel per annum as they do in all New England; and, therefore, that we offer them a market under the Union equal to that which these theorists want to persuade their followers they would lose."

Mr. LAURIER.

There is not a word to be taken from that passage. It is quite true that the population of Canada was as great as the population of all New England put together, and that Canada consumes as much fuel as the whole of New England put together, but Mr. McGee had overlooked the fact that the market of New England was at the doors of Nova Scotia, and that the market of western Canada was too far away to be of any service to Nova Scotia coal; and if the valuable life of Mr. McGee had been spared, he would have lived to see Nova Scotia coal, protected by a duty of at least 50 per cent. on the price of that coal at the pit's mouth, carried from the east to the west, carried on Government railways, not at trade rates but at favor rates, in fact at a loss, and he would have seen that not one lump of coal from Nova Scotia ever reached Toronto. We have been told we have developed an inter-provincial trade between the east and the west. I deny it. I deny that we have succeeded in developing trade between the east and the west. We carry some small amount of merchandise between the two sections, but is that the result of Confederation, is it the result of the Union? It is not. What trade we have between the east and the west is not a natural trade, but is due entirely to the fact that the country has to pay for the freight required to take it between the east and the west. You cannot legislate against nature, and nature has interposed obstacles in regard to the interchange of trade between the east and the west which no legislation can overcome; and, as year has followed year, it became more and more evident that the anticipations formed by the men of 1865 were mere delusions, that there could never be any profitable trade between Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island on the one side, and the Provinces beyond Quebec on the other. Then it was, seeing that our efforts had been baffled, seeing that the channels were not opened for trade which we had expected, that for the first time protection became a practical issue in this country. The advocates of the new idea fondly hoped and, indeed, resolutely asserted that the promulgation of a high tariff would stimulate the creation of so many manufactures, that it would bring in a large amount of immigration and would stop our own emigration, that we would find the markets here that we had hoped to obtain elsewhere. And although, during the agitation which took place in 1877 and 1878, all classes were promised that they would profit by the adoption of protection, the farmers were the class who were promised the greatest benefit. Indeed, the National Policy then was made to do duty all round, like the celebrated magic bottle in the hands of the juggler, which supplied wine or beer, or spirits or water, just as the man to be served was a wine and beer man, a whiskey man, or a cold water man. So the farmers were told that, if we had protection, they would find a market for their products at their doors. The leader of the Opposition at that time, in the speech which he made at Parkdale in July, 1878, said:

"By having all kinds of industries, we would have a great country; the industries would be twice blessed, our sons would be prevented from going to a foreign country to add to its wealth and strength and skill. The fruits of their labor would be exchanged for the fruits of the soil, cities would multiply, and not only would there be a demand for the larger products, such as wheat, flour, cattle, and everything we could raise, but for cheese, butter, eggs, roots and other kinds of small produce. Why was it that land around villages was more valuable than land away from the villages, land about towns more valuable than land in villages, and land about cities more valuable than land in towns. Land about Toronto was not so good, from an agricultural point of view, as it was 30 or 40 miles away from the city, and yet it was more valuable. The reason was because the farmers living near Toronto could get a market for everything they could raise. They were not obliged to send it away to a distance. The nearer the farmer was to the market the cheaper it was for him to send in his goods, and that single illustration would suffice to show how dependent the workmen, manufacturer and farmer were upon each other."

In so far as this language tended to prove that the adoption of protection would develop a large manufacturing industry

it was a fallacy, but in so far as the hon. gentleman meant to say that a large laboring population is the best market for the agricultural classes, I agree with him. England to-day not only absorbs all her own agricultural products, but drains the agriculture of many other countries besides. New England is very much in the same position. It not only consumes its own agricultural productions, but it absorbs those of many other States and it even draws largely from Canada, although the Canadian farmer has to pay a heavy toll on the frontier. But the prediction of the hon. gentleman did not come true. The country was not overrun with the manufacturing class. There was no great increase in immigration. Emigration was not stopped. Many dreams were dispelled, many dreams turned out to be mere deceptions, for it is a matter of fact that many of the principal advocates of protection who prophesied those great results were the victims of their own preaching. In their great anxiety for the success of this new idea, they represented the country as being overrun by manufactures, with magnificent buildings and tall chimneys throwing towards the sky the smoke of modern industry. They had represented cities and towns growing out of the ground, and teeming with artisans who would consume everything the farmer could grow, but these expectations did not come out true, and here again there was a failure. What was the cause? Why was it that the great expectations which were entertained of the future of the National Policy, were not realised? Because the agitators of 1877-78 completely lost sight of the fact that modern industries cannot thrive in limited markets. Modern industry in order to thrive must operate in large markets. The principle of modern industry is this: to minimise to an infinitesimal figure the profit upon manufactured articles, and then to increase the aggregate production to an unlimited quantity; in fact the profit upon the single article is always decreased in proportion as the aggregate production is increased. Under such circumstances no one can manufacture to advantage unless he manufactures in large quantities, and he who can manufacture in the largest market is always the cheapest manufacturer; and at the same time the man who can reduce the cost of production by ever so small an amount, will always drive his competitors from the field, and will overcome all the barriers opposed to him. That is the reason why the National Policy did not succeed, that is the reason why the manufacturers did not multiply. Why, Sir, our manufacturers, burdened as they are by the tariff, burdened on their coal, burdened on their raw material, cannot extend abroad because they cannot meet the products of free trade countries. They are limited to their own market, and within our own market, with a population of less than 5,000,000, they cannot expand and therefore they cannot thrive. Take the single article of cotton. It was expected that under the favor of the tariff all the great water powers from Kingston to Montreal would be lined with cotton mills, that we would have legion of cotton spinners and cotton weavers. Yet to-day, Sir, we have only 23 cotton mills, with an aggregate of 597,688 spindles. These figures may seem large at first blush, but they are in reality insignificant. In the year 1871, England alone had over 22,000 cotton mills and 34,000,000 spindles; and at this very moment, in the little town of Cardiff, Wales, one single company is erecting 13 mills with a capacity of more than 650,000 spindles. Therefore our figures are perfectly insignificant; our 23 cotton mills and 600,000 spindles are a mere drop in the ocean. But, Sir, the manufacturers of cotton started out for an immense output; they found themselves very soon with an immense surplus which they could not dispose of, and, under such circumstances, what did they do? They combined, they agreed to reduce the production, they reduced the working hours, they dismissed their employees, and reduced production simply to

the requirements of the country; and upon the capital which had been invested, they agreed to pocket the large profits which the tariff gave them over foreign competitors. Yet, as I understand, those profits upon the large capital invested, are not large. Although we have only 23 mills and 600,000 spindles, yet these are too much for the requirements of the country. Not one of these mills is working to its full capacity to-day; they are all working on half time, or at least, not on full time. What is true of cotton is also true of woollens and other industries of the country, so the conclusion is inevitable that the National Policy has not realised the expectations which were entertained at the time. The National Policy has not developed a great national industry, and has not created the home market for our agricultural products, as we were promised. But, Sir, the necessity of widening the area of our trade and commerce is so great that all these many years we have been looking around in this direction and in the other direction to find new outlets and new channels for our trade. In the debate on the Address during the present Session, the mover of the Address told us with pride that the Government had sent a commissioner to Australia in order to obtain the trade of that country; he told us that they had opened communication with the Argentine Republic in order to establish a trade with that country. What will come of these efforts? What has come of all similar efforts? What has come of our sending commissioners to Brazil, to the West Indies, and to Spain? Nothing, for the very obvious reason that, burdened as we are by our protective tariff, we cannot meet free trade England in those markets; so that the conclusion is inevitable that all the efforts we have made so far to develop our trade and commerce, and to broaden their area, since 1867, have been a succession of failures. What, then, is to be done? Is the problem without solution? Is the situation without hope? Is there nothing to be done but to fold our arms and to wait, and to wait, and to wait until something unforeseen and unexpected turns up that will, perhaps, do for us what we have failed to do for ourselves? No, there is a course open to us, and it is to revert to the only means which, in the past, have not failed—it is to adopt the resolution of my hon. friend to my left (Sir Richard Cartwright), it is to open as wide as we can all the avenues of trade between us and the 60,000,000 of people to the south of us. And here again let me recall the language of Mr. Brown. He expected the greatest possible results from the accession of 1,000,000 souls to our market. Here are his words:

“But here, Sir, is a proposal which is to add not only nearly a million of souls to our population, but to add valuable territory to our domain, and secure to us all the advantages of a large and profitable commerce, now existing.”

Sir, these expectations would have been realised if natural obstacles had not interposed. But what we expect to-day from the resolution of my hon. friend, is not only the accession of 1,000,000 of souls to our market, it is the accession of 60,000,000 of the most wealthy people on the face of the globe, with not even a molehill to separate us. Yet the Government will not accede to our proposition. The Government have no objection to send commissioners to the antipodes, but they will not send commissioners to Washington. They have no objection to open communication with the Argentine Republic and its 5,000,000 of souls, but they will not open communication with the great nations to the south of us whose trade is a thousand-fold the trade of the Argentine Republic. But they have their reasons for it. They do not act on mere caprice. They have their reasons; they have a standing offer upon the Statute-book that they are ready to open our market, to a certain extent, to the United States if that country will open its market to us to the same extent. But beyond that they will not go, they stand upon their dignity

and they will not budge an inch. The offer which is made by the Government to the United States is an offer of a limited character, in natural products only. It is not what we ask for. It is not an offer of unlimited trade, such as is asked for by my hon. friend to my left. My hon. friend has proved, at least to the satisfaction of everyone who will take a calm view of the matter, that unlimited reciprocity is preferable to limited reciprocity. Now, if the Government had secured the limited reciprocity which they have offered to the American Government, we would have been glad to accept it, and the Government would have been entitled to the thanks of the country. But the Government have failed in their efforts. That standing offer has been on the Statute-book for nine years now and the Americans have not yet chosen to bite at the bait; but it is not a bait, this is an improper expression. It was a threat, it was intended as a threat to the American Government to make them see what evil consequences might fall if they refused to open their doors to us. The bait or threat, whatever it is, however, has been ineffectual, and we must try something else. Now, limited reciprocity may be looked upon as an impossible thing. I have not heard one single voice raised on the other side of the line in favor of limited reciprocity, while eminent statesmen, members of Congress, influential merchants, boards of trade, have again and again pronounced emphatically in favor of unlimited reciprocity, and to-day there are before Congress two measures in that direction. This sentiment, which is evinced by the propositions before Congress, is not of yesterday. It dates as far back as 1861. In that year the Board of Trade in the city of New York petitioned Congress in favor of an enlargement of the Reciprocity Treaty which existed at that time. That petition to Congress was acted upon. In 1864 Congress considered a resolution from the Committee on Commerce in favor of an extension of the treaty and a widening of its provisions. That resolution was passed in March, 1864; it was laid over till December of that year, but nothing came of it I am sorry to say. And why? Because of the events which took place in the year 1864, because of the unfriendly attitude maintained by England and by Canada towards the United States in the great struggle in which they were engaged at that time. The Alabama cruiser, fitted out in the port of Liverpool, the St. Albans' raid, prepared in Montreal, so far embittered American public opinion that it would not allow that resolution to be carried any further; but of the sentiments which were entertained at that time by the Administration of Mr. Lincoln we can obtain an idea by a letter which was written by Mr. Adams, who was at that time Minister to the Court of St. James', and which was addressed to Lord John Russell. It was dated November, 1864, and it said this:

"The welfare and prosperity of the neighboring British Provinces are as sincerely desired on our part as they can be by Great Britain. In a practical sense they are sources of wealth and influence for the one country only in a less degree than for the other, though the jurisdiction appertain only to the latter. That this is the sincere conviction of my Government has been proved by its consent to enter into relations of reciprocal free trade commerce with them almost as intimate as those which prevail between the several States of the Union themselves. Thus far the disposition has been to remain content with those relations under any and all circumstances, and that disposition will doubtless continue, provided always that the amity be reciprocated, and that the peace and harmony on the border, indispensable to its existence, be firmly secured."

Those were the sentiments of the Administration of Mr. Lincoln in 1864, these are the sentiments of the Administration of President Cleveland in 1883. Of the sentiments of the Administration of Mr. Cleveland upon this matter we have ample evidence in the correspondence exchanged between Mr. Bayard and Sir Charles Tupper. In the letter addressed by Mr. Bayard to Sir Charles, although that letter has often been quoted, I quote it again because it seems to be pregnant with meaning. Mr. Bayard, after having alluded to the necessity of settling the disputes arising

Mr. LAURIER.

out of the fisheries question, proposed a settlement in this manner:

"I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations."

These words are pregnant with meaning, but their precise meaning is fully made out by what follows. Mr. Bayard continues:

"The gravity of the present condition of affairs between our two countries demands entire frankness. I feel we stand at 'the parting of the ways.' In one direction I can see a well assured, steady, healthful relationship, devoid of petty jealousies, and filled with the fruits of a prosperity arising out of a friendship cemented by mutual interests, and enduring because based upon justice; on the other a career of embittered rivalry, staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility."

What is the meaning of his language, "staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility?" What was in the mind of Mr. Bayard? The only way to settle this question was to remove those causes which threatened "a career of embittered rivalry, staining our long frontier with hues of hostility." I am glad to find that the gentleman to whom the letter was addressed, and who, unfortunately, is not in his seat to-day (Sir Charles Tupper), fully reciprocated those sentiments, and he said in his answer to Mr. Bayard:

"I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

Those were the sentiments of two of the gentlemen who were afterwards engaged as plenipotentiaries each for his own respective Government. The American plenipotentiaries made propositions to the British plenipotentiaries. What were those propositions? We have not yet been able to find out; for reasons which have not been explained, the proposals made by the American plenipotentiaries, and those proposals have been kept from the public. But what can they have been? We can imagine what they were; and what else could they have been except a reflection of the sentiment expressed by Mr. Bayard himself, the Secretary of State, when writing to Sir Charles Tupper? What else could they have been but proposals to settle the question upon a basis which would remove from our long frontier the danger of "staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility?" What could they be but proposals for the abolition of customs between the two countries? I fail to find they could be anything else, and unless we are shown at a future day that I was in the wrong, and that they were not such proposals, I think we can fairly infer that such were the proposals emanating from Mr. Bayard. Did the British plenipotentiaries answer in that spirit? No. The proposals made by the British plenipotentiaries, and which we have before us, are not in the same spirit which dictated the answer of Sir Charles Tupper to Mr. Bayard. Sir Charles Tupper in that answer said that he hoped also that the question would be settled by a "straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries." What was the new proposition by the British plenipotentiaries? Was it for an entire settlement of the question upon that line? No; the proposal was simply an arrangement for greater freedom of commercial intercourse. Sir Charles Tupper's proposal to settle the question was by an entire discussion of the trade relations, but the proposition of the British plenipotentiaries was simply for greater freedom of commercial intercourse than now exists. I say the hands of the British plenipotentiaries were handicapped by some power, either by the British Government or the Canadian Government; but it is manifest that the intentions of Mr. Bayard were not reciprocated by the British plenipotentiaries at the discussion of the treaty. So that, Mr. Speaker, the time is eminently well chosen now to move

in the sense indicated by my hon. friend on my left, and send a commissioner to the Government at Washington to confirm the principle, if he sees it is possible to confirm it, which would remove hostility from our frontier line. But the Government will not have that. Even if it were offered, as I believe it was offered in the negotiation of the treaty, they will not have it. They will not have unrestricted reciprocity. They maintain their line of restricted reciprocity; they maintain the offer they have made upon the Statute-book, of giving reciprocity in natural products only. What is the reason that they give for this? The reason they give is that, at present, unrestricted reciprocity would be fatal to our manufactures. Well, Sir, as to that argument, "unrestricted reciprocity would be fatal to our manufactures," it is admitted that unrestricted reciprocity would include reciprocity in natural products, and gentlemen on the other side are ready to give reciprocity in natural products. They admit thereby that reciprocity in natural products would be favorable and would benefit the growers of natural products, or, in other words, that it would benefit the farmers. They say that the interests of the farmers in this instance and the interests of the manufacturers are antagonistic. They admit that unrestricted reciprocity, which includes reciprocity in natural products, would favor the farmers, but they say at the same time that it would injure the manufacturers. I do not admit the argument whatever, for I think reciprocity would be useful all round. But if it comes to this: that we are forced to choose between the growers of natural products and the manufacturers, for my part my choice is made, I stand by the industry which numbers 70 per cent. of our population. I stand by the industry without which no other industry can live. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not admit the argument at all. I do not for a moment admit that reciprocity in manufactured goods would be unfavorable to the manufacturers. What is the objection? The objection is that our infant industries, as they are termed, are not yet strong enough to compete with the industries of the American people. Sir, it is a peculiarity of these infants, called industries, that they never grow. They are monsters, *lusus nature*, their appetite is insatiable, and yet they never get strong. They have to be kept on the feeding-bottle all the time. You have to carry them in your arms all the time, and if you put them on their legs they moan most piteously and are too weak to stand. The poor things are in fact so very weak that they combine amongst themselves to extort from the country, not only what the country will give them willingly, but even what the country will not give them. I can well understand that the monopolist will not have unrestricted reciprocity. He has the market to himself; the market is not large, it is true, but he has it all to himself without competition, and furthermore if there were competition he would have to exert his brains and muscle as everybody else is compelled to do. But the genuine manufacturer not only is not afraid of unrestricted reciprocity but will hail with joy the day that the American market is open to him. What is it that modern industry wants in order to thrive? It wants space, and nothing else but space; and give to our manufacturers that broad market of 60,000,000 of people, and every one with a heart in his bosom and a head on his shoulders will tell you that he is ready and eager to compete with the American manufacturer. My hon. friend the member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) stated the other day that he was opposed to the present movement, because he thought unrestricted reciprocity would destroy our manufactures, and he spoke from a local point of view. I am sorry that on this occasion I have to sever from him on this question. He said as follows:—

"We know in the cities of St. Hyacinthe and Montreal the number of consumers of agricultural produce is largely increasing and our farmer goes to this market. Every week dealers go through our district buying

71

eggs, poultry, animals, fruits and other articles of farm produce, and where do those articles go in much larger quantities than in the past? They go to the markets of St. Hyacinthe and Montreal, where there are a larger number of consumers than in the past. Destroy by unrestricted reciprocity the manufacturing industry of those two cities, throw out of employment the thousands of workmen who gain their living in those manufactories, and what would be the result? Our markets for the agriculturists' produce would lose its importance."

Sir, I will say to my hon. friend that the opinion which he expresses on the result of unrestricted reciprocity, with regard to the manufacturers of St. Hyacinthe, is not the opinion of the manufacturers of St. Hyacinthe. My hon. friend the member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) is a manufacturer, and he is in favor of unrestricted reciprocity; and I hold in my hand here a telegram from Mr. Boaz, who is a large and well-known manufacturer of St. Hyacinthe, and who says if you give him the American market to-morrow, the day after to-morrow he will treble his establishment. This, Sir, is the opinion of a genuine manufacturer. It stands to common sense, and it stands to reason, that the larger the field is at the present day for the manufacturer, the larger will be his exertions and the larger his profit and his trade. But, Sir, there is another objection, and a most serious objection upon the face of it. We are told that unrestricted reciprocity would largely affect our revenue. Under present circumstances the importations from the United States yield to our revenue an annual amount of \$7,000,000. There is no doubt whatever that if unrestricted reciprocity were adopted we would lose that revenue. Sir, I say at once, and I say emphatically, that the prospect has no cause of alarm to me. The prospect would be a serious cause of alarm, Sir, if the revenue of the country had been kept to the legitimate expenditure of the country. If the revenue of the country had been kept to the figure indispensable to carry on the legislative business of the country, then, Sir, the necessity of providing the deficiency of such a large amount to be levied every year upon the people of the country would be a serious problem. But, Sir, under the present high rate of taxation the revenue has been swelled far in excess of the legitimate requirements of the country. The equilibrium has been reestablished by the Government between revenue and expenditure. But, how? By decreasing the revenue? No, but by illegitimately increasing the expenditure. Sir, this fact that we are illegitimately increasing the expenditure of the country beyond the natural requirements of the people is a serious matter which should grow on the consideration of the gentlemen of this House. It is fruitful of evil consequences. The United States to-day suffer from the same state of things. They have also an abnormally large revenue, and although the expenditure has been kept down to a legitimate expenditure, still all the evils that we have to-day, from a large revenue and a large expenditure, have also arisen in the United States. In a recent number of *Harper's Weekly* the editor of that most valuable, able and high-toned paper, after having reviewed the policy of President Jefferson—who favored a large expenditure, and in order to have a large expenditure would maintain a tariff providing for a surplus—goes on to speak in this way, and this language I commend to everyone who thinks of those matters in this House:

"Experience, however, has proved what Jefferson could not foresee, that the course he favored leads to over-taxation, class legislation, a general derangement of commerce and industry, and political corruption."

All of these evils we have in this country. We have had class legislation, we have over-taxation, and we have political corruption—political corruption so bold that it does not even seek at this day to hide its shame. Let me in this connection quote the words spoken only a few weeks ago by the Premier of this country in the city of Quebec. At the dinner given there to the Minister of Militia, he uttered these pregnant words:

"Sandfield Macdonald, a Scotchman, and like all Scotchmen but myself, exceedingly economical, took great pains to save up a surplus. The Opposition abused him, and said he had not the heart to spend the money, but that when they got into power they would divide it. So that he was literally bought out with his own money. No Grit successor of the present Government will find much surplus left after us to spend among his supporters. Our opponents say that we bribe the constituencies, but we bribe them with their own money."

Sir, this is the level to which the politics of this country has been lowered by the false system which we have been pursuing for so many years. Sir, I will hail with joy the day when it will no longer be in the power of this Government or any other Government to bribe the people of this country with their own money. I will hail with joy the day when no more money will be extorted from the people of this country than is absolutely necessary to carry on the business of the country; and if unrestricted reciprocity were to do nothing else than to reduce the expenditure to such a normal figure that it would be impossible for any Government to distribute money among the constituencies to bribe them, with both my hands I would vote for unrestricted reciprocity. The advantages, Mr. Speaker, of a free, untrammelled commercial intercourse between this country and the great country to the south of us cannot be denied. Indeed, they are not denied. No assertion has been made on the other side against the assertion made on this side that great benefits would follow such an interchange. The objections made are not made to the idea itself, but all the objections are based simply on the supposition that this course would be fatal to some interests in our own country. But, Sir, the one great objection which we have heard from all quarters on the other side of the House has been the cry of disloyalty. That cry came as a lugubrious knell in all the speeches we have heard on this question. The objection was taken that to admit the importations from the United States free of duty, while we tax the importations from Great Britain, would be disloyal. The objections made on that subject were crystallised in one sentence by the hon. Minister of the Interior, in an interruption to my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island:

"What I said was that a differential duty against England was disloyal to the mother country and inconsistent with our position."

Sir, if this objection means anything it simply means that if we find it to be to our advantage to adopt reciprocal free trade with the United States, we should forego that advantage because we are a colony of England. That is the proposition made by gentlemen on the other side. I denounce such a proposition; I repudiate it; I denounce it as unmanly, as anti-Canadian, and even anti-British. To pretend, Sir, that our colonial allegiance demands from us that we should be deterred from the spirit of enterprise, that we should refuse to extend our trade and to increase our prosperity according to the best methods which commend themselves to our judgment, to pretend that this is loyalty, I deny; and if I were to characterise the sentiment in the only language in which it ought to be characterised, I would say this is not loyalty, but that it is mere flunkeyism. We are a colony of England, it is true; but we are a colony not by force, but by choice; and if we are a colony to-day, it is because we are convinced that at the present day our colonial dependence is quite compatible with the largest measure of national advancement and material prosperity. If you, on the other side, pretend that our colonial relation curtails and limits our possibilities, that England would allow us to reach a certain altitude and not go higher, I say you slander England; and if any man were to rise on the other side and tell us that England would be jealous at whatever we could do to improve our condition, I would say that man does not know England; he mistakes the England of to-day for the England of 100 years ago. I commend to the consideration of these fervent loyalists on the other side, whose mouths are ever full of the word loyalty, the following words

Mr. LAURIER.

spoken by Lord Palmerston 20 years ago in reference to the British North American Provinces:

"If these Provinces felt themselves strong enough to stand upon their own ground, and if they desire no longer to maintain their connection with us, we should say: 'God speed you and give you the means to maintain yourselves as a nation!'"

These are the sentiments of British statesmen. They tell us that whenever we want our political liberty, we are free to have it. But what we ask, Sir, is not political independence; we want to keep the flag of England over our heads; but we affirm that we are economically independent as we are legislatively independent. Sir, colonies have interests in common with the mother land, but colonies have interests of their own also; to-day we levy a heavy toll on all imports from Great Britain. We have done that not only for the sake of collecting revenue, but also for the purpose of protection, to enable us to manufacture ourselves what we had formerly purchased from England, and to that extent to destroy British trade. There was a time when this would not have been tolerated; there was a time when England would have disallowed such a policy; but now we adopt it as a matter of course; now our policy is never questioned—why? Because England has long ago admitted the principle that colonies have interests of their own, and that it is within their right and power to develop and foster and promote those interests, even to the point of clashing with British interests. It was not always so, however. In the last century, England lost her American colonies because that principle was ignored. The American revolution broke out for the revindication of the principle that taxation and representation should go together. Principles may lie dormant for generations until called forth for the solution of some great issue. And what was the issue which called for the vindication of those principles by the American colonies? The issue was this: At that time there was a trade in the American colonies, and there was also a British trade; and the British Parliament, from which the colonies were excluded, legislated exclusively for British trade against the interests of American trade. In our own country, in the year 1837, a rebellion broke out in the two largest colonies left to England, and in both the Provinces the cause of the rebellion was the same. It was that the British Government persistently ignored the interests of the colonies as represented by their Legislatures. The British Government, at that time, did not hold upon those matters the same opinion that it holds to-day; but when rebellion broke out, not only in Lower Canada, where the population was not of British origin, but even in Upper Canada, the British Government sent a commissioner to investigate the cause of the rebellion. In their selection of Lord Durham they were most lucky, for in him they chose a man of great sagacity of mind, great personal courage, and large and liberal views. If it were my duty to review his report, I would be bound to take exception to the conception which he formed of my own countrymen; but as to the main conception of the report, as to the main idea which governed it, it was one of the greatest conceptions of an age fertile in great conceptions. It was indeed a revolution. Lord Durham found at once that the colonies had interests of their own, and that these interests had to be prosecuted to their logical end; and he came to the conclusion that local parliaments were the only parliaments fitted to deal with them. He suggested therefore to give the colonies responsible governments. That was indeed a revolution. Every country which, up to that time, had had colonies, always thought it was necessary to keep its colonies closely in hand; they all believed that to grant the slightest emancipation would generate a desire for complete emancipation. Lord Durham found that the converse proposition was true. He found and maintained that coercion generated the desire for emancipation, but that freedom

would be a bond of union. That was a revolution indeed; it was one of the greatest conceptions of the age, and all the greater because of the circumstances under which it was formed. There was a rebellion at the time in which two Provinces participated. There was a rebellion in the Upper Province of Canada, where the population was of British origin; there was a rebellion, a far more dangerous one, in Lower Canada, where the population was of alien origin, and had only recently been made subjects of England. And at that very moment, when the country was in the throes of civil war, when the soil was reeking with bloodshed, when British domination had to be maintained by force of arms, at that moment Lord Durham said: Make them free, and you will make them loyal. And we who live to-day are the happy witnesses of the sagacity of his mind and the realisation of his prophecy. We who live to-day have seen how his policy has planted deep felt loyalty where, fifty years ago, rebellion existed. But, Sir, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite what is the extent of the freedom which was then granted to us? I say it extends as far as Canadian interests extend, and to that extent we, on this side, claim it. At that time, it is true, Lord Durham had not one disciple. British statesmen could not conceive that responsible government could exist in a colony as it existed at home, and it was not until another master-mind, Lord Elgin, came to this country, that the policy of Lord Durham received its full measure of adoption. But Lord Elgin went further. He negotiated the Treaty of Reciprocity, and in that treaty he admitted the principle of discrimination against British trade. Is there an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who will pretend that these great men, Lord Durham and Lord Elgin, did not save the British Crown on this continent? Will anyone pretend that the colonies would have long consented to be governed by the Colonial Office, through the instrumentality of a petty family compact? Who is not aware that the Reciprocity Treaty negotiated by Lord Elgin in 1854, effectually quelled the agitation for annexation which followed 1849. I say to our hon. friends opposite: You want to maintain British connection on this continent, and so say I; but I add this, that if you want to maintain British connection on this continent, British connection must walk abreast with all the requirements of this country. In this connection, I cannot do better than quote the minute of council of the Coalition Government of 1865, which is pregnant with meaning, in view of the present circumstances. That minute is as follows:—

"Under the beneficent operation of the system of self-government, which the later policy of the mother country has accorded to Canada, in common with the other colonies possessing representative institutions, combined with the advantages secured by the Reciprocity Treaty of an unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbors in the natural productions of the two countries, all agitations for organic changes has ceased—all dissatisfaction with the existing political relations of the Province has wholly disappeared."

Here is the admission that reciprocity with the United States effectually quashed the agitation for annexation which followed 1849:

"Although the colony would grossly misrepresent their countrymen if they were to affirm that their loyalty to their Sovereign would be diminished in the slightest degree by the withdrawal, through the unfriendly action of a foreign Government, of mere commercial privileges, however valuable these might be deemed, they think they cannot err in directing the attention of the enlightened statesmen who wield the destinies of the great Empire, of which it is the proudest boast of Canadians that their country forms a part, to the connection which is usually found to exist between the material prosperity of the political contentment of a people, for in doing so they feel that they are appealing to the highest motives that can actuate patriotic statesmen, the desire to perpetuate a dominion founded on the affectionate allegiance of a prosperous and contented people."

There is no fear of any desire for organic changes as long as the people are prosperous. But the moment the people will begin to believe that their prosperity would be in-

creased by an organic change, from that moment danger may arise. As to our moral right to act as we have acted in this matter, I have not the slightest doubt. The objection of hon. gentlemen opposite would have been a much stronger one, at least in my eyes, if it had been made from a different standpoint. If instead of telling us that we have not the right to propose to discriminate against England, they had said it would not be generous to England to discriminate against her, the objection, to my mind, would have been far stronger; and if I am not trespassing beyond the limits of good taste, in speaking of my own individual sentiments, I would say that this is a consideration which gave me much concern. We have been told in the course of this debate, in many instances, that sentiment should not be allowed in politics. That view I do not take. My view is that sentiment may, as well in politics as in everything else, well shape our actions to the extent of making us generous, if we can be generous without any sacrifice of duty. Sir, I am a subject of French origin, and I have often stated—and you, Mr. Speaker, agree with me—that there is no more loyal race of men under the British Crown on the American continent than Her Majesty's subjects of French origin. Loyalty is natural to you, men of British origin; it flows in your blood; you have inhaled it from the heart of your mothers; but I tell you that gratitude has worked in the hearts of my countrymen feelings of the same nature which is implanted in your hearts by your origin or your birth. With all my soul I say, let my tongue adhere to the roof of my mouth if it were ever to speak an unkind word of England; let my right hand wither, if it ever participated in anything which would be unfair to England. But this is not a question of sentiment. This is a question of duty, and, if you put it in this light, that I have to choose between the duty I owe to England, and the duty I owe to my native land, I stand by my native land. And there is not an Englishman, with an English heart in his bosom, that will not say the same if he is a true born Briton. Sir, England would treat us with contempt if we were to act otherwise than we are acting. England expects from us that we shall do the best we can for ourselves, and she will take care of herself, without any assistance from Canadian Tories. I am quite sure of one thing. It is quite possible that John Bull may grumble, but in his grumbling there will be as much pride as anger, and John Bull will feel flattered if there is an offspring of his so much like the old gentleman that he will not lose any occasion to turn an honest penny. John Bull will feel flattered, if he finds that that scion of his is a true chip of the old block. But there is another kind of loyalty which has not been alluded to on the other side of the House, and which should be taken into consideration in this instance. I have not heard from the other side a word about the loyalty which we owe to Confederation. Twenty years ago, we united the British Provinces on this continent with the view of making them a new nationality and with the hope of making them a nation. It was then a union on paper. It was expected that it would be made a real union. The Union has lasted twenty years, and what is the result to-day? What have we achieved during those twenty years? I say that to-day, after twenty years, the Union which, in 1867, was a mere union on paper is to-day still a mere union on paper. The hearts of the people by the sea are not in the Union.

Some hon. MEMBERS. They are.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) was once rebuked for saying that he was a Nova Scotian by birth and a Canadian by Act of Parliament. I say, and I think I speak with knowledge, that the sentiments which were then uttered by my hon.

friend are the sentiments entertained by nineteen-twentieths of the people of Nova Scotia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. LAURIER. Yes. Perhaps it will be said that I have no cause to speak that way, because Nova Scotia has returned a majority to support the Government. Sir, the reason why Nova Scotia has returned a majority to support the Government is that the issue which the Liberal party placed before the people of Nova Scotia was not repeal. I believe in Confederation; we believe in Confederation, and we want the people of the Maritime Provinces to understand that it is the policy of the Liberal party not so much to induce them to return men to support us, but to win them over to Confederation, and to make them not only loyal British subjects, as they are, but loyal Canadians as well. If you want to do that, if you want to achieve that object, you must reverse your policy altogether; if you want to achieve that object, you must give to the people of Nova Scotia and the Maritime Provinces their natural market. Let them trade where it is most profitable for them to trade, and their hearts will be won over to the Canadian flag, not only to the British flag. It was our hope at one time to make this country a nation. It is our hope yet.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. I hail that sentiment with joy, with unbounded joy, all the more that it is altogether unforeseen. I had expected, from the talk we have heard from these gentlemen on the other side of the House, that they expected that this country would forever and forever remain a colony. I see now that they have higher aspirations, and I give them credit for that. Colonies are destined to become nations, as it is the destiny of the child to become a man. No one, even on the other side, will assume that this country, which will some day number a larger population than Great Britain, is forever to remain in its present political relation with Great Britain. The time is coming when the present relations of Great Britain and Canada must either become closer or be severed altogether. For my own part, I do not intend at present to carry out this line of thought any further, but I say simply that, if ever and whenever Canada chooses, to use the language of Lord Palmerston, to stand by herself, the separation will take place not only in peace, but in friendship and in love, as the son leaves the house of his father himself to become himself the father of a family. But this is not the question of to-day. Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. To-day we have to face a problem of no small magnitude, which is to provide the best means of developing and broadening the area of our trade to such an extent as to afford to our struggling industries the space they require to thrive and develop. This is the duty of the present hour; this is the task which has to be faced and met. We, on this side of the House, believe that the motion of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) exactly meets the case; we believe that the solution of the problem is complete unrestricted reciprocity with the great nation to the south of us. I fully appreciate the objection of our friends on the other side, who would say that our course is not generous towards England. My answer is simply this: I only wish that we could offer to England the same propositions that we offer to-day to the American people. England has opened to us her doors. Gentlemen on the other side have closed our doors against England. They have done it, I know, not in any spirit of hostility towards England, but because they thought it was in the interest of this country. They have adopted protection as their deliberate policy. England has the policy of free trade. England is 3,000 miles away from us. The policy of the United States is a policy of protection, the same as ours. They are our nearest neighbors. There are our channels of trade. Therefore, the

Mr. LAURIER.

course we take is not a matter of choice, it is the dictate of reason. I fully appreciate as well the objection of those who say that this is the first of a series of changes which must end in annexation. Sir, I grant at once that there is force in the objection if you look only at the surface; but it is the greatest possible misconception in politics to believe that the same mould will reproduce the same casts of events. It is true that history ever repeats itself, but history never repeats itself in identically the same terms. It is true that the same causes always produce the same effects, but those effects are always modified by a variety of concomitant circumstances. Who, for instance, would have expected, fifty years ago, that the concession of responsible government would have resulted, as it has resulted, in a closer union between England and Canada? All the wiseacres of that day predicted that the concession which was made at that time would result in the absolute severance of Canada from the Empire, but all the prophecies have been falsified. The result has been to draw the two countries closer together than ever. We anticipate on this side of the House that the carrying of my hon. friend's resolution will have the effect of bringing about such prosperity to this country that trade will increase, not only between Canada and the United States, but between Canada and Great Britain herself, and make the bonds of union still stronger than they are. Nor, Sir, would I treat lightly the misgivings of those who, on the threshold of a great event, as this is sure to be, stand irresolute, dreading the unknown. I can well conceive that sentiment. Even when the mind is satisfied that a given political situation has become intolerable, that a change has to be made, even then the contemplated reform may, perhaps, be looked upon with misapprehension. For instance, the most radical Reformer amongst us, convinced though he may be that a revision of the Union Act which binds the three Kingdoms together, has become necessary, still may not look without anxiety to the impending change. When the past has been so glorious; when the present condition of things, though it has wrought intolerable evils, has made England so great, even he who is determined to amend the present constitution and amend it effectually, to remove existing evils—even he, Sir, perhaps, would not touch the existing fabric except with a trembling hand. But at the same time the staunchest Tory must admit that the history of England has been an unceasing transformation. There has not been one century when England did not change, when England has been the same as in the century before. England moved onward and onward, from progress to progress, until she has reached her present position. Yet every one of those changes which have made England what she is to-day, has been met by Tories, and by Conservatives, with the taunts of disloyalty with which we are met to-day. To go no further back than the present century when Catholic Emancipation had become unavoidable, all the Tories of England, from the King downward, wept over the fall of England. When the Reform Bill was carried, all the Tories of England wept over the downfall of their country; when the Corn Laws were abolished, still the Tories of England had more tears to shed. In our own country when responsible government was first agitated, all the Tories of Canada wept over the impending rupture of British connection; and when, a few years afterwards, responsible government was carried into effect, the Tories no longer wept, but they raved, they burst out into a torrent of passion. Their rage was perfectly genuine, but the tears they shed were merely crocodile tears. What the Tories, British or Canadian, wept over upon these occasions, was not the downfall of England, was not the rupture of British connection, but it was the loss of some privilege or some monopoly which, upon all these occasions, was forcibly removed from their grasp. Sir, if the views of the Canadian Tories had prevailed fifty years ago, Canada would

still be a medley of scattered Provinces, each governed or rather owned by a small family compact. If the Tories of to-day, if those whose lamentations we have heard for the last fifteen days, had lived fifty years ago, they, like their ancestors, would have howled with loyal yells against the reforms which have raised Canada from the position which she then held to the proud position which she occupies to-day; they would have opposed those reforms with the same cries of loyalty with which they meet us to-day; and I venture to say, judging of the future by the past, that the Tories fifty years hence will rejoice at the adoption of the resolution of my hon. friend, as it must be adopted some day, though, true to their Tory nature, they will shrink from the reforms which will then be necessary. Sir, I am not disposed to treat otherwise than with respect those protests which have been raised against the disturbance of the present state of things. I am reminded, in this connection, of some words written by Armand Carrel, a Frenchman of great power and greater promise, who, unfortunately, fell a premature victim to that curse of French civilisation, duelling. Armand Carrel had been an officer in the French army, and had deserted to join one of those numerous insurrections which took place in Spain about the year 1820, in favor of constitutional government. He was taken prisoner, court-martialled and sentenced to death; but after a series of dramatic incidents he obtained a new trial, and was finally acquitted. Referring, some years later, to the events which had brought on those insurrections, the French Revolution, the Napoleonic wars, and the organic disturbances created by those events, the new aspirations developed, in consequence, in some classes of society, and in other classes of society, the intense attachment to the old *regime*, and the intense desire for its restoration, he concluded as follows:—

“Events in their continual and fatal transformation do not carry all minds with them, nor curb all characters with an equal facility, nor take care of all interests; this must be understood and something must be forgiven to the protestations which rise in favor of the past. When a period is ended, the mind is shattered, and it is enough for Providence that it cannot be reconstituted.”

Those words seem to be full of meaning, and they seem forcibly to teach the lesson that it is the duty of Reformers ever to stand up to the duty of the hour, without fear of the consequences, either to themselves or to the country; ever respecting, but still never heeding, those protests which are sure to be raised in favor of the past—in the words of President Lincoln “with malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right.” Sir, believing that, I appeal to all Reformers on the present occasion; I appeal not only to those who belong to the Reform organisation, but I appeal to all those who believe that the world cannot remain stationary; I appeal to all those who believe that new exigencies are always arising which require to be dealt with; I appeal to all those who believe that the present economical condition of Canada is false and dangerous; I appeal to the old men who, in former years, have borne the brunt of many battles in favor of reform, and who have lent a helping shoulder to bring up their country to the high level it occupies to-day; I appeal to the young men whose aim it is still to raise their country higher—of all I ask their support in the task we have undertaken at this time. Sir, our opponents on this occasion again drag up their old-time weapon of abuse. They tell us that we are disloyal, that we are traitors, that we are annexationists. With such invectives we are not concerned. Those invectives are only an anticipation of those with which we will be assailed by our opponents. Again, they will appeal to all the prejudices that may lie in the people against this policy. They will again torture noble sentiments in order to arouse suspicion against this policy, they will again probe

the narrow corners of the heart in order to awaken what may be found there low and vile against this new policy. But with such tactics we are not concerned. Such tactics have been faced before and we must face them again. They say that without a doubt the people will repel us, that victory will again perch on the banners of the Conservative party. With such considerations we are not concerned. Our considerations are higher, our aims are higher than such low, vulgar, vile, selfish considerations. And, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to all those who believe that politics is neither a trade nor a gain; I appeal to all those who believe that politics is a duty which must be discharged, not with a view to the gain to be attained but discharged simply for duty's sake, and to those, in the language of the poet, I say:

“Onward! throw all terrors off!
Slight the scorns, scorn the scoff.
In the race, and not the prize,
Glory's true distinction lies.
Triumph herds with meanest things,
Common robbers, vilest slings,
'Mid the reckless multitude!
But the generous, but the good
Stand in modesty alone,
Still serenely struggling on,
Planting peacefully the seeds
Of bright hopes and better deeds.”

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend to my left has planted the seeds of brighter hopes and better days for this country when he moved this resolution. We may be defeated; but, as my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) said a few days ago, time is with us. Yes, time is with us, the cause is true and it will prevail. We are to-day in the last days of a long and severe winter. Nature, which is now torpid and inert, will awaken in a few days under the penetrating influences of a warmer sun, and the great river at the foot of the cliff on which we stand, now imprisoned in the close embrace of frost, will throw off her shackles and roll unfettered and free toward the sea. So sure as this will happen, I say that under the penetrating influence of discussion, of better feelings on both sides of the line, the hostility which now stains our long frontier will disappear, the barriers which now obstruct trade will be burst open and trade will pour in along all the avenues from the north to the south and from the south to the north, free, untrammelled and no longer stained by the hues of hostility.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Speaker, if I were not in the midst of a deliberative assembly, discussing the interests of the people, and having as much as possible to take care that the discussion is restricted to the subject which is before the Chair, I would gladly have joined in the applause with which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House greeted the great and eloquent effort of the leader of the Opposition. For rhetoric, for eloquence, for great forensic power, my hon. friend is known, and no one in this House admires him more than I do; and I would not rise now to answer him, I would not offer the few remarks I have to make in this debate—this debate which has been so protracted, but which I must say has not been too long,—were it not for a few assertions made by, and occurrences connected with, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I do not wish, as I have said, to add much to this debate—I could not. Interesting it will be in the future when this Confederation, in spite of the efforts of its detractors, shall have passed from youth to manhood, for those who will be living then, and for ourselves, old as we may be, to read over the report of this debate, of this battle upon which might depend the destiny of a whole nation. I again say I would not have risen to add anything to this debate were it not for some utterances of the hon. gentleman against which I am bound to enter my strong and solemn protest. It is the habit of the hon. gentleman in every one of his speeches in this House to display not only his great loyalty to the British Crown and

the British Empire and his intense British feelings, in words—it is his fashion to say not only that he is loyal to the British Crown and the Empire, but that no one except himself and his party have any of the elements of true patriotism and loyalty. Against that I must enter my protest. The hon. gentleman says he is loyal; I must believe him. He may say as long as he likes that he would take his solemn oath, and that his arm might wither if he was not anxious to maintain the integrity of the British Empire and the glory of the British Crown; but I would have preferred if he had said it in time of danger. Instead of brandishing his sword in defence of the British Crown to-day, he should have done so during the unfortunate outbreak of the North-West in 1835, during those days which have passed, and which I hope will be forgotten by every one in this country; but, on the contrary, he then said he would have shouldered a musket, which was anything but loyal, and which certainly was not acting to protect the interests and the integrity of the Empire. I do not wish to deny him the right to express his sentiments as he has expressed them and as he has a right to do. I say it is his right to do so, but at the same time a man must not make a display of a virtue only on parade and not in action. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is especially speaking for the Province of Quebec, of which he is one of the bright sons, and I may say the Province is proud of him as such. My hon. friend appears to say, and he wants the people to believe that true patriotism is only to be found in the ranks of the party which he leads now, and that "those Tories" as he calls us possess none of the ingredients which go to form a good patriot. During the lifetime of the lamented Sir George Cartier, the true representative in his time of the French-Canadian element in Confederation, my hon. friend was one of those who called that distinguished and lamented gentleman a Tory, a slave of England, a man whose sense of honor for his country and for his fellow-countrymen was nothing, but whose subserviency to England was everything. Still, in 1855, when the North-West agitation commenced in the Province of Quebec, we saw in the newspaper of my hon. friend's party, that there was no man who ever existed in this country who was such a great patriot as Sir George Cartier, nor did there ever live a man who had been such a lover of his country, and who had been such a successful builder up of a Canadian nationality. Yet, Sir George Cartier was vilified by those gentlemen during his lifetime. Judging from the soberer judgments of my honorable friends, I have hope, one of those days, that although our party is now abused by him, that some of the younger friends of the hon. gentleman will, some day say that we acted as the true friends of Canadian nationality, and that we acted as the true friends of our Province; and, in speaking so, they will only say in the time to come what the Province of Quebec and Dominion of Canada has already said of the men who at the present moment are at the head of this Dominion of ours. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has stated that the National Policy, inaugurated in 1879, was ruinous to the country and that the country was tired of that policy. When he said this he stated that he was speaking for the Province which he specially represents in this Parliament. To that assertion of my hon. friend I reply that, in speaking as he did, he did not represent the true feelings, the true sentiments, and the real opinions of that Province of Quebec from which he springs. If there is in the Dominion a Province which has adopted sincerely and heartily, and I might add, practically, as well, the National Policy of 1879, it is the Province of Quebec. Perhaps I may be contradicted, but I will state here that in no other Province was the movement for a National Policy commenced earlier than in the Province of Quebec, and to prove it I might perhaps quote an authority which my hon. friend himself will not deny. I may say that as far back as December, 1867, and the first time that I had the honor to speak on the floor of

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

the Legislative Assembly in Quebec, I advocated the National Policy, that is to say, I advocated the encouragement of manufactures and to prevent—what? To prevent exactly the state of things which my hon. friend now says is the great evil and the great disease of the country—emigration to the United States. In my efforts in this direction I was followed and supported by many. As far back as 1867 and 1868 the National Policy, as the policy for the Federal Government to adopt, was agitated in the Province of Quebec, long before it was agitated in other Provinces. I have here in my hand a book in which I find an extract of a speech which I myself heard delivered by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition when we were colleagues, and happy to be colleagues, in the Legislature of Quebec. In the debate upon colonisation grants which at the time was the popular debate in the Legislative Assembly at Quebec, my hon. friend was endorsing the policy of his colleagues, that of finding fault with the existing Administration. On our side of the House we believed that the great curse of the Province of Quebec was that a great many French Canadians were emigrating to the United States. When we were complaining of that emigration from our Province, strange to say, it was during the time that the Reciprocity Treaty existed between Canada and the United States, and I can assert here that the tide of emigration to the United States, in comparison with the population, has never been greater than it was during the period between 1854 and 1866—during the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty. What did my hon. friend then say? He could not even then help speaking of patriots and patriotism. If in the speech which he has just delivered we did not hear him mention the name of the great Papineau it is certainly only the fault of his memory; I am sure if he had thought of it he would have had the name of Papineau on his lips. My hon. friend, speaking in Quebec in 1871, said:

"It is now many years ago since the great patriot of Canada, that great patriot whom we have just lost, the Hon. L. J. Papineau, seeking to remedy our misfortunes and the evils of the day was resuming his speech in that simple sentence: 'We must not buy anything from England.'"

And the hon. gentleman adding his opinion to that of the great Papineau, said:

"I am of opinion that that policy imposes itself upon us to-day with as much and more force than at the time it was formulated. It is for us, and especially for us French-Canadians, a duty to create a national industry and a National Policy."

When my hon. friend used this language he was a patriot and he was a National Policy man. He cannot deny the history of his party in his Province. Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned a speech delivered in 1871; I can also mention to my hon. friend and to those who are conversant with the political history of the Province of Quebec, that in 1871 and 1872 a great National Policy originated in Montreal under the auspices of my hon. friend and some of his friends. Their great National Policy began with Mederic Lanctot, and ended when the chief of the Government took the real National Policy into his hands and wrested it from those children's hands. In 1871 and 1872, especially in 1872, when the movement was set on foot in Montreal to defeat the giant of Canadian politics in the Province at that time, Sir George Cartier, what was the platform invented in the hope of putting up those small men and putting down the great man? It was this absurd old National Policy. I will mention the name of one man who is now out of politics, but who occupies a seat on the bench, to which he does honor—the Hon. Mr. Jetté. When he was a candidate against Sir George Cartier in Montreal, in 1872, what was the policy of the hon. gentleman's friends? I will quote what Mr. Jetté said on the 25th of July, 1872—and I beg the indulgence of the House in translating as I read:

"Three elements are the sources of greatness of a country and the development of its resources—agriculture, commerce and industry.

Agriculture cannot alone retain the population which is leaving. The Government should have recourse to the establishment of manufactures; but that system having been considered contrary to the interests of the metropolis, the Government has abandoned it. New England, where our fellow-countrymen are emigrating to, is essentially a manufacturing country. Here we have greater advantages for the establishment of manufactures, and the Government should adopt a policy to protect such manufactures. When people are speaking of the repatriation of our fellow-countrymen, the latter have argued that the advantage they found elsewhere, that is, labor, should be given to them here; and that advantage will be given to them only when manufactures will be flourishing in our country. Then, and then only, can we call our fellow-countrymen from the United States. Capital is dormant in the banks of this country. If we had manufactures we might utilise that capital. Our Government has adopted an industrial policy which is only in favor of foreign manufacturers, and not to the profit of Canadian manufacturers.'

I quote this extract because it is a type of all the speeches and declarations of those gentlemen at that time. You may generally judge of the policy of the party by the organs of the party. We do the same now. Great papers having changed their appreciation of the policy of the Government, new organs have been created. At that time, the old *Le Pays*, which was the organ of the party, was changed into another organ, which was called, according to this policy, *Le National*. Oh, this name "National"; that is a great word—a word which has been unfortunately used and abused a great deal in our Province by our hon. friends on the other side of the House during the past two or three years. If my hon. friend says it was only a little local movement in Montreal, I shall quote a resolution proposed in 1872 by a man whose name is venerated by all my hon. friends on the other side, from the Province of Quebec at least—the Hon. Mr. Letellier, who was the incarnation of Liberalism, who, I can say to his credit, was unflinching in his Liberal views and opinions, and who to the last moment declared himself a protectionist. Mr. Letellier, in 1872, in Quebec, seconded a resolution in which it was said that the Government should not mind whether the interests of the manufacturers in England were injured or not, but that it was a sound and patriotic policy on the part of the Government of this country to protect our manufactures so as to create in this country centres where manufacturing industries could be developed, and where the hands that were idle during the winter months could be utilised, and our people prevented from emigrating to the United States. But if 1872 is too remote a date for the changeable affections of my hon. friends, if it is too much for their dull memory of the political events of the country, I might come to 1878. Who was their standard-bearer in Montreal in that year? Who presented himself as the representative of the Liberal party against my hon. friend from Montreal East? A strong Liberal, whose principles were known to all his friends and who declared himself in favor of the National Policy. Who was the Liberal candidate that, in 1878, held up his banner of free trade? Was there one from Gaspé to Pontiac? No, Sir; every one of them, in accordance with the dictates of the leader of their party, was for protection. Shall I quote the Hon. Mr. Joly, who was for a long time the dignified Premier of the Province of Quebec, a man whose sentiments were shared in by my hon. friend, and whose opinion cannot be a matter of suspicion? Shall I quote the answer he sent to Dr. Orton who was chairman of the Committee on protection to manufactures? Did not Mr. Joly send his answer in saying that even if he had to separate from his party, even if he were to receive the censure of his party, he would be true to his Province and country in advocating a national policy of protection to manufacturing industries.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When the House adjourned I was pointing out that not only in the electoral movements in

Montreal of 1871 and 1872, but that during the electoral campaign of 1878, the question of protection to our manufactures had not only not been repudiated by the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, but had been taken up as a part of their programme; and I was about to say that if those reminiscences were not fresh enough for the dull memories of my hon. friends, I might recall to them another fact. It is still fresh in the memory of all of us in the Province of Quebec, that, at a certain moment during the electoral campaign of 1887, a wave came over the electorate which threatened to engulf the people. It was thought that the then leader of the Liberal party, the Hon. Mr. Blake, was certain to see victory perched on his banner. It was then thought that power would be attained by him and held for at least the next five years, and in some parts of our Province, as in some of the Maritime Provinces, especially in Prince Edward Island, this belief in the certainty of the success of the Liberal leader was a great factor in the elections. In Montreal, what was it that occasioned the doubt which came over us, leading us to think that perhaps the Liberal party would win the day? It was the fact that when the great leader, Mr. Blake, came to Montreal to arouse the energy and the courage, which were rather flagging at the time, of his followers, he addressed the electors of Montreal and made the following declaration, which I take from the report of his speech in the *Montreal Herald* of the 21st January, 1887:

"Mr. Blake declared that it was even clearer in 1886 than it was in 1882, that a very high scale of duties must be continued on goods such as we can manufacture at home. He added that free trade was not practicable in Canada, and he reaffirmed his statement that there was no possibility in a change of our system of taxation."

The words uttered by the same gentleman, which were quoted the other day by my hon. friend the Minister of Interior, were even stronger than these. In 1872, in 1878, and 1887, the Liberal party, in the Province of Quebec at least, for which Province my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) more specially spoke, was in favor of the National Policy, if not as a political party, at least individually, desiring to be in harmony with the wishes and aspirations of the whole country. I challenge my hon. friend to cite a single fact which would authorise him to speak in the way he has spoken this evening, as representing the opinions and the wishes of the people of the Province of Quebec. I may go further, and say that the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is an attempt, under false colors, and on false pretences, to win the sympathies of the country. Reciprocity with the United States, as we all know, cordial commercial relations with the United States, is popular in this country. We know that a large measure of reciprocity with the United States meets with the sympathies of the population of this Dominion, and my hon. friend's resolution is a move to take an unfair advantage of that sympathy. I will tell the hon. gentleman, and this is not the first time that hon. gentlemen opposite have heard it from Conservative lips, that what the Government of the day desire, and what the people desire, is to have reciprocity with our neighbors in the natural products of the sea, the farm, the mine and the forest. This is the broad reciprocity which we, on this side, have always advocated. My hon. friend quoted the expressions of sympathy which were interchanged between the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Bayard, and the hon. the Minister of Finance in this country, previous to the conference at Washington. The letters on both sides, which the hon. gentleman read, accurately expressed the views, I am sure, of the Governments of both countries, and these, together with the protocols of the conference now before the House, are the only papers that it was in the power of the Government to put before the House, because the Government were bound by the decision of the plenipotentiaries at the conference. My hon. friend, however, has—I do not say,

intentionally, but he has—given an interpretation to the propositions made at the conference, and based conclusions on that interpretation, which certainly should not be allowed to go to the country uncontradicted. He asked how is it that Mr. Bayard wanted to have all these questions of commercial intercourse settled and that Sir Charles Tupper answered in the same sense, and yet when the conference met, the proposals of the British plenipotentiaries for reciprocity were not accepted by the plenipotentiaries of the United States? My hon. friend then drew the conclusion that the reason was that the propositions of the British plenipotentiaries for reciprocity were not framed in that broad, liberal spirit, which inspired the letter from the Secretary of State of the United States. This should not go to the country uncontradicted. There is nothing to warrant such an insinuation. The policy of the Government has repeatedly been enunciated in this House as well as in the Conservative press of this country; the explanations given by the Government will go to the country, and my hon. friend should not have gone further than that. A proposition was made that there should be reciprocity between the two countries according to certain terms and conditions, which necessarily must have been in accordance with the well known desire of the Canadian Government, but all propositions tending to reciprocity were declined by the other party, the American plenipotentiaries wishing to restrict this treaty, and saying that they were bound, by their instructions I suppose, within the limits of the fisheries question. I do not know more than any other hon. member of this House, but we all know what the American press said; what Mr. Bayard and other American politicians have said; we know that the declarations have gone throughout the breadth and length of the United States that no proposition for reciprocity of trade could be entertained by the United States as a subject-matter of the conference and the basis of the intended treaty, because the Senate and Congress would repudiate it, and would repudiate anything in regard to which the plenipotentiaries of the United States went further than the discussion of the fisheries of the Atlantic. On our side, we have never been reticent in saying what we wanted. We have said what the people of this country want, and, when I stated that the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was an attempt to build up a political platform on false pretences and under false colors, I was right. My hon. friends here are desirous to have reciprocity to a certain extent. I do not mean to say that the whole country is in favor of reciprocity in natural products, because, with such an immense frontier as we have, covering different conditions of production, there are some parts of the country in which reciprocity, even in raw products, would be considered objectionable. I know there are some parts of Ontario in which reciprocity in those articles referred to in the Order in Council, read here yesterday by the hon. Minister of Finance, would be objectionable, but we have in this country to give and take. We know that the interests of the Maritime Provinces are not always in accord with the interests of Ontario, but we know that the different parts of the country have to make sacrifices, and that each portion of the community must give something for the general benefit of the whole community. It was a member from the other side of the House who gave me the idea I am just going to express. What will be the verdict of the people on the motion now before the House, and on the policy which my hon. friends are trying to induce the country to adopt? Reciprocity? Yes. Large reciprocity? Yes. But "non"-restricted reciprocity? The people will say no; unrestricted reciprocity we cannot have and will not have, and the people of this country would not allow us to adopt it even if we were willing to do so ourselves. In a country like ours, where we have no foreign policy, the programme of

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

the Government is necessarily more limited than it is in independent countries, and it must be the aim of the Government to build up a national spirit in such a way that all the resources of the country should be developed, that all the institutions of the country should be protected, that the laws of the country should be enacted by the free will of the people, and that the general action of the people and that the general policy of the Government should be untrammelled by any foreign influence. Although, in that way, the legitimate struggle for power may not have the same interest that it would have in independent countries, at least the efforts to gain the confidence of the people has a wide scope, a wide horizon, and wide possibilities for the intelligence and the energies of the people; but I say that this struggle becomes a sinister comedy when we find people constituting one party, in their contention against the other, forgetting their national pride, forgetting the main interests of the people they are representing, and inducing the people to look across the frontier for assistance, in order to barter the interests and the destinies of the nation against the possibilities and chances of a Ministerial defeat. On this question an appeal has been made, I must say, to the low interests of the people. What is it that we are telling the people of this country? We are a nation and we must remain a nation. It is true that we are only five millions of people in an immense territory, larger than the territory of the United States, but we must try and build up this nationality. Our industries may not be as prosperous as they should be, but, if they are not as large as they are on the other side, we must protect ourselves, as the youth must be protected and as the child must be protected; we must protect our industries instead of saying with our hon. friends opposite that our salvation depends upon the assistance of a foreign people, whose interest it is to absorb our country. My hon. friend who spoke before me said that the National Policy was nothing, that it had done nothing except to feed by the spoon some rich capitalists who had made large fortunes and were trying to protect them by combines; that we should not have a National Policy, that, being an agricultural country, we should look only to agricultural pursuits for our prosperity. It is true that the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) took a different ground. He said that if we had free reciprocity in manufactured articles, we would have larger and more prosperous manufactures, but he has forgotten what the people in every part of this country know, that if we had complete reciprocity, or commercial union, or annexation—because that is the last word of the resolution—though we might have larger manufactures, more prosperity if you like, still it would not be our country. The people in this country understand that. They have said yes, and they will say yes, to the building up of our country by protection to our manufacturing interests. My hon. friends may say that they want to educate the public opinion with their theory. They may call it a policy, some of them may call it a theory, but I call it a utopia. Are they speaking for the people of this country? No, they are not. The country spoke in 1878, the country spoke in 1882, and again in 1887. They do not speak for the country. They may say that they want to educate the country, and I do not blame them; but for whom are they speaking? Are they speaking for the United States? They disclaim it, and even if they answered, yes, as I hear that answer made by some hon. gentlemen around me, I would say, no, they do not even represent the public opinion in the United States, if they mean to ask unrestricted reciprocity with independence for the framing of our own tariffs with other countries; they do not represent the sentiment of a single statesman of standing in the United States, in the proposition which they make to-day. And why, Mr. Speaker? Unrestricted reciprocity, without any power to interfere in the tariff of this country by the United States?

Is there any business man in the United States who would say that they wanted reciprocity with us if we, in this country, had a right to fix our own tariff with England, to say, for instance, that we would have a duty of 10 or 20 per cent., while on the other side of the line they would have to impose a duty of 40 or 50 per cent.? No such an idea has taken root in the minds of American statesmen. On this point, I will quote the energetic, if not very parliamentary, expression that was used outside this House, by an hon. member opposite, who said: "Unrestricted reciprocity alone, and not commercial union! The Americans never thought of such arrant nonsense." Yes, Mr. Speaker, this motion is merely an attempt to make the people believe that they would enjoy great material prosperity if they had an immense market for their products. It is true that we would have an immense market for our products, but the manufacturers of the United States would also have our country for their market, and then where would be our products if the American manufacturers were at liberty to compete with ours? I see my hon. friend smiling. I may quote an expression that he used. He said, the greater the market, and the more extensive the plant employed, the cheaper would be the cost of production of any article. But, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what our manufacturers were saying in 1878, when they overthrew the Administration of that time. Then our people were saying, it is true we have the benefit of the American market, but the Americans have the benefit of our market; how can our manufacturers, with their smaller plant, with their smaller capital, compete with the large manufacturers of the United States? It is a law of gravitation that the larger body attracts, and necessarily in the end absorbs the smaller body. Under unrestricted reciprocity the American manufacturers could do as they have already done, make this country a slaughter market and kill off our nascent manufactures. I need not enlarge upon this point. The fact is known to every one. It is a by-word among all the manufacturers and workingmen of this country. Unrestricted reciprocity is an impossibility. It is a theory that hon. gentlemen opposite are discussing, but which the Americans will not consent to. I understand they would consent to commercial union, and those in the United States who favor that scheme do so with the conviction that it would end in annexation. Why have not Mr. Wiman and Mr. Butterworth succeeded in persuading the people of Canada to accept that scheme? They have done everything that men could do to make the movement successful, why have they failed? Because the people of this country understood that under commercial union the fiscal policy of the Dominion of Canada would have to be arranged in conjunction with the tariff of the United States. What is the meaning of that? When, in a company of shareholders, one represents three-fourths of the capital and another represents only one-fourth, we know what course will be taken, we know what the board of directors is, we know what the policy of the company is, and we know the general result of such an association. If a man with a penny and a man with a pound go into partnership, we know very well what the result will be. If the tariffs of the two countries were to be fixed by a joint commission, we know that the policy of the more powerful country would necessarily prevail over the policy of the other. Commercial union has been repudiated by the people. Those who advocated it at first, either in the press or on the hustings, are ashamed of it today. But it is said that it might bring about annexation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I shall not indulge in such magnificent periods as my own friend has done, and say that the man who is true to his native land is the true patriot, and is the true and loyal citizen. That is true, and I tell him this; because we are devoted subjects of our beloved Queen

Victoria, it does not follow that we should give up the interests of our land, if they were to come into conflict with the material interests of the mother country. I agree with the hon. gentleman in what he says about annexation. My hon. friends opposite, at least those from the Province of Quebec, must not be scandalised at the expression; some of their best men in the Province of Quebec have been agitating annexation. They have been making speeches to the people on that question. I say annexation is a question that might be discussed in connection with the future of Canada, but it would not be approved of by the people of this Dominion; it would, I am convinced, be repudiated by the mass of the people. I remember a circumstance that occurred, I am not certain in what year, in an election in Ontario, when a gentleman, a friend of my friend, came before an Ontario audience. It was in the county of Prescott, and not knowing that he was speaking to a population who had not the same ideas as those of his Liberal friends in the Province of Quebec, having been absent a long time from the country, he said in a moment of eloquence, after I had charged some of his friends with having annexation sentiments: Yes, when the question of annexation comes up you will find more people supporting it than you have any idea of." That was before an Ontario audience; and I give my hon. friends opposite credit when I say that the chairman of that meeting, who was a good Reformer, got up and said: "My friend, if you come here from the Province of Quebec only to say such things, the sooner you leave the better for you." But if you say that Canada would be better under the American flag, say it clearly, say it above board, make a platform of it, and then we will discuss it. We are not afraid of the verdict of the people. Even if you were to find dozens of eloquent men, as my hon. friend is, to stand on platforms in the Province of Quebec and say that we are prepared for annexation, I say the good sense and good judgment of my fellow-countrymen will be against them a hundred to one. Yes, Mr. Speaker, on these questions, on a question like this we are now discussing, it is not the politicians, the statesmen, who can impose such questions on the people. When bread and butter is at the bottom of a question it is the people themselves, the masses themselves, that give the word; those who in public appear to be teachers are nothing but the echoes of the masses of the people themselves. On some abstract questions men can dictate to the people, they can elaborate certain opinions and impose them on the people; but on a question of policy like this it is the voice of the people that first decides; and the voice of the people is against you. Your statistics may be ingenious, and you may be able to make them prove anything you want, but the only statistics I want are statistics of the sentiments and feelings of the people; and those are against you. Free trade is in the hearts of the people of England; and why? Because in England after long years, I might say after centuries of well digested, of well guided, of well applied protection, the manufacturing genius of the English people has acquired a perfection that cannot be surpassed or equalled. Manufacturing capital in England challenges and defies all competition, and in a country like England where the largest possibilities of production have been attained, cheap living is the desideratum of the working classes. Free trade is in the hearts of the people of England, whatever might be the difficulties which at the present moment it might entail on the financial condition of the country. On the other hand, Protection is in the hearts of the people of the United States; and why? Is it because the genius for manufacturing industries has not developed there? It has to an immense extent. It has so much that American manufacturers are the rivals of Great Britain in almost all the markets of the world. Why is protection still in the hearts of the people of the United States? It is, and will be, so long as there is a productive south, an extensive west,

affording opportunities for the activity and intelligence of the sons of their workmen, of their numberless immigrants, to progress under the protective policy which has done so great benefit in the past. But it is still more in the hearts of the people of the United States, because the people feel that the grand structure they have built requires further time to become consolidated so as to defy the world. Again, why is it in the hearts of the people of the United States? It is, perhaps, because in their view of developing manufacturing industries they look to this northern part of the continent as being very soon or in the future, to become one of the accessories of the great republic, not by war, not by coercion but by the good policy they have impressed upon the minds of their people, a policy which our Government are trying to impress on the minds of the people of this country. Should we not pursue the same course, should we not build up our own prosperity, our own national spirit and our own nation? We are doing it. Again I say that the hearts of the people are not with hon. gentlemen opposite on the question covered by this resolution. I was saying a moment ago that my hon. friends opposite had changed their views, at least in the Province of Quebec on the subject. Up to the time the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) came into power those were the sentiments of my hon. friends, and I say—and I speak knowingly—that, in 1877, at the time when my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) joined the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie, there was in the Province of Quebec, in his own party, a strong movement to try and impress upon the leader of the then Government the desirability of taking up a policy of protection for manufactures, so as to gain the support of the people of our Province. I am not revealing a secret, it is now in the domain of history, but that celebrated manifesto and protest signed by so many members of the Liberal party in Quebec, which was presented to the leader of the Government just at the moment when my hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) was entering the Administration, that protest, which stated that the members of the Government from Quebec were not having their views carried into effect, and that they had no influence on the fiscal policy of the Government, that document which represented two-thirds of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, really was an earnest appeal in favor of a National Policy, and to its refusal by the leader of the Government is attributed the first defeat of my hon. friend in Drummond and Arthabaska, and, a year after, the defeat of his party and of the Government. Mr. Speaker, I have heard before hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House declare that no great question should be placed before Parliament unless the will of the people had been manifested in a certain manner. We have had the expression of public opinion about commercial union; commercial union has broken down and disappeared. We have had now three weeks' debate, and before the debate took place there was a notice of motion which took another week. Where are the petitions presented to Parliament asking for unrestricted reciprocity? From what county have we had expressions of opinion in favor of the movement? I have heard some hon. members say they were in favor of it. I heard the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), the other day state that we were essentially an agricultural race, that manufactures would spoil our population in Quebec, that manufactures had a deleterious influence over the people, and that the policy of the Government was the reason why such a large number of the population had emigrated from the Province of Quebec to the United States. My hon. friend from Bellechasse only forgot to say one thing. Why are French Canadians emigrating to the United States; for what reason do they go there, and where do they go? Do they go there as agriculturists? No, they go there to work in the factories; and I believe

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

that if our manufactures were better developed in this country than they have been up to the present time emigration would almost cease. I have already said that the period of the greatest emigration to the States was during the time of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. But is the emigration now as large as my hon. friends opposite are pleased to say it is? I say, no; and, strange as it may be, my authority for this assertion is one of the papers on which my hon. friends opposite will not cast suspicion. I quote now from the *Montreal Witness* of the 4th April:

"For some weeks back the incoming trains from the United States have had more passengers belonging to the working classes on them than usual at this season of the year. Heretofore large gangs left for the brickfields and other industries in the State of Massachusetts, but this year that state of affairs has been reversed. Not only the breadwinners are returning but their families and they are bringing with them large quantities of their household effects; so much so that extra help has been put on to handle the baggage and see it delivered safely at its destination. Very few of the passengers come through to Montreal compared with the large number that get off at the different way stations this side of the line between St. Lambert's and St. Armand's. They have been gradually increasing until extra cars have had to be put on to carry the people and their baggage back to their native place in Canada."

Mr. FISHER. Read the entire article.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think there is enough there to prove what I have said but I will finish it. I did not know that my hon. friends on the other side of the House had been so much interested in the article, but it appears now they must have seen the article and that it was touching a little upon their toes. They have seen that it has a certain bearing on the discussion, and I am glad to see that they have read it. My friend has asked me to continue the article and I will do so:

"A *Witness* reporter asked the father of a family of thirteen children—"

That is a good exodus from the United States,—

—"the cause of so many of the French Canadians returning to Canada. He said the different factories had been shut down for the most part,"—

Is it that my hon. friends would insist on my reading?

—"as they considered they had a sufficient stock on hand for present demands."

Do my hon. friends want me to continue with the article? I do not indulge much in reading the *Witness*, but it is an interesting paper at times, and I will continue:

"Have they any more now than they have had for two or three years back?" asked the newspaper man."

I do not know who the hon. member is on the other side who suggested that question,—

"Oh, no," was the reply, "but we have been informed that another presidential election will take place next fall which may bring about a good many changes in the tariff which might prove ruinous to manufacturers if they had a large stock on hand, and this is the reason they give for throwing us out of employment."

Some hon. MEMBERS Read on; is there any more?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is all; I cannot read more because it is the entire article. But I am thankful to the interrupter who has given me a chance of showing one thing more than I intended when I began to read that article, and that is that American artisans are so much afraid that the result of the next presidential campaign might be against protection, that even now they are beginning to emigrate to Canada for protection. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to continue the discussion any further. I do not wish to take the time of the House any longer and I will close my remarks. Before concluding I beg to apologise to the House if I have not put my remarks in as good a form as my hon. friend who spoke before me has done. At all events I speak as I feel, and I feel very strongly on this subject. The whole *résumé* of the argument of my friends on the other side against the Government is this:

They say to us: "We want more manufactures, we want Americans to come here and manufacture for us; we are not satisfied with the strides this country has made during the last twenty years, and especially during the last ten years under the policy of the Government. We want to have the same impetus in the way of progress that the American Union has had." Mr. Speaker, I challenge this assertion, and I think I am right in saying that Canada during the last ten years has made greater strides in the road of progress and prosperity than even the American Union has done in comparison to its population. And, Mr. Speaker, what authority shall I give you to prove this? I shall give you the authority of the Americans themselves. Not long ago I read in an American paper an article saying that if the Americans allowed this country to go on as we were going, if they allowed the Government of this country to follow the policy we had been following, that we would see greater progress, greater advancement and greater superiority in this country than could be claimed even by the spread-eagleism of American papers for the United States. The arguments of my hon. friends are that the Government has over-estimated the capacity of this country in the liabilities which have been undertaken during the last twenty years. I say that this argument is not only a false notion, but that it is also a false teaching to the people. This teaching has been repeated for the last twenty-five years, and the answer to it is found in the lists of the money markets of the world. In 1867, as a young man, I used to hear in my county the same arguments and the same speeches as we hear to-day—that the Conservative Government was leading the country to ruin, and that in a few years we would be bankrupt; but we are not bankrupt yet. I find by the *Economist*, the leading financial paper of England, that in 1866, in the month of August, Canadian 5 per cents were quoted at 76, and 6 per cents at 90-91, and in the month of November the 5 per cents had risen in view of Confederation to 81-82, and the 6 per cents to 96½-97½. That was at the time my hon. friends on the other side were saying that Confederation was going to ruin the country, when the ambition of the Prime Minister was to make a grand country on this North American continent. What was the course of our securities from 1867 to 1878? I see by the same financial paper that in December, 1878, Canadian 6 per cents were quoted at 101-105.

Mr. JONES. That is because you got the Maritime Provinces in to give you credit.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. So much for the scheme of Confederation which was denounced by the hon. gentleman; and I hope that Nova Scotia, with her good representatives, my hon. friend included, will still contribute to put higher the credit of Canadian securities.

Mr. JONES. You have been telling us that the small country always suffers by connection with the larger.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am very sorry the enthusiasm the interruption has raised has prevented me hearing the hon. gentleman's remark. I was about to say that our 6 per cents in 1878 were quoted at 101-105, and our 4 per cents, maturing in 1904, were quoted at the same time at 89-91. Then, if we come to that worst period of all according to hon. gentlemen opposite, the period of the present Administration, we find the same 4 per cents quoted on March 22, 1888, at 115-117. Our 3½ per cents securities, one-half per cent. only less than the new consols of England, were quoted on the same date at 108-110. We generally say that we are better appreciated by our neighbors than we can be appreciated at home; but there is another saying which is very true, and I apply it to my hon. friend with his poetical quotations, and with all his great prophecies: "Nobody is a prophet in his own country." The Opposition for the past twenty-five years have been prophets

of evil, and it has been for the good of the country that their prophecies have never been fulfilled. My hon. friend quoted the opinion of one of his friends, the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier), with regard to the industrial movement in that city, and stated that Mr. Boaz, who I think is at the head of a worsted woollen manufactory there, had sent a telegram to the effect that he would like to see reciprocity with the United States, because with it he would sell his products better than he does now. I would ask my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe, who had some interests in the manufactures of that locality in 1878, if those manufactures were not nearly bankrupt at that time? I might quote to him the evidence of one of the most successful manufacturers in this country, Mr. Côté, of St. Hyacinthe, and I would ask him to say whether protection has not done the industrial interests of this country not only an immense good, but removed them from the danger of bankruptcy which was threatening them if the Americans had been allowed to continue to make the country a slaughter market. In 1878 the woollen manufacturers of St. Hyacinthe were on the brink of bankruptcy, now they are prosperous; and I give credit to that little town, Liberal as it is. That enterprising town has not only approved of the National Policy, which the hon. gentleman has denounced, but on top of the protection given by the Government, it has voted liberal bonuses to manufactures. That little town has proved that protection was good even when it went one better than the Government. I say, that if the Government were doing what my hon. friends were saying they were doing, over-estimating the capacity of the people in the work of the development of the country, that error would be readily forgiven by the people. The electors will always be for a policy that is on the side of hope and progress, for a policy that looks to the building up of a nation; and the electorate will always hold that a policy of hope, of progress, of the building up of a nationality, should be the great aim and object of a Government worthy of the trust of the country. In carrying out what is said in the motion in amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster); in declaring that we desire, as good Americans also desire, to have the best of feeling and larger trade relations between the two countries, while taking care to give due consideration to the interests of our own manufacturing industries, this House will give a verdict in accord with the good of the people and the wishes of the country.

Mr. FLYNN. It is not my intention to occupy the time of the House at any length, as this great question has been ably and exhaustively discussed by hon. gentlemen who preceded me on this side, but I feel that I would not fairly discharge the duty I owe to those I have the honor to represent, if I gave a silent vote on a question so important as this. I desire also to say that I do not approach the discussion of this question in any party spirit. Had the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) been moved by any member of the Government or by any of their supporters, or had a resolution embodying the same principle been moved by them, it would have equally received my support and approval. I look upon this question as too broad and comprehensive, as affecting too closely the interests of all classes in this Dominion, to be discussed from the narrow standpoint of party. I support the resolution for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, because I believe it would be of great benefit to the Dominion. I know that unrestricted reciprocity would be of great benefit to the Maritime Provinces, and I know that an overwhelming majority of the people of the Lower Provinces would view any measure embodying that policy with a great deal of favor. Much has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite against the resolution, but their arguments may be narrowed down to two: disloyalty and injury to our manufacturing industries.

There was one gentleman from the Province of Nova Scotia who addressed the House on the resolution, with whose manner I was pleased, but I was surprised at some of the statements that he made. I allude to the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny). That hon. gentleman declared that, on this side, we said our people were not prosperous, that our people were not contented, and that they were forced to go to the neighboring republic in search of employment. He denied that our people were leaving the country, and he contended that the National Policy had established factories all over the land which gave employment to our people, and enabled them to live happily at home. Let me take the eastern part of Nova Scotia. In dealing with this question, I will speak of that section of country with which I am most familiar. I will take the four counties of Cape Breton, the two adjoining counties, Antigonish and Guysboro', making six counties with a population of over 120,000, and I will take the neighboring Province of Prince Edward Island with a population of 108,000 and I say that the National Policy has not built one factory in eastern Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island. Take the county of Halifax, which has a population of 65,000, with the exception of three factories that were brought into existence through its influence, there is none in all eastern Nova Scotia, including the county of Halifax. It is true the National Policy has built up three industries there: two sugar refineries and a cotton factory. But what was the result? All the original stock of the sugar refinery in the city of Halifax was completely lost, and \$100,000 was due to the bank of which this hon. gentleman was president. The hon. gentleman knows also that the refinery, which was started into existence at Dartmouth under the auspices of the National Policy, had scarcely begun running when it also collapsed. It is true these refineries are again running, and may perhaps be doing a little business, but the result I have given was the result in the first instance. The cotton factory was started under the auspices of the National Policy, and now I believe the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny) would not give fifty cents in the dollar for its stock if it was on the market to-morrow for sale. So much for the three factories brought into existence in Nova Scotia. We had some factories in the Maritime Provinces before the introduction of the National Policy. We had three very important factories: Logan's factory in Pictou county, Nova Scotia, the Londonderry steel works in the county of Colchester, represented by the Postmaster General, and Parks cotton factory in New Brunswick. These three factories, under the revenue tariff, previous to the introduction of the National Policy, were able to keep afloat, but after the introduction of the National Policy they collapsed and went to ruin under its benign influence. It would have been better had the hon. gentleman, when he made the statement that our people were employed happily at home in our factories, stated to the House what factories the National Policy had brought into existence in Nova Scotia, and what people were employed in them. Hon. gentlemen on this side, when they made statements that numbers of our people were leaving this country, forced to leave it for the want of employment, were charged with decrying the country. It is certainly not pleasant to have to say that people are forced to leave Canada, but, as representatives of the people, we have a solemn duty to perform, and whether hon. gentlemen opposite call the performance of that duty decrying the country or not, the statements are true, and we are justified in making them. I speak with more particular information of the section of country which I represent, and I say that our people have been leaving and are still leaving that section in large numbers for the States. No later than the other day, I received a letter from a friend of mine in the county I represent, who said:

Mr. FLYNN.

"Hundreds are leaving for the States. The agent of Hawkesbury sold, I am informed, seventy-five tickets in one day this week for Boston."

In another letter my informant tells me:

"The steamer *Rimouski* continues running here. She has taken a great number of our people within the last fortnight, many of them Frenchmen, who are going to the States. I am told there is a large number preparing to leave between this and the first of April."

I know that last year large numbers left not to return, bringing their families with them, and taking up their domiciles in the United States; and the same emigration continues this year, notwithstanding any statements of hon. gentlemen opposite to the contrary. So far from the National Policy being a benefit, I look upon it as the greatest evil that could have befallen the lower Provinces. Now, as to the other arguments that have been adduced in opposition to the resolution moved by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and that have been given to the House as evidence of the prosperity of the Dominion of Canada. One is the deposits in the savings banks. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), exultantly pointed to the amount of the deposits in the savings banks in Nova Scotia, and in the Dominion, and said it was absurd for anyone to deny that this was a test and a proof of the prosperity of the people. At the outset, I say that it is no test. I say that the deposits in the savings banks are no test of the prosperity or wealth of this country, and that it is absurd to say that the increase of the deposits in the savings banks is any evidence of an increase in our prosperity. Let me call your attention to the condition of affairs in 1873, which was one of the most prosperous years that we have known in this country. The Finance Minister, in his Budget speech of that year, congratulated the House and the country on the prosperity which existed, and he might well do so. In that year, our imports amounted to \$127,514,594, and our exports to \$89,789,922, the imports exceeding the imports of 1886 by \$28,000,000 and the exports exceeding the exports of 1886 by \$4,500,000. That was one of the most prosperous years in the history of the Dominion of Canada. That was admitted on all sides, and this is the evidence that it has never been exceeded in the amount of the trade we did in any year before or since. Well, we find that in that year, the deposits in the savings banks amounted to \$10,221,393. We are all aware that a wave of depression swept over this country just after that time, which continued from 1874 to 1879, and I believe there was no more depressed period in the commercial history of Canada before or since. If this savings banks doctrine is true, the savings and accumulations of the years of prosperity should have been taken out during the years of depression, but was that the case? Not at all. I find that, during the period of depression, during the period that hon. gentlemen opposite talked about the "flies on the wheel," and said that the country was going to ruin, the deposits in the savings banks were increasing from year to year until, from \$10,000,000 in 1873 they reached, in 1879, \$15,375,124, or, during that period of depression the deposits in the savings banks increased by more than 50 per cent. If, during the period of depression, there was a continual yearly increase in the deposits in the savings banks, I would ask hon. gentlemen how those deposits can be an evidence of prosperity, I would ask them how they can say that this is the true test of the wealth and prosperity of the people? I think it is so absurd that I shall not further waste the time of the House upon it. But, if it is a true test of the prosperity of the people, and an index of the wealth and progress of the country, let me call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the savings banks deposits in the New England States. I will take the six States in New England and give you the population of each and the deposits in the savings banks.

	Population.	Deposits.
Maine	648,930	\$ 35,111,600
New Hampshire.....	346,991	47,213,219
Vermont	332,286	11,723,625
Massachusetts	1,783,000	274,996,413
Rhode Island	276,500	51,816,390
Connecticut	622,700	92,188,426
Totals	4,010,526	\$ 513,345,572

From this we find that these six States in New England, with a population less than the population of Canada, have savings banks deposits amounting to over \$500,000,000, or an amount equal to \$125 for every man, woman and child; while we in Canada had, in 1886, an amount of \$38,173,813, or about \$7.50 per head of the population. Those six States had something over \$513,000,000, while we had only \$38,000,000. The little State of Rhode Island, with a population a little more than one-half the population of Nova Scotia, and possessing none of her natural advantages, without her wealth of soil, her inexhaustible fisheries, and her great mineral resources, had an amount deposited in the savings banks of over \$51,000,000—a great deal more than the amount of the deposits in the whole Dominion of Canada. Still hon. gentlemen opposite will persist in giving us the savings banks deposits as an evidence of the progress and prosperity of the country. I repeat what I said at the outset, that there was nothing in it, and that it was no test whatever of the progress and prosperity of the country. The people of the Maritime Provinces, having realised the benefits flowing from the limited Treaty of 1854, are fully satisfied that unrestricted trade with the United States would be of vast benefit to them. Trade hampered and restricted as ours is with the country nearest to us must injure and has injured the Maritime Provinces very much. There can be no better proof of the value and advantage of unrestricted reciprocity to the people of the Maritime Provinces at all events, and I think to the people of the whole Dominion, than the progress which was made during the existence of the Treaty of 1854. From the first year of that treaty, our trade with the United States steadily increased until its termination. For a period of nine years previous to the Treaty of 1854, our trade with the United States had only increased \$12,000,000. In 1845 it was \$3,000,000, and in 1854, \$20,000,000. The very first year of the treaty, it increased from \$20,000,000 to \$33,000,000, \$13,000,000 in one year, \$1,000,000 more than the total increase during a period of nine years previous to the treaty. This increase continued year after year until, in 1866, the last year of the treaty, it had reached the enormous sum of \$84,000,000. During the existence of the treaty, a period of 12 years, our trade had increased \$64,000,000, while, during a period of nine years previous, it had only increased \$12,000,000. What do we find the very first year of its abrogation? When the treaty was abrogated in 1866 and the restrictive duties became operative again, there was a falling off in our trade with the United States of \$27,000,000. Let me call your attention again to the effect which this had on the Maritime Provinces, for I have been referring to the trade of the whole Dominion. The trade of Nova Scotia with the States amounted, in 1854, to \$4,500,000; in 1866 it amounted to \$7,300,000. The trade of New Brunswick with the United States amounted, in 1854, to \$4,050,000; in 1866, to \$5,300,000. The trade of Prince Edward Island with the United States amounted, in 1854, to \$280,000; in 1865—the Island fiscal year closing in December—the trade was \$1,050,000, while the increase in the other Provinces was very great indeed. The increase in the trade of the Island was marvellous, amounting to over 400 per cent. These figures show what great advantage the Reciprocity Treaty was to these three Provinces during its existence. Now, Sir, I have a statement here, from which it appears that while the treaty was in exist-

ence our population kept on steadily increasing, but after its abrogation the population decreased. This appears from the following statement:—

	1851.	1871.	Percentage of increase.
Nova Scotia.....	276,851	387,800	40.0
New Brunswick	193,800	285,594	47.4
Prince Edward Island.....	87,000	96,226	40.3
Totals	537,654	767,415	42.7
	1871.	1881.	
Nova Scotia.....	387,800	440,572	14.3
New Brunswick	285,594	321,233	12.5
Prince Edward Island.....	96,226	108,891	15.8
Totals	767,451	870,696	13.5

Reducing these percentages to the base of yearly increase we get:

	Average increase per year.
42.7 per cent. in 20 years	2.135
13.5 do 10 do	1.035

Now, if, during those 12 years, we increased so much more rapidly than during the following ten years, it is fair to assume that if the whole term had been under reciprocity, our progress in population would have been twice as rapid as it was in the period without reciprocity. I have given this evidence of the progress of the country during the existence of that treaty as a proof of the great advantage we would derive from a renewal of it. At all events, to the people of the Maritime Provinces, it is a question of vital importance, more particularly to the fishermen. I have the honor to represent a constituency largely engaged in the fishing industry, and I know how much that industry has suffered from the duties it has to pay on fish now exported to the United States, and I know how many of our fishermen leave, year after year, to man American fishing vessels, because, as was stated the other night, the man who fishes in a Nova Scotia fishing vessel labors under a disadvantage as compared with a Nova Scotian who fishes in an American fishing vessel; he saves so much duty on his codfish, and \$2 a barrel on his mackerel. Now, it was stated here the other night by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) that the United States was the only market for our mackerel. That statement is correct; I state also that the only market for the mackerel produced by the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, is the United States. But, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the testimony of these two hon. gentlemen, let me give the testimony of an hon. gentleman whose opinion will be accepted with the highest respect, at least by hon. gentlemen opposite—I allude to the Premier. In 1871, in discussing the Washington Treaty, in this House, the Premier said:

"They are so anxious to get free admission of their fish into the American market that they would view with great sorrow any action of this House which would exclude them from that market, that they look forward with increasing confidence to a large development of their trade, and of that great industry, and I say that being the case—if it be to the interest of the fishermen and for the advantage of that branch of national industry, setting aside all other considerations, we ought not wilfully to injure that interest. Why, Sir, what is the fact of the case as it stands? The only market for the Canadian No. 1 mackerel in the world is the United States. That is our only market and we are practically excluded from it by the present duty. The consequence of that is that our fishermen are at the mercy of the American fishermen. They are made the hewers of wood and the drawers of water for the Americans.

They are obliged to sell their fish at the Americans own price. The American fishermen purchase their fish at a nominal value and control the American market. The great profits of the trade are handed over to the American fishermen or the American merchants, engaged in the trade, and they profit to the loss of our own industry and our own people."

Again, in the same speech on that occasion, in alluding to the period during the existence of the Treaty of 1854, he said:

"More goods were imported than ever before, commerce was brisk, stores were open and profits made which never would have been realised but for the existence of the treaty."

Again the Premier said on that occasion:

"That our fisheries are valuable, I am well aware. Their value, under favorable conditions, could not be overestimated, but that value will be great or small, just in proportion to the markets we possess."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could use no more expressive or powerful language than this, to show the value of the markets of the United States to the fishermen of the Lower Provinces. There was one other point thrown out, with which I will deal briefly, that is the question of direct taxation. It was stated here by some hon. gentlemen that we levied \$7,000,000 in customs duties on imports from the United States, and that if the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford was to come into effect, and we were to have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, we would lose this revenue of \$7,000,000, and that this loss could only be made up by direct taxation. Mr. Speaker, I deny that, I deny that one dollar of direct taxation would have to be levied on the people of this country as a result of reciprocity. In 1878 the present Finance Minister, then in Opposition, stated, when the expenditure under the Mackenzie Administration amounted to \$22,500,000, that it was more than enough to govern this country, and he stated in this House that if he and his friends were again restored to power, they were capable in the future, as they had in the past, of governing this country wisely, economically and well, but within certain bounds and limits. What were those limits? Within the limits of \$22,000,000 or \$23,000,000. That same statement was made by Sir Leonard Tilley (then Mr. Tilley) the member for St. John. He stated that the Mackenzie Administration was extravagant, and that an expenditure of \$23,000,000 was more than was needed to govern this country. Now, Mr. Speaker, what was the expenditure last year? I think it was \$36,000,000—I am speaking from memory. If it was \$36,000,000 it would be something like \$13,000,000 in excess of what those hon. gentlemen said was necessary. If you take \$7,000,000 from the \$13,000,000 you still have \$6,000,000 left, and adding that to the \$23,000,000 would give \$29,000,000, even without the \$7,000,000, which hon. gentlemen opposite say we would lose. We will suppose that if unrestricted reciprocity came into force we lost the \$7,000,000. Who pays that amount? Those are duties on goods which are now paid by the people of the Dominion. If we had unrestricted reciprocity the people of Canada instead of paying \$7,000,000 in duties, would be purchasing the same goods for \$7,000,000 less. But supposing there was a loss to the revenue of the country, is there any way of balancing the account by retrenchment? I say there is. There are many items on which retrenchment can be made. In the first place, if we had unrestricted reciprocity we could save \$150,000 annually expended on the protection of our fisheries. No less than \$27,000 has been expended on the Railway Commission and \$24,000 on the Labor Commission up to date. a total expenditure of over \$50,000, and whatever benefit it may be to Ontario or Quebec, I unhesitatingly say that it will be of no benefit to the people of Nova Scotia. Then there is the Franchise Act, which is not necessary in my opinion, which costs \$500,000. That amount could be saved. Then there is the expenditure on immigration,

Mr. FLYNN.

regarding which the policy of the Government has been changed this year. That amount could be saved. Then there is the Militia expenditure, a large amount of which is unnecessary, there is a large expenditure also for the Mounted Police, and there are also various items on which a saving could be effected if a policy of retrenchment were pursued. But above and beyond all, if we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, I maintain that such would be the prosperity of the country that the volume of dutiable goods from other countries would so greatly increase, and the purchasing power of the people would be so much enlarged, as to make up any deficiency for the loss sustained. Give us reciprocity, and there is nobody in Nova Scotia who will fear to face the \$7,000,000 deficiency. Two of the main arguments used by hon. gentlemen who opposed the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) are the disloyalty argument and the loss to our manufacturers. I fail to see how the exchange of a few barrels of fish or a few bushels of potatoes with our neighbors across the border could affect our loyalty. Of course, since the Finance Minister spoke yesterday afternoon, the opposition to the resolution has taken quite a different turn. The resolution was opposed outright by the amendment of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but yesterday during discussion the Finance Minister said it was the policy of the Government now, as it had been their policy before, to obtain reciprocity in natural products. Therefore, he has relieved us from the crime of disloyalty so far as natural products are concerned. The free exchange of manufactured goods would be an overt act of treason compassing the death of Her Majesty, according to the views of some hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me go back as far as the year 1847. Such a depression of trade prevailed at that time in Upper and Lower Canada that a petition was sent to Her Majesty asking the Imperial Government to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States. Nothing came of it, but it resulted in the annexation movement of 1849. We had a Treaty in 1854 in natural products, and also a treaty in 1871, and if that treaty was not more extended it was because the British commissioners could not get a more extended treaty. There was no disloyalty then in regard to those who framed the treaty for an interchange of commodities with the United States; and if we ask more extended terms for an interchange of manufactures as well as natural products, are we open to the charge of disloyalty? Not at all. If it was not disloyal at that time, it cannot be disloyal now. Let me quote from the Minute of Council of 1855, when the present Premier, then leading the Government of that day, was negotiating for a renewal of the treaty. It has already been quoted, but it is one of those documents which it is necessary to bring forward because of the contentions put forward by hon. members, and in fact the Secretary of State himself used the word "annexation" 50 or 60 times during his speech and the whole tendency of his utterances was not to meet by argument the resolution of unrestricted reciprocity and to show that it would be an injury to Canada, but he sought to lead the people off the track by inducing them to believe it would bring on annexation. That is the reason I quote this statement from the Minute of Council in 1855, in which it is stated:

"Under the beneficent operation of the system of self-government which the later policy of the mother country has accorded to Canada in common with the other colonies possessing representative institutions combined with the advantages secured by the Reciprocity Treaty of an unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbors in the natural productions of the two countries all agitation for organic changes has ceased, all dissatisfaction with the existing political relations of the Provinces has wholly disappeared."

In the same document in urging upon the British Government the necessity for renewing the treaty they say:

"They cannot err in directing the attention of the English Government to the connection which is usually found to exist between the

material prosperity and the political contentment of a people, for in doing so they feel that they are appealing to the highest motives that can actuate patriotic statesmen—the desire to perpetuate a Dominion, founded on the affectionate allegiance of a prosperous and contented people.”

Here we have it laid down as a doctrine that political contentment exists with material prosperity. Thus if we had material prosperity under the Treaty of 1854 we had the assurance that we would have that prosperity increased under the treaty for unrestricted reciprocity between Canada and the United States, and having that prosperity we would have contentment. If there is an annexation feeling existing to-day, and I know it does exist, so long as we are shut out of the neighboring republic it will exist, so long as trade is depressed, so long as we have high tariffs on both sides it will exist. Let us have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States to-morrow, and a free interchange of natural and manufactured products, and that feeling will disappear at once, because I believe no matter what the form of government may be, there will be contentment if there is prosperity. It was said in 1878, when the present Premier, then in Opposition, moved his resolution, that it was not for a protective policy but a readjustment of the tariff—that its main object was to secure a reciprocity of trade. They knew the Maritime Provinces would oppose a protective policy, that it would be injurious to their best interests, and it was then said they asked for a protective policy in order to obtain reciprocity. It was a readjustment of the tariff or a reciprocity of tariff leading up to a reciprocity of trade. Here was the statement:

“Will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of the reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors as far as the various interests of Canada may demand will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade.”

It has not developed that inter-provincial trade. The inter-provincial trade has been one-sided, because, as has been repeatedly said, you cannot legislate against geography. The people of Ontario do sell us a lot of goods, but we sell them nothing in return. They take none of our farm produce, because it is too far and too costly to send to them; they take none of our coal, because that is bulky and costly and they cannot take it, but they buy American coal notwithstanding the duty upon it. It is true that the Province of Quebec may have taken some coal from the Province of Nova Scotia, but how has this happened? As was stated here to-night, it was done at the expense of the people of the Dominion of Canada. You send it from Pictou to Quebec a distance of 637 miles at 80 cents a ton, 20 cents less than we have to pay from Pictou to the place where I live. That is the way you force that inter-provincial trade. I shall say nothing in reference to the standing offer, as enough has been said on that question within the last few days. The cry of loyalty is one used as a bugbear to frighten weak-minded people, but I do not think it will have much effect. The people of Canada have always had a strong attachment to the mother country. It is the land of our fathers, and everyone of us feels strongly attached to the old country. But we have another land. There is this Canada. It is our home, and we in Parliament who are entrusted with the legislation of the country should have as our aim and our object, to legislate in that direction in which we may advance and promote the best interests of Canada. That is the true way, and it should be the true object of every Canadian legislator. Now, Sir, in addition to the benefit from a commercial point of view, there is another good result that would follow from unrestricted reciprocity. If we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States it would settle the fishery question, that question which has time and again given rise to serious complications between England and the United States, and one that may at any time, by an act of imprudence on the part of an officer in charge of one of our police vessels, involve both countries in serious

difficulties. I say that in addition to the commercial advantages that would follow from unrestricted reciprocity the settlement of this question would be one very desirable result. We must protect our fisheries. They are ours by solemn compact. We have certain rights that foreign fishermen are excluded from. We have always been willing, and are willing still, in consideration of a fair equivalent, to give within our territorial waters the same rights as we possess ourselves, but until we get that fair equivalent those fisheries must be protected, and during their protection serious difficulties may arise which it would be well if we could avoid, and I believe that only by unrestricted reciprocity can we avoid them. I believe, Sir, that the overwhelming majority of the people of this Dominion favor the resolution submitted by the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)—all but the manufacturing class. But, Sir, all those engaged in the manufacturing industry are not opposed to unrestricted reciprocity. I saw the other day in one of the leading journals of Toronto forty or fifty names of leading manufacturers who were in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, and I have heard gentlemen on this side of the House name others who are not afraid of that policy. I cannot see what our manufacturers have to fear. With all the modern appliances, unrivalled water power, cheap machinery, cheap raw material, with as cheap labor as they can procure in the United States, with proper care, and proper supervision over their industries, what have Canadian manufacturers to fear? Nothing whatever, Mr. Speaker. Under unrestricted reciprocity, in place of 5,000,000 consumers they would have 65,000,000, and, therefore, they have nothing to fear. But suppose some of those industries would suffer; is the limited few engaged directly and indirectly in the manufacturing industries of this country to stand in the way of the prosperity of the great majority? Let us compare the few engaged in the manufacturing industries, or those who get employment from them, with the lumbermen, with the fishermen, the farmers, the mechanics, the laborers, and all the other classes who are not benefited in the slightest, but who are oppressed by this system of taxation which protects the manufacturing industries. Our total exports in 1886 were \$80,000,000. Our export of manufactured goods was \$3,000,000 and the exports of the forest, mines, fisheries and the soil were \$77,000,000. Here we have an export of \$80,000,000 and only \$3,000,000 of which was exported by manufacturers, and yet we are asked to stay our hand and not to accept reciprocity with the United States because we will injure the manufacturers in this Dominion by so doing. We have engaged in agricultural pursuits, 657,281 people; laborers, 165,000; fishermen and other occupations, over 250,000, making a total of 1,580,000. I take those statistics from a book issued by the Agricultural Department, the Statistical Record of 1886. Of those engaged in manufactures we have 2,390, of operatives 5,846, or 8,236 as compared with over 1,000,000 engaged in other pursuits, and yet we are asked to continue this high system of taxation in order to protect the few, when the vast majority of the population suffer from it. Now, Sir, unrestricted reciprocity would not only give us a market for our natural products, but would give a great stimulus to the development of our mineral resources. We have in this Dominion a great many valuable mineral deposits, particularly in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, and they only await capital for their development. If we had unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, the necessary capital would flow in and employment would be given to the people and our mines would be developed. The amendment moved by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), refers to reciprocity in our coasting trade. It is not necessary for me to say much on this, because we all know that it would be of immense advantage to us if we could have the coasting trade of the States given for reciprocal privileges on our side, and it would be a great boon to the people of the

Maritime Provinces if we could have the reciprocal right of registering our vessels in the United States. Much has been said about it being beneath the dignity of Canada to approach the United States, and we were pointed out the standing or statutory offer as regards reciprocal arrangements. Now, Mr. Speaker, I see nothing undignified on the part of Canada approaching the United States, but we need not approach them, as they have approached us by Mr. Bayard. In order to have this fishery question settled, he has invited Sir Charles Tupper in these words, in his letter of last May:

"It is evident that the commercial intercourse between the inhabitants of Canada and those of the United States, has grown into too vast proportions to be exposed much longer to this wordy triangular duel, and more direct and responsible methods should be resorted to. Your own able, earnest and patriotic services in the Government and Parliament of the Dominion are well known, and afford ample proof of your comprehension of the resources, rapidly increasing interests and needs of British North America. On the other hand, I believe I am animated by an equal desire to serve my own country. I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

In reply to that, Sir Charles Tupper said:

"I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

Now, Sir, here is a proposition by Mr. Bayard, the United States Secretary of State, in which Sir Charles Tupper concurred, and I concur in it also. I believe, Sir, that it is the only way to settle the fishery question—that the only true solution of that difficulty must be founded on a basis of unrestricted commerce between the two countries. Now, it is said that the United States abrogated both the treaty of 1854 and the treaty of 1871. That is true, but what were the reasons? Under the Treaty of 1854, by which we had an interchange of natural products only, I believe Canada had the best of the bargain; but we all know the unfortunate attitude assumed by England towards the United States in regard to the war that raged in the Union. Not only England, but Canada largely sympathised with the South, and such was the feeling in the United States against England on that account that the American Government took the earliest opportunity to give notice of the abrogation of that treaty. Under the Treaty of 1871, \$5,000,000 were awarded to Canada for the use of our fisheries, but that was only for ten years. The Americans believed, whether rightly or wrongly, that they were giving too much, and the only way to avoid paying any more was to give notice of the abrogation of the treaty. But to-day we find a better feeling in the United States; we find that this question of freer commercial relations has been discussed by the leading men there and has been brought before Congress; and if there ever was an opportune moment to approach the United States on this great and important question, it is the present. If there is one reason more than another that would induce me to look with favor on the treaty recently negotiated at Washington, it is the hope that its adoption would lead to kinder and more friendly feelings between the two countries, and tend to bring about unrestricted reciprocity. I believe unrestricted reciprocity would give a great impetus to the trade of Canada, especially to the lumbering, the farming and the fishing industries. It would open up our vast mineral resources to capital. It would, I believe, remove the discontent now existing in the Maritime Provinces, and would give them prosperity. It would produce on a more extended scale that commercial life and business activity which prevailed during the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. It would give our young men employment and keep them at home, and inspire them with hope in the future of their country. It would, by permanently settling the fishery question, remove all cause of ill-feeling between Eng-

Mr. FLYNN.

land and the United States, producing peace and amity and be the foundation of a firm and lasting union between two powerful and kindred nations, the foremost in commerce and civilisation, in the world, in whose friendship no part of the Empire has greater interest than the Dominion of Canada. For these reasons I intend to support the resolution moved by the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I would not at this late hour of the debate have dreamed of adding one link to the long chain of argument which we have had, if the position taken by the hon. member for South Oxford in opening this discussion had been adhered to by hon. gentlemen opposite. But in consequence of the amendment to the amendment of the hon. Minister of Marine, which was moved by the hon. member for Halifax, looking to a request for a reciprocal coasting trade and a reciprocity in the registration of ships, and in consequence of the strong terms and glowing language with which the hon. member for Halifax and the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) in anticipating that amendment, have spoken of the value of reciprocity in the registration of ships, I thought it my duty, not having heard this point dwelt upon by any hon. member on either side of the House, to address a few remarks to the House with reference to it. These hon. gentlemen spoke—I say it not disrespectfully—as if they had found a mare's nest and hit upon a new wrinkle in this country. But I would remind the House and the country that this is not the first time, nor the second, nor the third, nor even the tenth time in the history of Canada, that efforts have been made by the Canadian people to secure reciprocity in the coasting trade. I quite agree with all that was said as to the value of that trade, and with the cheerful and hopeful spirit with which the hon. member for Halifax spoke of our shipowners, those who man and build our schooners, brigantines and brigs in the Maritime Provinces, and of their ability to fit up those ships and sail them in the American waters, and to do a very large portion of the coasting trade. With all those remarks in appreciation of our own people I agree. If we could secure a part of the coasting trade, the people along the coasts of the Maritime Provinces would find their interests advanced. There is no doubt about the excellency of the hon. gentleman's proposition, but there are grave doubts about its practicability. The serious question is, whether the amendment of the hon. gentleman is likely in any way to advance the proposition. He has tacked it on to a resolution which is clearly not in accord with the temper of this House, and it is not, therefore, likely to advance that action which we all agree would be salutary to Canadian shipping. Of all strong and powerful commercial nations, the United States of America have shown themselves the most jealous with regard to their own coasting trade; they have most jealously guarded it, and most jealously excluded from all share in it the vessels of foreign nations. That could be proved if the time of the House would allow me to do so, but I will not trespass on the time of the House to prove it. I will only ask hon. gentlemen to read the section of the American Shipping Act and contrast that with the section of our own Act, and still more with the Canadian Order in Council of 1886, and they will find our coasting laws are very much more liberal than theirs. In all attempts to negotiate treaties with the United States, we have failed to secure reciprocal coasting trade. To go back thirty years, I will refer to the fact that in the negotiations which led to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, there was not one advance made by the Americans, there was not one response made by the American negotiators to our request that our vessels should be allowed to participate in their coasting trade; and I desire to call the attention of hon. members to the fact that in all the provisions of the Treaty of 1854, there is not one that looks in the direction

of reciprocal coasting trade. Within the last hundred years there never has been in our history any period in which there was such a feeling of amity and good will between Great Britain and the United States as in 1853 and 1854. All the bitterness of the old wars had faded almost from memory. The generation which then ruled had forgotten the quarrels of 1776 and 1812, and that period antedated by six or seven years the bitter feeling that was to arise out of the American civil war. But even in those years of amity and good will Americans were unwilling to grant us anything like reciprocal coasting trade. In 1871 once more Her British Majesty's plenipotentiaries are found in Washington, undertaking to negotiate another treaty, the Alabama treaty. A Canadian statesman was one of the five British commissioners, and if the House will permit me I will read the record, to show by the protocols of the treaty of that year, that once more an advance was made by the British commissioners in the direction of obtaining reciprocal coasting trade between the United States and Canada, but once more the reply, was discouraging. The plain cold words of the reply as shown in the protocol to that treaty, are as discouraging as words can be. The protocol reads as follows:—

"The British Commissioners then suggested: That, if any considerable modification were made in the tariff arrangements of that treaty, the coasting trade of the United States and of Her British Majesty's possessions in North America should be reciprocally thrown open, and that the navigation of the River St. Lawrence and of the Canadian canals should be also thrown open to the citizens of the United States on terms of equality with British subjects."

And the answer given was:

"The American commissioners declined this proposal."

In 1874 once more we find the representatives of Great Britain and the representatives of this Dominion in Washington, undertaking to negotiate a trade treaty with the Americans, and once more the record shows that our Canadian representatives asked that a scheme of reciprocal coasting trade should be considered and favorably entertained by the American commissioners. In the draft of the treaty of that year, you will find the record is as discouraging as it was in 1871. Read the protocol of that treaty which the Hon. George Brown, on behalf of Canada, undertook to carry through:

"We propose that during the continuance of the treaty the coasting trade of Canada and the United States shall be thrown open to the vessels of both countries on the footing of complete reciprocal equality."

Here is the second proposal:

"We propose that during the continuance of the treaty vessels of all kinds built in the United States and Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other, and be entitled to registry in either country."

There is the precise proposal. To this proposal the United States gave as before an unfavorable reply. Therefore in 1854, 1871 and 1874, the Canadian people have been knocking at the door of the United States asking for this boon in vain. It is not dignified, it is unworthy of us, it is idle, it is, if I may use the expression, puerile, to be clamoring for all the good things of life when we cannot get them, and to be like children reaching out their hands for the moon; clamoring for something which our past experience shows us we are not at all likely to obtain. I shall vote against the amendment to the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and in so doing I do not apprehend that I am in the least degree voting adversely to our interests as regards reciprocal coasting trade. When that is voted down, the position will be this: that we are a people who have had for eighteen years on our Statute-book a clear law, offering to go half way, not with the United States alone, but with any people who will come half way to meet us in the direction of reciprocal coasting trade. In the Act of 1870, chapter 14, section 2, are these words:

"The Governor in Council may, from time to time, declare that the foregoing provisions of this Act, shall not, while such Order in Council is in force, apply to the ships or vessels of any foreign country in which British ships are admitted to the coasting trade of such country, and to carry goods and passengers from one port or place in such country to another, and may, from time to time, revoke or alter such Order in Council."

In other words, as soon as any foreign state will admit Canadian vessels to the enjoyment of their coasting trade, we will admit them. We will not ask them to wait for several months, until Parliament meets, but we will at a day's notice, as soon as a meeting of the Council can be held, empower them to come and share our coasting trade. This Act was put on the Statute-book when the right hon. the First Minister held the same position which he holds to-day. It was put on the Statute-book by the party which we are supporting. We have shown our good faith in this matter, and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot tell us, in regard to this, as they do with reference to the Tariff Act of 1879, that it is a delusion, a sham and a blind, that it is insincerely put there, because almost continuously since 1870, with scarcely the intermission of a year, the Canadian Government has been making representations, through the British Minister at Washington, calling the attention of the American Government to the existence of this statute, and asking that they should go half way to meet us. Furthermore, we have evidence that eight or nine of these States, which have the largest commercial marine in the world, have accepted our offer. The great Mediterranean state, Italy, the great northern state, Germany, Austro-Hungary, the Netherlands, Belgium, the Scandinavian powers, Sweden and Norway and Denmark, have accepted it; and the young republic to the far south of us, the Argentine republic, with which we in New Brunswick are in hopes of cultivating a large and successful trade—this young sister of our own, starting on the career of life with about our population and with the same hopes, has opened her coasting trade to us as we have opened ours to her. The very fact then that these eight or nine nations, many of them powerful nations and the foremost carriers of the world, if you except France and the United States, have admitted our coasting vessels to enjoy their trade, shows that the Act of 1870 is not a delusion or a blind. In 1879, our Government made an energetic representation to the American Government, asking them to meet us half way, and during this year of grace 1888, not six weeks ago, representations have been made to the Americans, once more calling attention to the existence of this law on our Statute-book of 1870, and which appears on the statutes to-day. Therefore the Government have shown the most perfect good faith and the most unremitting anxiety to secure this trade, and the hope that hon. gentlemen opposite have of obtaining some little sham credit by introducing their amendment to the amendment is a vain and delusive hope. In the nursery tales, children are told that where the rainbow arc rests on the hill, at the foot will be found a pot of gold. Children running for that insubstantial treasure are not running on a more fruitless and frivolous errand than hon. gentlemen opposite would have us run when they ask us to vote for this amendment. I would sit down and would not say one other word, having spoken on this particular matter, were it not for the remarks uttered by the hon. the leader of the Opposition this afternoon, remarks which I was deeply pained to hear and which I deeply regretted that he should make. We must all admire the duel which took place between the two brilliant French Canadian statesmen, the Liberal leader and the Conservative Minister, in a language which is not their mother tongue. But, while we were delighted to listen to that, as one who comes from the Lower Provinces I was deeply pained to hear the unnecessary remark which was made by the leader of the Opposition, that our Lower Provinces were on the verge of revolt. If it be parliamentary to say so, I state that that is

unmitigated rubbish. I declare that there is not any man in the Lower Provinces out of politics who believes it, and that there is no one out of politics in those Provinces who will venture to make the statement; and, further, I say that there is not a county in New Brunswick to which any man can go with any chance for election on the ground of repeal. I see before me the hon. member for the City of St. John, and I am sure that he will not contradict me in regard to that, and, if my hon. friend from the city and county of St. John were here, I am sure that he would state that I am not mistaken.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in regard to Nova Scotia.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I will speak of Nova Scotia presently.

Mr. JONES (Digby). He is not entirely mistaken in regard to Nova Scotia.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). I think my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Hale) will say as I do, that no one who attempted to stump the county of Carleton in favor of a repeal of the Union could hope to carry that county. I speak with moderation, and I speak in all sincerity, when I say I do not believe there is a single county in New Brunswick where a man would have a ghost of a chance of election who ran on the ground of repeal. Now, with reference to Nova Scotia. Although I have lived there for five years, I have no possible right to speak for that Province; but, as a bystander, I know something of the feeling. I know something of the wave which struck that Province in the summer of 1886; I know that the Province of Nova Scotia at that time put on record its constitutional decree in favor of a repeal of the Union; but I tell the hon. the leader of the Opposition that, when he was advised that nineteen-twentieths of the people of Nova Scotia were in favor of the repeal of the Union, somebody was stuffing him. I hope he was not misled in the same way as his friends were misled when they thought that the local election which took place at that time was an indication of the feeling of the Province. We were told that 19 out of the 21 members from Nova Scotia would support Mr. Blake, and we know the result. I will put against the information which the hon. gentleman has received, the facts as they are recorded in the leading Liberal paper of Nova Scotia, the *Halifax Chronicle*, and I desire to read an extract from a speech made by Mr. Fielding, who was the head and front of that movement, and who carried his party into power on the wave which that agitation raised. He has abandoned that movement and has said that, while he thought the people of Nova Scotia gave a mandate in favor of repeal in the summer of 1886, he finds that in February, 1887, they have withdrawn that mandate. I quote from a speech delivered by Mr. Fielding on the 24th February last, and printed in the *Chronicle* on the 25th February, 1888. This is what is reported of the utterances of Mr. Fielding, the Premier of Nova Scotia, in the paper which for many years he edited himself:

"The people of Nova Scotia in 1886 did seem to return a majority to this House favorable to the policy of repeal. Previous to that election the Government were met with a taunt that they would not dare to submit such an issue to the people, but when they proved that they did dare do it our opponents said it was done in haste, and that no importance was to be attached to the result. The next election, the Dominion election, seemed to tell a different story, and the same constitutional state of affairs which made it appear previously that the people desired repeal, made it necessary after the elections of 1887 to recognise the act that the people had not declared in favor of repeal, but against it."

When the leader of the repeal movement in Nova Scotia has abandoned the matter, as he has; when he is afraid of it and is anxious to get rid of it, it is little short of a calamity that we should have hon. gentlemen opposite stating that nineteen-twentieths of the people of that Province are in favor of it. I credit those hon. gentlemen with

Mr. WELDON (Albert.)

sincerity. They bear the taxes and the burdens of the people as well as ourselves, and I have no doubt that the overwhelming majority of hon. gentlemen opposite have the same love for the country as we have ourselves. What good end is gained by scattering abroad these unfounded stories? We know that the Island of Prince Edward, from which my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) comes, was approached in the summer of 1886 by Mr. Fielding, and that, in that year, which seemed to be favorable to that purpose, the overtures of Mr. Fielding and Mr. Longley were not received very well by their political friends in that Island. We know that Mr. Blair, that very able and astute political leader in New Brunswick, had not very favorable words for Mr. Fielding when he approached him on the same subject. I say that this Canadian Confederation, young as it is, although its life was threatened by those political incendiaries in Nova Scotia in 1886, who I believe were not sincere in their attack when they laid their knife to the throat of our Canadian Confederation, will continue to live; and I assert that the overwhelming opinion, not only in New Brunswick, but in the whole of the three Provinces by the sea, is in favor of standing by the Canadian Confederation.

Mr. SEMPLE. I do not desire to speak at length at this late hour and at this period of a protracted debate. However, I cannot let the opportunity pass, as I live in one of the most fruitful agricultural constituencies in the Dominion. We have heard a great deal from the other side from the standpoint of the manufacturers, and I think there should be a little heard also in regard to the farmers. I have never yet met a person who did not agree that the reciprocity with the United States which we had from 1854 to 1866 was a great benefit to this country. It was something from which the people saw they had an advantage, and, no matter what their politics may be, they have all said that they would like to see a return of the same good times. When that is the case, I think we should endeavor to obtain a return of those good times. For my part, I would be well satisfied to have the same reciprocity as we had before; but it appears that we cannot get it, and that we must go a step further and have reciprocity not only in natural products but in manufactured articles as well. We are led to believe from those manufacturers who are established on a sound basis and are self-reliant that they have no fear for the future and are willing to meet competition. It is only the portion of the manufacturers who are spoon-fed, who have been getting from the Government an Act of Parliament to suit them and to give them special privileges, and in that way to take it out of the consumers, who object to this. The insinuation has been thrown out that hon. members on this side of the House decry the country. Such is not the case. We can speak well of the country, but not as well as we possibly might, and we think it would be well to have something done to help the Dominion. Now, the county from which I come, and the counties adjoining it, are doing very well, to all appearances, but when you speak with the people they will tell you that the country was never in a worse position than it has been these last six years. The whole county of Wellington has decreased in population, in six years, 237 souls. The property valuation has declined, although that is something hard to estimate, because they generally make the same valuation from year to year, as it seems to make no difference to the people in a township or county whether the valuation be high or low, if equally assessed, so that no change is made. But when we come to examine the prices at which farms are disposed of, we realise the depreciation in the value of property. I will give you one or two instances. I know a farm of 170 acres that was bought five years ago for \$10,000, and it has recently been offered at \$8,500; I know a house that cost \$4,000, the building was put in the market and

the best offer that could be obtained was \$1,700. There is any amount of property for sale, but there is no one to buy. When I passed through the city of Toronto, I noticed in an hotel a bill of a Mr. Daley, real estate agent, Guelph, who stated that he had 500 farms to sell. Now, 500 farms by one agent is certainly a large number. Nothing can give a better indication of the state of a country than the decline in the number of inhabitants and the depreciation in the value of farm properties, and in both these particulars the facts show that the country is not in a prosperous condition. Now, I have examined the census returns for a number of counties, and I find that in 26 counties there has been a gain of 21,413, while in 10 counties there has been a decrease of 8,830. The whole value of farm lands in the Province of Ontario is \$989,497,911, and in those 26 counties it is \$696,101,331; so you see that where land is the best, where property is of the greatest value, there has been a falling off, because there is not nearly the natural increase in the population that we should expect. Now, I will read an extract on this subject from the Bureau of Industries:

"Out of the 45 counties and districts into which the Province is divided, not less than 17 show a slight falling off in the rural population of 1886 as compared with that of 1877. The decreases occur mainly in the older counties along the shores of Lakes Erie and Ontario, and in the figures of rural populations chiefly. Whenever towns or villages come within the bounds of counties with a decreasing rural population, the increase in these generally suffices to offset the falling away in the county; but in the counties of Norfolk, Haldimand, Huron, Perth, Durham, Northumberland and Prince Edward, the total population was less in 1886 than in 1887. In this table the cities are included in the respective counties within which they are situated, and a comparison of the totals at the foot of the table will show how much more rapidly the population has grown in the cities, towns and villages than in the townships. During the ten years the township population increased from 1,108,671 to 1,144,520, being for the ten years a fraction over 3 per cent. In the same period the city, town and village population grew from 511,672 to 674,506, an increase of nearly 32 per cent."

Thus you see that the towns, cities and villages are gaining very rapidly, and the rural sections are falling behind. That is one of the effects of the National Policy; it is making the people who raise the supplies poorer, and is increasing the population of the towns and cities. On this question we have had extracts read from Professor Brown, of the Model Farm, Guelph. I have heard his statements spoken of as extravagant by farmers. I suppose he was something like a tailor I heard of. Thirty years ago some of the tailors were itinerant, and went round from house to house to make clothes for the people. On one occasion this tailor had made a coat. It was tried on, but it did not fit the person for whom it was made. "Well," said the tailor, "I think I have taken the wrong figures for a dividend." And so with Professor Brown, I suppose he has taken the wrong figures for his dividend. Now, I will read you the report of a greater man than Professor Brown; I will read you the report of Professor Mills, of the same institution, who, in his younger days, was a practical farmer and understands the situation very well. His report contrasts with that of Professor Brown. Here is what he says:

"In this country the price of produce is exceptionally low, and we have coupled with it the comparatively high price of manufactured articles. Generally speaking, we may say that what the farmer has to sell is cheap, and what he has to buy is dear. Therefore the agricultural atmosphere is disturbed. A feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction is abroad. The farmer finds it increasingly difficult to make a comfortable living, and something must be done to remove the difficulty or the whole community will suffer. Farmers often get credit for grumbling without any well-defined reason. But in this case the trouble is really serious—so much so that no one can question its existence, and wise men will not minify its gravity. * * * The farmer requires a small amount of the produce of his farm for his own use. But all that he has, over and above this amount, is no benefit to him unless there is demand for it. Even a very limited demand for his surplus produce makes it of some use to him. But there must be a sufficient demand at a price which will cover the cost of production and pay a fair rate of interest on the capital invested, or continuance in the business will soon lead to bankruptcy. Hence Canadian farmers have imposed upon themselves taxes for the building of railways in order to reach or create markets for their produce. But, after all, a demand for farm produce in the Dominion is limited, and the prices are exceptionally low.

"Now, in view of these facts, nothing can be clearer than that the farmers have reason on their side when they demand that no restriction on trade, which this Dominion has power to remove, shall be allowed to interfere with the price of grain, fruits, live stock, or dairy products of this country.

"Not having studied the pros and cons of commercial union, we have nothing to say on that question, but simply lay it down as fundamental, that we should seek the best trade relations which we can possibly get, whether it be by negotiation with England, or the United States, or any other country.

"Ontario farmers, at least, seem to understand the situation, and are waking up to the necessity of united action in a matter of so much importance. Let them get a clear understanding of what their interests under this head really are, then unitedly indicate their wish, and it must be granted. If, however, they allow interested men of any class to divide their ranks, and play them off one against another, they will undoubtedly fail, and bring upon themselves the well deserved contempt of every other class."

That is a very fair description of the situation. Another reason why I think something should be done to help the country is the enormous taxation, which has been rapidly increasing. If we have heavy burdens imposed on us we should be afforded some chance to improve our position if possible. During the time Mr. Mackenzie's Administration was in power it was charged with being corrupt and spending money lavishly; but what are the facts? After the Government had been in power four years, the amount to be raised was \$23,500,000, an increase of \$200,000, or an average of \$50,000 a year. What has been the position of affairs since the present occupants of the Treasury benches assumed power? The increase in ten years has been \$12,500,000 or an increase of \$1,250,000 a year. It is thus evident that the expenditure was kept down, and I have no doubt it can be done again. In regard to the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), of which I very highly approve, there is nothing cringing about it, as has been alleged, but it is a resolution simply stating that it would be for the advantage of the country if the Government would endeavor to bring about freer trade relations with the United States. When Mr. Greenway came here to make an arrangement respecting Manitoba it was said that he would only be humbugged and be compelled to return without getting anything, but he appears to have been successful; and, in our opinion, if a proper offer was made to the United States in the direction indicated in the resolution, it would be successful. When the Reciprocity Treaty was repealed some years ago there were several reasons why it was repealed. The United States was passing through a civil war, involving a great loss of life and destruction of property. They needed all the taxation that could be raised, and I believe Hon. George Brown was not successful at Washington in 1874 because the Americans wished to impose duties on all goods entering the United States. We know very well that the Reform party in Canada have always desired reciprocity, it has always been a plank in their platform, and they have always been ready to have it carried out. It has been stated by some hon. members that this question was never discussed at the elections. I have stated to my constituents repeatedly that as a representative of the people there was nothing I could do better than to further in every possible way the obtaining of freer trade relations with the United States and the keeping down taxation, and I say so still. The proposition covered by the resolution is worthy of a fair trial. At the conclusion of the civil war the Americans had not very kindly feelings towards Canada, for Canadian and British sympathy was in favor of the South. Every thing was taxed by the Americans at that time; if a man had a watch, a carriage or a box of matches each article was taxed. That prevailed during the Republican administration. It was a good thing that the Republican administration did not always last, and the Democrats came into power, for it is well known that they have always had a better feeling towards this country. The President in his Message spoke of having freer trade with the country to the north. In this

connection I will read the words of Secretary Bayard, a statement that cannot be too often quoted. He is a statesman who understands the situation very well, and he says :

"I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I say commercial because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to effect the legislative independence of either country."

The United States, no doubt, are satisfied with the size of their country. There is Cuba, a very rich and fertile island, in which rebellions have very frequently occurred, and which could have been acquired by the Americans, but it was not done; and I have not read that any public man in the United States wished Canada to be annexed. The feeling in the United States is growing that their taxation should be reduced. The Secretary of State spoke of one manufacturer who proposed to return to Canada. All this indicates that the public feeling is that manufacturers in the United States have bled the country sufficiently, and that it is time for the people to obtain relief. There is also a Bill before Congress providing for the reduction of taxation by \$55,000,000. I observe by to-day's paper that a Senator of Minnesota has submitted to Congress a Bill to place a number of articles on the free list. I see also an article copied from the *New York Post*, which states that on an average the duty is 42 per cent. and that before 1890 it will average not more than 25 per cent. If there is this reduction in the tariff in two years, commercial union will not be such a bugbear. It is, however, only necessary at this time to discuss the general principles of freer trade relations, and the details can afterwards be settled by the representatives of the two countries. The Central Farmers' Institute of Ontario passed a resolution, by 61 to 13 votes, 46 institutes being represented, in the following terms:—

"That this meeting desires to place on record its high appreciation of the value to this country of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States and we fully endorse the actions of the institutes which have discussed the subject and passed resolutions favorable thereto, and it is of opinion that so soon as it is introduced into the Dominion Parliament and becomes a party question its further discussion in the institutes should be discontinued."

At two meetings which I happened to attend last summer the farmers were nearly unanimous on this question. Mr. Wiman spoke at the meetings, and I can assure you that the construction put upon the remarks of that gentleman by members of this House was not at all the proper one. The question of "broilers" seemed to cause a great deal of merriment, and I heard him speak on that question. He mentioned it incidentally, saying that in the United States when the people wanted anything they generally paid a high price for it at a particular season of the year. One of those articles in demand was broilers. He did not state that if the people got closer relations with the States he would invite them to raise those broilers for sale. We ought to be proud of such a man as Mr. Wiman, who, leaving Canada, has obtained such an important position in the United States. I heard Mr. Butterworth make mention of the fact that Mr. Wiman was very generous in New York, and that if any Canadian, or any man was in difficulties he would help him if he could do so. Mr. Wiman is always willing and able to help a Canadian, and it is well known that he has a warm interest in this country. When he lived in Toronto any citizen who was in straightened circumstances always found Mr. Wiman willing to lend him a helping hand, and he made to the people of this city a present of the Wiman Baths. Taking Mr. Wiman's position and influence into consideration, I think the sneering remarks made in reference to that distinguished Canadian who has worked his way up so well in the United States against so many competitors, should not have been introduced into the discussion. Now, Sir, I look at the Trade and Naviga-

Mr. SEMPLE.

tion Returns and I find that in 1887 the produce of the mines amounted to \$3,805,959; fisheries, \$6,875,810; forests, \$20,484,746; animals and their products, \$24,246,937; agricultural products, \$3,826,325, and manufactured goods, \$3,079,972. So you see that the manufactured goods were only a very small proportion of all the other articles. I would also mention that in 1876, when they had no protection, the export of manufactured goods was \$5,000,000, or \$2,000,000 more than at the present time. It is wonderful that when the manufactures have been pampered so much and have got so much assistance, that such would be the case. We should have thought they would have exported a much larger amount, but they evidently do not wish to do that. Their only wish is that the tariff should raise their prices, that they may make more money for themselves, that they may make the country pay more. That is what those gentlemen do, they are good calculators, they make a mathematical calculation and understand their business very well. We have been told that we are very foolish to seek a market in the United States, when our market is in Great Britain, and as the only result would be to come into competition with the United States, there would be no use to seek a market there. The statistics give us some information where the produce of the field and the stock raised on the farm is exported. There are six articles which we raise and which go to Great Britain at the present time, and there are eight articles which go to the United States. The export of wheat to Great Britain last year was 5,048,084 bushels, value \$4,278,417; to the United States we sent 341,075 bushels, value \$265,940. But then we imported of wheat 3,550,844 bushels, value \$3,152,478; that is if we take the wheat we sold from the wheat we bought, our net cash is \$1,391,879. Now the oats is the second article. We sent oats to Great Britain 1,627,629 bushels, value \$509,875; to the United States 40,342 bushels, value \$12,210, making in all \$521,085; so that those two articles which cost the farmer so much labor and so much trouble amount to \$1,912,964, just exactly \$87,405 more than we get from our export of eggs. We sent to Great Britain 3,348,180 bushels of peas, value \$2,026,670; to the United States we sent 405,358 bushels, value \$331,349. Then there is cheese, which brought us \$7,065,983, and butter, of which we exported 4,076,365 lbs., valued at \$757,261. We exported to Great Britain 63,622 head of cattle, valued at \$5,344,375. Great Britain is our natural market for these articles enumerated. Let us now take the articles which go to the United States. Barley, 9,437,717 bushels, value \$5,245,968; hay, 69,450 tons, value \$670,749; potatoes, 1,276,809 bushels, value \$328,604; horses, 18,225, value \$2,214,338; sheep, value 363,046; value, \$974,482. Then there are lean cattle for which there is no market in Great Britain, but which are sold in the back districts and shipped to Buffalo, which is the market for that stock. In regard to oats, sometimes the United States is our principal market. A large dealer informed me just before I left home for Ottawa that when oats were bringing only 39 cents a bushel in Toronto, he had shipped them to Buffalo and got 63 cents a bushel and paid the duty. He shipped a short time ago three car loads of peas to the United States, and received 90 cents a bushel for them, and after paying the duty and the freight he realised more than he could get in this country. Mr. Cluxton, of Peterboro', formerly a Conservative member of this House, in addressing the Farmers' Institute in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, mentioned that he had sold 180,000 bushels of oats in the United States, and after paying the duty he had a good profit. So that I believe that if the duty were taken off, the United States would be a market in every season for peas, and in most seasons for oats. Now, the question as to who pays the duty has been touched upon, and that is a very important question. I thought the proposition advanced on the other side of the House the

other evening that our barley was just the same as the United States barley, and that the people of the United States paid 10 cents a bushel more for it than for their own barley, was a rather strange proposition. I would rather agree with the hon. gentleman who spoke the other night, and who said the Yankees generally wanted a dollar and a half in return for a dollar. But we should look at that matter as the hon. Minister of the Interior, on one occasion when he was canvassing Wellington for a railway bonus, said we should consider the price of grain. He said grain was worth the price paid in Liverpool less the cost of transportation. Goods of all kinds that are sent from here to the United States are worth the price they are in the United States less the cost of transportation and other charges, and the charge on barley entering the United States is 10 cents a bushel. Every individual who makes a trial trip to the United States knows very well who pays the duty. We have been told of a man in the Province of Quebec who had repeatedly sold his hay in the United States, and when it was worth \$10 a ton there he took it across the line and paid \$2 duty. He knew who paid the duty, for he knew that he got \$2 less for his hay than he would have got if he had lived across the line. The same thing is true of lean cattle, for which there is no market in England. They are brought from the counties of Wellington and Grey and shipped to Buffalo, and are charged with a duty of 20 per cent. The same duty is charged on lambs, and even on turnips there is a duty of 30 per cent, of which a large quantity is shipped to the United States, and on which the farmers lose about 3 cents a bushel. In all these cases our farmers would receive the enhanced price but for the duty. Then, dealers in cattle are subjected to difficulties and great loss on account of the duty; they are sometimes charged with undervaluation. So that with unrestricted reciprocity our farmers would not only gain the amount of the duty, but they would also be saved from many annoyances that the shipper has continually to meet. Now, I will make what I consider a reasonable estimate of what would be the advantage to a farmer on an average farm of 100 acres. I shall take six articles. I take first barley. We will say he has 400 bushels, the produce of ten acres; the duty on that would be \$40. Then he has one horse, worth \$100, on which the duty is \$20; cattle of the value of \$100, the duty \$20; 100 lbs. of wool, at 10 cents per lb., the duty \$10; 18 sheep and lambs, of the value of \$60, the duty \$12; 5 tons of hay, the duty \$10; \$112 in all, which would be gained to the farmer under unrestricted reciprocity. With regard to hay: there is an extensive bayer at Fergus who tells me that he is buying hay, and he cannot place it at present, but that if the duty was removed he could place it to advantage in the United States. What seems to terrify some hon. gentlemen in regard to unrestricted reciprocity is the fear of direct taxation. I have always been afraid of debt; but when once debt is incurred I do not suppose it is of great consequence in what way it is paid. Now, this year there has been imported of dutiable goods \$105,000,000, which yielded a duty of \$22,433,308. In 1883, when the country was more prosperous, we imported \$123,000,000 worth, which proportionately would produce within \$3,000,000 of the amount of taxation we would require to raise, supposing we received no duties from the United States at all. So that with a little more prosperity and a little more economy, we could make both ends meet, and there is no ground for my hon. friends holding up that as a bugbear to the people. If the farmer could make \$100 more per hundred acres, it would be of very little consequence if he had a little more taxation to pay, either directly or indirectly; as he would be getting in more, he could afford to pay out a little more. I notice from the Abstract and Record that the goods manufactured in Great Britain and exported to different countries amount to \$2,366,533,819.

Of that Canada takes \$35,766,173, one sixty-third of the whole, or in every \$1,000 worth \$15.75. It would not take a very large quantity of manufactures in Great Britain to make up the quantity which goes to Canada, and if we could show Great Britain that it is to our best interest not to take quite as much from her as formerly, she would be glad to consent to the change. It is just like the case where a young man has started out in life for himself, and after some years have elapsed tells his father that owing to the distance between them, they cannot trade very well together, and it would be better for him to trade elsewhere. The father would say to his son: Do the best you can, I only rejoice in your prosperity, and hope the step you take will give you satisfaction. That would be a common sense view to be taken by Great Britain, even if her manufacturers lost by this arrangement, and I do not think they will. Look for instance at the United States, which has a higher tariff than ours. Last year Great Britain sent to the United States \$49,000,000 worth of iron and steel and other manufactured articles, being an increase of \$12,000,000 over the previous year, so that if we become more prosperous, we in Canada will be able also to buy more English goods. Should our farmers make \$50 a year each extra through this policy, they will not roll it up in a napkin and put it aside, but will spend it in various ways throughout the country and a certain amount will be expended in the purchase of manufactured imports. Make the whole country more prosperous, and our trade with the mother country is bound to increase. I can remember very well the time when the treaty of 1854 was in force. It was about the time that I began to sell grain, and I can endorse the sentiment expressed by the hon. member for Victoria as to the great prosperity that then existed. That hon. gentleman has given an account of what happened in Victoria, and I could tell the same story with regard to the county of Simcoe, where land, which was worth \$2,000 per 100 acres, in a short time was worth \$6,000, property having increased in value threefold. People were anxious to buy farms; laboring men were getting higher wages; there was a demand for everything; and I remember when our farmers had to team grain from forty to sixty miles to Toronto to meet the American schooners which wanted to get the white wheat that we raised of the best quality, and were prepared to give the highest prices. If farmers happened to be in Toronto when schooners were to be loaded for the United States, they generally received from one to five cents per bushel more than is usually paid. Any one who has seen the good times that then existed would like to see them recur; and we believe that by judicious management, and by freer trade with the United States, a vast gain will be secured to the country. It was said in 1878 that one of the evils of this country was that the balance of trade was against us. Since Confederation I see, by the Abstract and Record, that the balance of trade has been an average of over \$20,000,000 against us per year, but the idea was propounded in 1878 that a new era would dawn, when we would manufacture all the goods we required and take nothing from Great Britain in return. Well, that has not been accomplished, and only last session the hon. the Minister of Finance had to take a new departure. He told us how much iron and steel was used in the country, and he propounded a scheme of putting on taxes on these articles, by which means he said 20,000 people would be employed in these works in a short time, meaning a population of 100,000, and we would not have to go to Great Britain for our iron and steel. That project has not so far been carried out to any great extent, and the only effect I see of his scheme is an increased burden on the farmers, who have to pay 50 cents extra a hundredweight on the nails they use in making improvements on their farms; and other manufacturing articles have been increased in price, into the construction of

which iron and steel enter. That has been the result of the tinkering in the tariff on iron and steel last session. It has been repeatedly stated that the National Policy would give to the farmers a great market for their produce, but so far we have had nothing to substantiate that statement. I find from the census of the assessors, that in 1886 the population of the Province of Ontario was 1,819,026, and in 1878, it was 1,646,035, or an increase of 172,979. Suppose one-tenth of this number were employed in manufactures, this would give only 17,297. The employment of this small number required to make this amount of manufactured goods would surely not affect the markets for our staple farm products. I do not doubt that in large manufacturing places, at certain seasons of the year, when butter and eggs are scarce, they will increase in price to a certain extent; but as regards the staples of wheat, oats and potatoes, they will not be affected at all. I think also that the prices we have had for the last five years do not show that they have increased the value of the market very much. I find that the average price of wheat for the five years from 1882 to 1886, was 88.5 cents. In 1882, it was \$1.01; in 1883, \$1.05; in 1884, 80 cents; in 1885, 81 cents; and in 1886, 73 cents. The average price of oats for the five years is 35 cents. In 1882, it was 43 cents; in 1883, 38 cents; in 1884, 33 cents; in 1885, 31 cents; and in 1886, 32 cents. Two years ago, potatoes sold for 15 cents a bag, so it is clear that the manufacturers had not been very hard on the potato crop. It has been held out as another bugbear that, if we had free trade with the United States, we would be disowned by Great Britain, and they would not take any of our produce. They have an established rule there that whoever sends in grain or whatever they have to sell have a chance of disposing of their produce, and that will continue to be so. They shut out nobody, and they would not shut out Canada. This is only thrown out in order to frighten people, but I do not think that many will be scared by it. It has also been said that the geographical position of this country in regard to the United States is of no consequence, because we have railways. I think it makes all the difference imaginable if a person is 50 miles from a market or 500 miles. I am credibly informed that in Prince Edward Island potatoes are only worth 20 cents a bushel, while in Toronto they are worth from 60 to 65 cents a bushel. Oats are only worth 25 cents a bushel in Prince Edward Island, while in Toronto they are worth 45 cents. Thus it is the geographical position that makes the difference, and it is on account of the geographical position of this country in relation to the United States that it would be better for us to have our trade relations extended. If we were as close to the mother country as we are to the United States we would be one. But we are not. We would desire nothing better. But we are 3,000 miles away, and when our best customers live so near us, that is a very important consideration. A dealer stated that he could ship grain from Drayton to Buffalo as cheaply as he could to Toronto. The farmers do not dread competition. The county I represent raises some of the best cattle that are raised in the Dominion of Canada, and the farmers of that county would hail with delight the news that they would be able to compete in the markets of New York, Detroit and Albany. When our fairs are held they are attended by buyers from Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston, and all over the Dominion, and, with extended trade regulations, we would have them from different points in the United States. As to the price of oats, it has been said that oats coming from the United States lower the price in this country. That has never been the case. I remember that, at the time when oats were shut out, I sold them for 25 cents a bushel; and that when they were coming in from the United States, I sold them for 55 cents a bushel, and these were manufactured into oatmeal and sent to New York, and our farmers never made such

Mr. SIMPSON.

profits as they did when they had a chance to send to the markets of the United States. I say that, with the large and well equipped mills which we have in Canada grinding oatmeal, many of which are now idle for the want of markets for their output, if we had free trade with the United States, those mills could take and hold the trade in the large cities of the United States. When this Confederation was formed, it was supposed that it would confer a great benefit on the people, a great and lasting benefit, and no doubt it will if it is properly carried out; but if, on the other hand things are carried on as they are now, and there is a combination of members affected to make Provinces that have built their own railways contribute subsidies and build railways in every part of the Dominion, it will soon make the Province of Ontario say that it was a mistake to enter into Confederation. In 1886, the amount of subsidies granted for railways was \$2,396,065, of which Ontario got \$390,000. In 1887, the amount of subsidies was \$2,075,600, and Ontario got only \$570,000. The Province that pays half of the taxation and has built her own railways is now called upon to pay subsidies to railways in all the other Provinces. If this is to be continued, and if our debt is to be increased, I think the people of Ontario, as well as those of the other Provinces, will show their dissatisfaction. It is well known to people who understand the Province of Ontario that we have a network of railways over that Province, that townships and villages and cities have bonused railways to a very large extent in order to get better communication. The Ontario Government has also bonused railways. The county I represent gave a bonus to the Credit Valley Railway of \$135,000, which was paid by a few municipalities, and the village of Fergus and the village of Elora issued \$10,000 in debentures and took bonds from the Credit Valley Railway for the same amount. They sold their bonds for fifty cents on the dollar, and each lost \$5,000 on the transaction. Then there is the town of Orangeville, that granted a large bonus to the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, and afterwards was one of a group that granted \$135,000. Then it granted \$15,000 the same as Fergus, and they lost \$7,500 on the transaction. They wanted to have competition, but today, instead of having two railways in competition, there is only one; competition is swept away and they cannot get their grain moved as speedily as their circumstances require. The conditions under which they granted this bonus have been swept away, on account of the Canadian Pacific Railway absorbing these two lines. Now, Sir, considering these things, there is good reason why a stop should be put to subsidies to railways. I think it was the member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Davies) himself who said he wanted subsidies to railways to be continued. Well, if he gets subsidies and does not have to pay for them, and other people do, I suppose he would like to get them, but I think Provinces that have built their own roads do not want to build roads in every other part of the Dominion. This question seems to have had an important bearing on the elections in some of the Provinces. Last session the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) made use of the following words:

"I am prepared to take issue with the hon. gentleman on that question. I will just point out to my hon. friend the result of the last election. My hon. friend well knows that the question of the railway route in the Island of Cape Breton, was the question upon which, to a very large extent, the elections were fought in that Island, particularly in my own county. As regards the general fiscal policy, it was a one-sided question with the people of the Island, which party should hold the reins of power in this Dominion. The elections of previous years showed that fact from year to year, so that the question of a railway route, I might say, was the sole and absolute question which was before the people on the occasion of the last election."

So you see the subsidies had a very important bearing on the election. I will read another short extract bearing on the same subject, from the remarks of the Minister of Finance made last session in answer to a question of Mr. Eisenhauer:

"I am much inclined to think that the hon. gentleman's object is to get this grant struck out of the resolution. I believe that is the object which the hon. gentleman has in view. The hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Kaulbach, the late representative of the county of Lunenburg, pressed the construction of this road upon the Minister of Railways in the most urgent and earnest manner. He went to every member of the Government, and year after year he urged upon them the great importance of the construction of this road. It was rather a large undertaking; it involved a considerable expenditure of public money, but he represented that his constituents in the county of Lunenburg were extremely anxious that the road should be constructed. Finally the urgent entreaties and strong representations made in this House and out of it as to the importance of having this road constructed, induced my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and the leader of the Government to express the intention of asking this Parliament for the means of constructing it. The Government supposed that the people of Lunenburg attached great importance to that road; but they found that when Mr. Kaulbach went back to the county, the gentleman who had succeeded in obtaining this promise of support from the Government for the construction of the road, was defeated, and that the county of Lunenburg had sent a gentleman here to oppose the Government that had expressed its desire to construct the road. The Government would therefore be perfectly justified in accepting the action of the people of Lunenburg as a reason for not proceeding with this work, and in holding to the conviction that they did not wish it done. As the Government are prepared to give a certain amount of aid, I think, looking to the future construction of the road, that ought to satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. But I believe, from the tone of the speech made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), that he is very anxious that the Government should strike out this grant, as I think the Government would be justified in doing after the manner in which it has been received. As to the hon. gentleman's references to the future of Nova Scotia, which I think it was somewhat indelicate for him to make, if he is as well prepared to meet his constituents in the county of Halifax, which he will probably be called upon shortly to do, as I or anyone standing in my place would be to meet the people of Cumberland, he would be a very fortunate man."

So you see that was a very important question. These words were uttered by the Minister of Finance, stating that the grant was given in the expectation that the county of Lunenburg would return a supporter of the Government. But they did not, they rejected the bribe which was held out to them for the purpose of stifling their consciences and destroying their convictions. These railway subsidies have a tendency to corrupt the people, and when the Minister of Finance uttered these words in the most guarded manner before so many members of Parliament, we can well suspect what he would do in a constituency where no one was taking note of his remarks. But, Sir, the people, in the case of Lunenburg did their duty. They seemed to think that the time might come when the designs of Providence would be fulfilled, and that better things were in store for them. It is a fact that the present Ministry has been long in power. But if we take a review of English history, we shall find that the most corrupt Ministry that England ever had, the Walpole Administration, was the longest lived, but even that Administration came to an end; and we believe that by the discussion of public questions the same result will follow in this country. Now, another matter that has just come to my mind is the question of the sugar duties. A great deal has been said in relation to that matter. I examined the Trade and Navigation Returns and found that the duty on sugar was 68 per cent. Now, it has been stated that a poor man may live in this country and not pay a dollar of duty. He would be a very poor man indeed, and would be fit to go to the House of Industry. Certainly he would not be a working poor man, because a working poor man, in six months, buys a dollar's worth of sugar, on which he would have to pay 68 cents duty, or \$2 worth a year, on which he would have to pay \$1.34 duty. If he got it from the Drummond refinery he might get it for \$1.25, which he would not pay as duty, but as protection going into the pockets of the manufacturers. They make a little difference in order to sell, and to keep up the price as high as possible. I am further informed on good authority that in Buffalo four pounds more of the same quality of sugar can be bought for \$1 than can be got in this country. We must do away with that extravagant profit and seek to cut down the duty, for the less duty there is the better chance there will be to have cheap sugar in this country.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat made such a remarkable speech that I will not attempt to follow him in all his wanderings. I have made a few memoranda for my own use in order that I may reply to some of the points that I think are worthy of attention, and I will take up the question where he left it—his last reference was to the excessive price of sugar in Canada owing to the excessive rate of duty. He told us that the rate of duty on sugar imposed by the policy of this Government was 68 per cent. I am not disposed to quarrel with the hon. gentleman's figures, but I wish to point out to the House that in 1878 the Administration which the hon. gentleman would support if the same party were in power to-day that was in power then, imposed a duty \$2.39 per hundredweight on sugar, and to-day this Government impose only \$1.58 per hundredweight. I give that to the hon. gentleman as one portion of my reply on the question of sugar. Let me give him a further and a better one. The tendency of the remarks of the hon. gentleman, and of the remarks of all hon. gentlemen opposite throughout the whole of the debate, has been to show that if we would only accept commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity everything would be bright and happy for Canada. Let me deal with this question of sugar in the United States, and while I will not touch the cost of production I will touch on the duty on the product. I have taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States this information for the hon. gentleman, and probably he will make a note of it for use in future so that in taking up this question of sugar duties, he will not impose on an intelligent community who can read and think for themselves, or on an unsuspecting farmer who he may meet in the town hall in his county or in some village, and make them believe that we in Canada impose a higher rate of duty on sugar than is imposed by the United States. Here are the records, and sugar is the very first item at the head of the list. Sugar, molasses and confections, \$74,242,000 worth was imported into the United States, on which a duty was collected of \$58,000,000, or at a rate of 78.15. The hon. gentleman complains that we charge 68 per cent., but he is ready to fall into the arms of a people charging 78 per cent. duty on sugar. That shows the anxiety of the hon. gentleman to obtain commercial relations with a people who know how to protect all the interests of their own country, and in protecting them they have at times imposed unreasonable rates of duty as they would appear to us; still the hon. gentleman would have it appear that sugar was charged less duty in the United States than in Canada. Let us have a little more of competition and a little less of combination and we will have the same result here as in the United States. I showed the House, however, one clear indisputable fact that the United States charge 78 per cent. as against Canada 68 per cent. Let me take up another item that the hon. gentleman thought worthy of bringing to the notice of the House, and I think his observations on that point are worthy of some little reply. He dealt with the question of oats. He said they are cheaper in Canada than they would have been if we had not had the National Policy. He says oatmeal mills are silent, and he named a number of them, and this, he says, is in consequence of the National Policy. I challenge hon. gentlemen to deny what I am going to state, that there has been a combination among millers to buy up the smaller mills and close them up, the combination paying them a percentage on the silent machinery,—and they have done that to control the price of oatmeal in Canada. I tell the hon. gentleman that in my own county, the county of Perth, there is in the town of Mitchell the president of the Oatmeal Millers' Association; that when the National Policy was brought into force that gentleman said it was impossible to live in Canada, and accordingly he sold out and went to

the United States and remained for some years, entering the same business. What was the result? He came back to Canada and to day is president of the Millers' Association which controls the mills of the country, and he is doing it and making money out of it too. The hon. gentlemen opposite are very ready to take advantage of all those circumstances and trade combinations and then blame the National Policy with having closed up a number of mills. I challenge the hon gentleman or any hon. gentlemen opposite to take up the *New York Herald*, *Boston Herald*, *Buffalo Courier* and any United States newspaper, east, west, north or south, and show me that the markets of the United States furnish as good a price for oats as the markets of the Dominion. I have the tables here, and if necessary I can give the quotations. I have the *New York Herald*, the *Boston Herald*, *Buffalo Courier*, *Toronto Globe*, and *Montreal Herald*, and I do not think one of those papers can be charged with favoring the Government, I do not presume any hon. gentleman would say that the market prices were prepared in the interests of this Government or National Policy, but we assume they are correct. According to the *New York Herald* the prices of oats, on 3rd April, were as follows:—

New York.....	37 cts to 40 cts per bushel
Montreal.....	42 cts to 43 cts "
Buffalo.....	35 cts to 39½ cts "
Toronto.....	48 cts to 49 cts "

An hon. friend beside me says that they are to-day 50½ cents in Toronto.

Mr. WELSH. They were 44 cents in Toronto on 4th April.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman has attempted to show, and he would make the farmers of Canada believe that farmers in the United States obtain a better price for oats than our farmers do here. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to produce quotations in this country and in the United States and lay them side by side, and I venture to say that the prices for all products of the farm are as high in our markets as those of the United States. I will show the House why I make this statement. The Americans have immense quantities of natural products to export from their own country. Is it reasonable to presume or to suppose that we in Canada can find a better market in a country that produces an enormous surplus for which they have to find a foreign market, than we can have in a country to which the American people themselves export their surplus. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite can expect the people of Canada to believe that statement. Let me take the article of wheat. According to the *New York Herald* the highest price for the best quality in New York was 85½ cents. Sales were made at 89, and sellers were asking 89½. Now, Sir, the price in Montreal was 89 and 90 cents that same day, according to the *Montreal Herald*, and if the hon. the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) were here, I presume he would think that a pretty good authority. That very same day, in Toronto, the quotation was 91 cents for Manitoba wheat, and in Buffalo, which is a corresponding market to Toronto, it was quoted in the *Buffalo Courier* at 84½ to 87½. What will hon. gentlemen think of this? In Toronto the same day it was 85 to 89 cents, or wheat was sold one and three-eighths cents higher in Toronto than in the city of Buffalo. How can hon. gentlemen say in the face of this that New York or Buffalo are the best markets for our wheat? I have given you exactly the figures for those places and the names of the papers and you can see them yourselves. In Chicago we find that 72½ to 72½ was the highest price for wheat, while in Toronto, on the very same day, it was 85 to 89. In Detroit the price was 83½ cents, 85 cents being the highest, as against 89 cents in the city of Toronto. In St. Louis wheat was from 80 cents to 81 cents, while it was 89

Mr. HESSON.

cents in Toronto. In Milwaukee the price was 74½ to 75½. I have been very exact with those figures, and I have quoted them very carefully, because I knew I would be watched, and it would not be fair to myself or to the country to make any incorrect statement. In the face of those facts what is the use of saying that the American market is the best market for our produce. We cannot hope to find a good price in their markets when they themselves are seeking a foreign market for their surplus products. They produce the same things as we do, and yet they are looking around for the best market in which they are likely to get high prices to export their surplus to. They find themselves compelled to go to Great Britain and to find a market there, as we find a market there to-day. From the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States I find that the Americans had to find a market to export \$523,000,000 worth of the products of the farm. Let hon. gentlemen remember that. It is a matter of very vital importance to people of this country to comprehend the whole case and to see whether or not the American market is our best market, and whether it would be desirable that we should take any hasty step in this matter which we might afterwards have to repent when we had abandoned the trade with that great country which gave many of us birth, and to which we look for protection, and sympathy, and help when the time comes that we need it. I tell you it would be a most unwise thing to throw away our connection with that great and grand old land to run after some possible chance of getting a better market for perhaps our barley or possibly a small quantity of peas. I may point out what hon. gentleman perhaps may forget that last year the United States had to export, of wheat \$90,000,000 worth; flour, \$52,000,000 worth; corn, \$19,000,000 worth; oats, \$15,000,000 and pork, \$62,000,000 worth. All those articles are produced by our farmers and all those American products have had to find a market abroad. Will hon. gentlemen contend that we should be simply producers of those in the raw state and hand them over to the American middleman to make the profits on shipping them abroad, or that we should take that traffic from our own steamship lines and our own grand lines of railway, which have been built up at such great expense to this country with the hope of making it one solid confederation and a grand nation in the future. Are we to hand over the carrying trade of our country to the United States and enable them to be the parties who handle this product and make profits out of it? I say no. I say it is our duty to seek the best market, and that a market in a country that does not produce the article and must purchase the article is at least the best market for us, so long as we have a surplus to export. That leads me to the thought that what we hope for from the National Policy and what we said it would accomplish it has accomplished to the extent of building up within our country a better home market, which we have always maintained is the best market. The effect of the National Policy has been to enable us to consume a large proportion of the products of the country at home, which would have to be exported abroad were it not for the National Policy. The Americans consume about 90 per cent. of the products of their own farms. I presume that the business men, the farmers, the mechanics and the workmen of Canada consume as much and live as well as the people do in the United States. I may assume that we consume at least 90 per cent. of our products. Well, Sir, if we have a home market to the extent of 90 per cent. of the products of the farm this has been caused by the effect of the National Policy on the industries of the country. I say, Sir, we have accomplished all that was professed to be accomplished by the National Policy in giving employment to the people of our own country. We have afforded better markets to the producers of those products which otherwise would have to

be exported at least in many cases to the United States or to greater distances abroad. I shall follow the hon. gentleman a little further in some remarks he has made. He mentioned the name of the father of the new platform of hon. gentlemen opposite, although it is pretty hard to say who the father is just now. It was Mr. Wiman a short time ago; to-day I believe the hon. member for South Oxford. But the reference of the hon. member for Centre Wellington to Mr. Wiman and his address before the Farmers' Union of Ontario brought to my mind this fact, that that gentleman had a different story for the people of Canada when he was discussing this matter before them from what he had for his own people—because, although he says he is a Canadian, I have a very serious suspicion that he has changed his views in reference to which country, after all, he has the greatest interest in. I cannot conceive that the gentleman, with all his wealth, would consent to live in the United States for the benefit of Canada. If he is really a sincere Canadian, let him reside in Canada; he has wealth enough to choose his home, and if he really takes an interest in this country, he should live in it, and not on an island of New Jersey. In his address before the Commercial Club of Cincinnati, on the 26th of March, on the question of commercial union, he said:—

"I came to undo the mistake made 100 years ago when the Declaration of Independence should have covered the whole North American continent. The Boston tea-party had a good effect upon England."

Later on, speaking of the French Canadians, he said:

"The Speaker of the Canadian House of Commons is the twenty-fourth child. Show me the twenty-fourth child of an American?"

What his object was in referring to that I do not know. Again:

"I bring you the trade of half a continent."

What does he mean by this? Is it that the Americans will take possession of the trade of this country? Is that his purpose? If it is, I say it is about time we should reflect whether we have any interest in that trade ourselves,—whether if the United States cannot exhibit a better market for us than they are able to exhibit to-day, we can afford to trade with them in those articles of which we have a surplus to export. Later on he says:

"Just so sure as the Americans invite the Canadians to a free interchange under commercial union, just so sure will Canada accept. If England refuses to allow the measure, then we will say to the British Crown: We have no further use for you in North America."

That is a very loyal sentiment. He knows, and the people of the United States know pretty well, what that means. I will give the hon. gentleman one more quotation; I will read what the *Boston Advertiser* says. It quotes the resolution submitted to the House by the hon. member for South Oxford, and says:

"As Sir Richard Cartwright pointed out, the right to enter our markets free is the only commercial privilege which can make Canada prosperous, and without it she can never be so."

"Senator Frye, who has given this subject more careful study than any other member of our Congress, has expressed it as his opinion that it is simply a question of time when at least the Maritime Provinces of Canada will be forced to ally themselves to the United States on whatever basis they can obtain, with this provision of a free market thrown in. He believes Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, at least, will be forced by the necessities of the case to demand of Great Britain a peaceful separation from Canada on condition that they may be annexed to this country."

Is it at all unreasonable for this paper to take that view, or for gentlemen on this side of the House to have very serious misgivings as to the ultimate object of their resolution? It goes on to state further:

"It may be that this result may not happen directly, but the whole tendency of public discussion in those Provinces looks in that direction, and while it would be a severe blow at English Imperial pride to give up these Provinces to this country, and to sacrifice the splendid harbor of Halifax which for more than a century has been the headquarters of the British naval force in this hemisphere, yet we believe that the neces-

sities of the case are so great that a large party in Canada prefers free trade with us to any consideration of national pride."

What party does this paper refer to? Does it refer to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite or to the party on this side of the House? I hope hon. gentlemen will just take that into their consideration, and remember that it is very serious language so far as our good faith towards the mother land is concerned. I am proud and pleased to say, with all sincerity, that I believe there are many men on the other side as loyal as gentlemen on this side; but there are a large number, I am sorry to say, who hold other views, and who are not slow to state them in either public or private. I am afraid it is to that party that this paper refers when it says that they would not hesitate to give up their connection with the mother land for the sake of some patri-otry advantage. We have some further information on this subject. We have Mr. Wiman stating in St. Paul:

"Canada is the natural market for the manufacturers of the United States"—

Is it? Is that the object of hon. gentlemen opposite—that the United States should manufacture for us? I say no, we can manufacture for ourselves.

"Commercial union means to create a market for the excess of United States production which protection has stimulated"

"The extent and character of the tariff would necessarily have to be left to the Congress of the United States, they being the larger representative body, while the total amount realised from its enforcement and also from the enforcement of similar internal revenue taxes should be put into one pool and the sum realised divided by *per capita* proportion according to population."

"Commercial union means that which would have been accomplished, so far as trade and commerce is concerned, by the extension of the Declaration of Independence over the whole continent instead of over less than one-half of it"

"Canada under commercial union could no longer resist the attractive forces which would prevail towards a political absorption."

"If England should not consent to it, it would be the most momentous pause in the history of Canada, and then, as I said to Chamberlain, 'look out for another Boston tea-party.'"

"I come to you to offer you half a continent. The largest part of the British Empire shall be given to the United States without tax, if you so desire it"

"If England refuses to allow the measure, then we will say to the British Crown we have no further use for you in North America."

Now, after reading quotations like this, I would like hon. gentlemen opposite to say whether or not we have good reason to doubt their sincerity, when they make a pretence of wishing to retain our connection with the old land. From all the evidence which we can gather from the gentlemen who are promoting this scheme on the American side, backed, I am sorry to say, by some prominent gentlemen on this side, their sole intent and purpose is to sever our connection with Great Britain. I, for one, shall protest as long as I live against such a movement. We have been too well treated by the mother land, which has helped in many trying circumstances and invariably treated us with kindness, to go back on her in this way. For my part I shall never be a consenting party to anything that will grant to the United States greater privileges in our markets than we grant to the mother land. I shall never be a party to opening a trade with the United States for the exchange of all sorts of products on terms more favorable than those we grant to Great Britain. To do so would be most disloyal, and I must say that the men who propose such a course deserve indeed to be charged with disloyalty to the British connection. The hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Semple), dilated at length on the taxation imposed on the people by the National Policy, and he wants us to escape that taxation by adopting the United States tariff. Under our National Policy, the taxation is something like an average of 23 or 24 per cent. on our imports, but I hold in my hand a statement taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States, of the total imports into that country, and the total revenue collected therefrom, which shows that the total imports were

\$450,000,000, on which the duty collected was \$212,000,000, or a taxation of 47·10 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to rush into the arms of a people who are taxing their imports to the extent of 47 per cent., and yet they complain of the small taxation which we imposed upon our imports. They say that the poor man here is heavily taxed, but let them look in the returns of the United States and see what relief the poor man has there. On woollen goods, which are imported to the extent of \$60,000,000, the taxation imposed is \$35,000,000, or 58·81 per cent. Are hon. gentlemen opposite prepared to accept a tariff, in the framing of which we cannot have the slightest influence, and which imposes on the woollens of the poor man a taxation of 58 per cent. Hon. gentlemen opposite complain of our duty on iron and steel, but the Americans imposed a duty on these articles of 40·92 per cent. On cotton they imposed 40 per cent., on silks 49 per cent., and on jewellery and precious stones—I wish hon. gentleman opposite to make a note of that, because it is a matter of considerable interest to the poor man—10·58 per cent. That is the relief the poor man has in the United States. He only pays 10 per cent. on his jewellery and precious stones, if he has to pay 58 per cent. on his woollens. On glassware they impose 59 per cent., and on earthenware 56 per cent., but what does the poor man care about that when he can get his jewellery and precious stones at 10 per cent. Another duty, which I am sure will gladden the heart of the poor man and make his wife and children smile with contentment, is the duty on rice of 64 per cent. Compare that with Canada. I do not understand that we collect anything here on rice. But then in the States the poor man can get in his jewellery and precious stones at 10 per cent. The hon. member for Centre Wellington was kind enough to say that our towns and villages were growing, but he said they were growing at the expense of the farmers. The hon. gentleman must have his wail one way or the other. I may say that the farmers are glad that the towns are growing, for they are always pleased to have a home market, which is their best market, at their own door. That hon. gentleman lives in one of the gardens of Ontario. Wellington, Perth, Bruce, Huron, and the Waterloos, and the Middlesexes, and the Brants, are amongst the best in all Ontario, and yet the wail has come from that riding, and from Huron and from Waterloo, and I am going to talk to the member for North Waterloo later on. The wail has come from the gardens of Ontario, but they are doing it for a purpose. They are doing it to make a point against the Government; they are doing it with the object of blinding the eyes of the farmers, but I shall take good care that they do not succeed in doing it. I ask that hon. gentleman where are the vacant farms in Wellington? There are not any in South Wellington, or in North Wellington, or in Centre Wellington. In many cases—and no doubt that has caused a great deal of the exodus from the country—farmers have found that growing grain is not as profitable as it was in other days. They find that they have more competition, and they would have been driven out of the country altogether if it had not been that the Government have given them better communication with the mother country, and better markets by giving them greater railway and steamship facilities, and so greater access to the European countries. We have had a better price on the Liverpool market than we ever had before, but, notwithstanding that, the price of grain is just as low in the great American nation, because of the great surplus which exists. That is not only the case on this continent, but if you go to India, or to Russia, or to China, you will find that the market has been flooded. Year after year it is going on in the same way. The opening up of the Western States, the opening up of our own great North-West, where there are twelve million bushels of grain waiting for

Mr. HESSON.

a market, have contributed to this. Are they going to sell that grain from the North-West in Chicago or in Milwaukee or in Minneapolis, when the Americans are exporting much larger amounts out of their country. The farmers of Canada are realising that they cannot grow grain and make money by exporting it, and consequently they have been increasing the size of their farms, have been raising stock, and going into dairying, and possibly in that way they have found a better market. Our farmers are doing very well, and I do not hear any murmuring among them. It is only when I come here that I hear of their bad times, and that is alleged in order to make a point against the Government and against the National Policy, which is the object of their everlasting hatred, a hatred that will keep them on that side of the House as long as they entertain it. I again challenge the hon. gentleman to produce a statement of the vacant farms. There are many farmers who have 50 acres and have taken 100, and many who had 100 who have increased them to 200, and many of their sons have gone to the North-West or to the American side in consequence, and that also is part of the exodus. While dealing with that question, I may just as well reach my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan). In his speech the other night he threw out this challenge. I quote from *Hansard*. Referring to the statements made by the hon. the Minister of the Interior in reply to the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) says:

“The hon. gentleman has taken his report from the Bureau of Industries, and I challenge him to go over whole report, and show that my statement is not correct. I have no fear that any hon. gentleman will be able to show anything of the kind.”

Well, I am just going to see if I can show that. I have here the very book from which the hon. gentleman quoted. I will give you exactly what he said in reference to it. He said:

“There has been a good deal said with respect to the decreased value of land in the Province of Ontario. I will say, as a farmer, that this is, perhaps, a subject with which I am better acquainted than many others, as I have had an opportunity of testing the value of lands in the County of Huron and in the County of Perth which very few farmers have had. I had the honor to be appointed twelve months ago to value the whole County of Perth for equalisation purposes. I went over it along with another gentleman and put a value on every lot of land there, and I can assure you, Sir, that the reduction in the value of land in that country amounts to 10 and 15, and in some cases more, per cent. I am certain that the same reduction has taken place in the County of Huron, to which I have the honor to belong.”

Now, we will see what Mr. Blue says about that, and we will also see what the hon. gentleman said about it on another occasion, when he was under oath, when he was making the statement not for political purposes, when he was selected for the purpose he refers to there, to value every farm in the county of Perth, and he dares to come and use language like that against one of the finest counties—I have no hesitation in saying—in the Dominion of Canada. I accept this challenge, and I produce the proof. I have the evidence of his own report, and I will quote Mr. Blue's report as to the value of lands in that county. In 1882, which is the date he used further on in his speech, and I will take his own sworn statement, sworn to last May, for I took the trouble to send to the county clerk for it, he and his colleague, one Wm. Long, made their sworn statement. In the year 1882, land in the county of Perth under the equalised report made by the county council itself in its June session, was put down at \$19,408,293 for real property, or an average value of \$35·67 per acre. Now, I have Mr. Blue's report, which bears that out within a fraction. The council passed that equalised assessment, and every township came into it. I will give you what the hon. gentleman says in reference to the value in 1886, the year for which he makes the report, and he leaves

out all the buildings and all that sort of thing, I believe. The equalised report of the hon. gentleman is as follows: \$21,940,936. I told you that it was \$19,408,000 in 1852. The assessed value for 1882, as made by the corporation, was \$18,445,000, or \$35.67 per acre. The gentleman who made the statement that land had declined in value from 10 to 15 per cent. in the county of Perth, and he includes Huron, swears that when he made this report the value was \$21,930,496, or \$42.40 per acre, an increase of \$6.73 per acre over the assessed value. Now, let me give the hon. gentleman further information. Lest he might doubt my words, I will send him the report and he can see for himself. The council met in June, 1887. The hon. gentleman's report was before them, they were dealing with it. The council in equalising the various municipalities—I omit the towns and cities, because they have nothing to do with the farms—put the value of real property under the very same heading that my hon. friend does; and where he gives \$21,930,000, they put it \$22,968,000, or in other words they go about a million and a-half better. Probably the hon. gentleman knows more about it than all the wardens and Reeves of the county of Perth; probably he knows more about it now than he did when he made that sworn statement; he knows more than Mr. Blue did in 1882. I shall make the hon. gentleman a present of the figures, and I ask him to apologise to the House and to my county for having made such a statement. Now, Mr. Speaker, you would scarcely believe, after the pious way in which the hon. gentleman made his statement, that he would attempt to do anything that would cast a slur upon a neighboring county, that I think has done him no harm, and who selected him for his good judgment—I have no doubt he has good judgment—it is difficult to believe that for mere party purposes he would not only damage my county but damage his own. But he can do what he likes with his own, although as a neighbor I protest against it. I think I may go further and say that not only has the value of real estate increased in the county of Perth from 1882 to 1886, as I have stated, but when you come to take the total valuation of farms including personal estate, such as cattle, and implements, and including the houses on the farms, which is a fair test, when Mr. Blue in 1882 gave the value of \$34,296,739, in 1886, he gives the value at \$35,059,249, or an increase of \$762,510. So we find that even by the worst report we could get of the county, because Mr. Blue, whose report the hon. gentleman uses, was certainly no friend of the Conservative party, we ask no favors from him, but take his own report, still the county of Perth stands \$7,200 better than in the report of the hon. gentleman. Now, then, I will deal with the hon. gentleman's own county briefly. In 1882, according to Mr. Blue's report, the value of farm property was \$47,289,529. In 1886, notwithstanding all the cry of wail and despair, that the hon. gentleman has made, the alleged depopulation of the country, the farms getting poorer, and the mortgages increasing, and the mortgages have increased for the reason that the farmers have increased their holdings, where they owned 50 acres they have bought 100, and where they owned 100, they have bought another 100; in that way they make liabilities for themselves, no doubt, but in 1886 the value had increased to \$49,110,033, or an increase of \$1,820,504, according to Mr. Blue. If the hon. gentleman wants later information, he can get it in the report for 1887. Then the hon. gentleman directed his attack against the whole Province of Ontario. We find that in 1882, the farm lands, buildings, implements, and live stock were valued at \$948,000,000, and in 1886 at \$989,497,000. Here is what Mr. Blue says in his report of November, 1886, on page 5:

"These values are made up from the June schedule of farmers. They show an increase on the figures of last year, \$21,667,804 in farm lands; \$6,518,649 in live stock; \$1,961,211 in implements, and a little over

\$1,000,000 in building, or about an excess over the values of 1885 of \$31,338,171, and of \$41,195,106 over the values of the four years."

He goes further than that, he says:

"Compared with 1882, in 1886 the increase was \$41,195,106 over the Province of Ontario."

Now, what are people to think of a gentleman who, for mere party purposes, tried to make them believe that the country was going to ruin, and all for the paltry purpose of gaining some political advantage? Now, the hon. gentleman did not stop at that. The reason I direct so much attention to the member of South Huron is that I have got a pretty high respect for him, seeing that my county engaged him to do a certain work, and no doubt they had a good opinion of his judgment as a valuator. The hon. gentleman went further. Dealing with the stock and the cattle he says—I quote from *Hansard*:

"Now, Sir, in 1887, there were 70,000 head less cattle in Ontario than there were two years previously. The farmers are in a very bad condition indeed. I think the farmers are in the worst condition of any class of population in the Province of Ontario."

Again, he says:

"In the report I received last August we have 70,682 fewer horses and cattle than we had in 1882."

We will see what Mr. Blue says about it. I find in Mr. Blue's report that in 1882 we had 508,998 horses; in 1886, 569,649, or an increase of 60,651 horses. That gentleman also deals with the number of cattle, but I must take horses and cattle together. The number in Ontario in 1882 was 1,680,056; in November, 1887—and I sent especially for the latest returns—the number was 1,948,264, or an increase of \$40,280; yet the hon. gentleman said the number was less than formerly, and he passes in the country as a fair and honorable gentleman in dealing with public questions, while at the same time he is damaging, not only his own county and my county, but the whole Province of Ontario. If we take the two together, horses and cattle, we find that instead of there being 70,000 less, as stated by the hon. member there was an excess in 1886 over 1882 of 406,571. The hon. gentleman got the sheep mixed with the question and tried to pull the wool over our eyes. It is very true that we have less sheep now than formerly, but he did not mention them when he said there were 70,000 head short. The truth is he got sheep, cattle and horses mixed, and, as I said, he tried to pull the wool over our eyes, but he did not succeed. We will again see what Mr. Blue says on the subject. On page 62 of his report he says that the value of animals in 1882 was \$93,325,797; in 1886—and the hon. gentleman said that our farmers had been exporting all their cattle, because they were too poor to feed them, and they had set their store cattle to Buffalo—the value was \$107,000,000 odd, or an increase of \$8,883,843. That covers sheep I suppose.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. HESSON. I do not think hon. members are ready for a division yet, but when the time comes they will swallow this resolution as they have others, and they will vote against the National Policy as they have done in the past. I have a dose yet for the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). That hon. gentleman could not leave my county alone. He made the same mistake, whether willfully or not I do not know, or he may have taken his figures from some other gentleman, at all events he raised the same wail of despair that has been raised by every hon. gentleman on that side of the House. He said the farms in Wellington had been mortgaged to a very great extent. The hon. gentleman knows more about mortgages than I do, because it is in his line of business. The hon. gentleman knows something about some of the unfortunate farmers there, and I rather think they know something about him too. I want to give the hon. gentle-

man a better idea of his own county than he possesses himself, and I am very sorry that a gentleman representing such a noble county as Wellington should fall into the same mistake as has been made by the hon. member for South Huron. The hon. gentleman said there had been a great decline in the value of farm lands, and in support of that statement he quoted statistics regarding his own county. According to Mr. Blue's report the value of farm lands in Wellington in 1881 was \$34,354,286, in 1886 \$35,416,621, or an increase of \$1,060,000 odd. I feel an interest in my neighbors, and as hon. gentlemen who have spoken for counties surrounding my county have spoken of the want of prosperity in those counties, I desire to examine as to what the cause is, and to what extent the statement is true. Last evening the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Bowman), one of the garden counties of Ontario, made the very same departure. He did not open it with a wail but he closed it with a wail. He said that the value of lands had depreciated there and I presume that as he is in the loaning business he will know all about it. He is a very nice gentleman and represents his county faithfully and well, but I do not think his constituents will be thankful to him for representing that noble county as on its last legs. If there is one county more than another which is holding its own and holding more than its own it is that grand county of Waterloo, and if there is one man who ought to be proud of that, it is the gentleman who represents the Germans of that county, the most industrious, hard working, and honest citizens in Canada to-day. To see their beautiful homes, their magnificent farms and the growth of their glorious towns is a sight to be admired. Let the hon. gentleman go to the town he resides in Waterloo, and let him look around him there and how can he come here and wail against the National Policy. He cannot help admitting that the National Policy has built up the town he resides in. Look at Berlin, one and a half mile distant, it is a perfect marvel of progress. I may say it is a Manchester in a small way. What was it before the National Policy was introduced? I am not afraid to say that with the exception of one firm in that town, Messrs. Erb, Brown & Co., who are extraordinarily bitter Grits, not a manufacturer in that magnificent little town could be found to say that the National Policy had not been the making of their business. I am surprised that my friend from Waterloo had the courage to say that he represented the opinions of the manufacturers of that town. The town has doubled its wealth and population since the National Policy came into force, and I challenge that hon. gentleman to stand up and say that he can express the opinions of the manufacturers of that town, for the manufacturers voted solid for the National Policy. In 1874, when the hon. gentleman represented that county before, he was elected by acclamation. No man dared to enter in the field against him. It was a county known for years as one in which no Conservative had a right to show his face, and it was only when the National Policy had so benefited the people of that county and that town that my hon. friend was defeated by the gentleman who represented the county in 1878, and until the House was dissolved in 1882. The gentleman I refer to was Mr. Kranz. Although the hon. gentleman who now represents the county was previously elected by acclamation the town of Berlin gave 250 of a solid majority against him. While he may have a right to represent the farmers on this question I challenge the right of the hon. gentleman to profess to represent the people who are engaged in the manufacturing industries in that town and to say they are not in favor of the National Policy. Let him go to his native town where he has lived for a long time, and where he is respected highly, and I do not think there is any other gentleman in that riding more respected than he is for he

Mr. Hession.

has friends and relatives everywhere and he has represented North Waterloo in an able and distinguished way. Indeed that gentleman in his own town could not get a majority while in the rural places he was able to throw the veil over the eyes of the farmers. Right in his town there was no less than a majority of 58 against him. I think I have devoted enough attention to those hon. gentlemen and perhaps more than the subject is worthy of. I for one enter my protest here against any attempt to put into the hands of the United States Government the power to levy the rates of duty that people will have to pay in this country on their imports into this country. I protest against our looking to them for what they may chose to dole out to us for the purpose of the public expenditures of this country. I protest against Canada ever having to submit or to surrender her right to legislate for herself in those matters, and to decide under her own good will what is best for her people. You may call me ultra-loyal if you will, but I protest, and so long as life continues I shall protest, against anything that would lead to a severance from the old land that we all love so well. I believe, that if there is one thing that we could desire better than another, it would be that the grand old country should make with us and her colonies which, look to her for encouragement and aid in time of distress, one grand Zollverein against all foreign nations, giving the right of her markets, under conditions that would be denied to other countries. I believe that we should look to this instead of turning our backs upon the British Empire and upon our glorious Queen. I say it is our bounden duty, as British subjects, whilst at the same time considering our own interest, to look towards the mother land. I believe our interest points in that direction, and even if you put it on the very lowest grounds, I believe it is to our advantage in every possible way to keep up that connection and to strengthen it more. Above all things, never allow the Americans to legislate for us in matters that we understand ourselves best. I believe that the course I have referred to will make our people contented and prosperous, as I believe they are now, outside a few politicians in this country.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Adjourn.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Mr. Speaker, as it does not appear to be the wish of gentlemen on the opposite side of the House that we should be permitted to adjourn at this late hour of the evening I certainly will have to bow to their desires and wishes. They being in the majority, of course we on the side of the minority must submit as we have always submitted with the best grace possible. But, Sir, a question of this kind, a question involving results which may be of serious consideration to the country, a question in which we are all deeply interested, should have a proper time for consideration and discussion. This late hour is hardly a proper time for a person to express his ideas and his reasons for the vote that he may be called upon to give. I was more or less amused by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hession). I do not really know whether he was serious in the statements he has made or whether he desired the House to understand or consider that he was discussing the question of unrestricted reciprocity, or whether he was offering a few remarks so that he might congratulate some hon. members on this side of the House on the manner in which they had addressed the House. I am surprised that any hon. member of this House should so far forget what is proper and right as to deliberately accuse any hon. member of this House of attempting to draw the wool over the eyes of any of the people of the Dominion of Canada. I much regret that

he should deliberately and positively affirm, from his place in this House, that my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Bowman) should have succeeded in drawing the wool over the eyes of the farmers in that locality. Does he pretend to say that the farmers are so ignorant that they do not know when or how to record their votes? He may imagine that he is addressing himself through this House to an ignorant class; but I will give him to understand distinctly that I have had an opportunity of meeting farmers in various sections of this country, and no class in this Dominion are more intelligent, or who more thoroughly understand what is best for their own interests. I say, with reference to his remarks about my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan), that the statements made by that hon. gentleman were correct in every particular; and I think any dispassionate individual within the hearing of my voice, will agree with me that, taking into consideration the opening up of new territories in the North-West, and the departure of many people from this country to the United States, farm lands are not at present in Canada as valuable as they were a few years ago. But it matters very little whether the lands be assessed high or low, there is a certain amount of taxes to be raised, and if the land is assessed low the rate of taxation will be high, while if the land is assessed high, the rate of taxation will be low. Therefore, the assessed value of the land is no certain indication of its real value. The hon. gentleman stated another thing which I take exception to. It has been the rule among hon. members opposite, when they rise to address the House, to hurl across the floor the charge, not only that we on this side are disloyal, but that we are continually decrying the country. Now, Sir, I challenge any hon. member opposite to point to a single statement made by any member on this side in any way disparaging to this country. They are the individuals who are decrying the country. Not a breath of detraction has been uttered by any member on this side of the House. We have simply stated what we conceive to be true, and I have yet to learn that any of us feel that we are doing wrong when we are stating the truth. It may be very congenial for hon. gentlemen opposite to withhold the truth or not, to be free to express candidly what they feel to be the facts. I am not going, Sir, to decry my country. I believe we have as fine a country as lies under the sun. I believe we have a class of inhabitants that, perhaps, cannot be surpassed in any country in the world. Our situation and surroundings conduce to render the human product of Canada one of the most superior in the world. If we take into consideration the climatic conditions of Canada, our people in longevity surpass probably any others; and for physical endurance, for strength and bravery, we know that no other country has been able to show the equal of our people. Knowing these facts, would it be reasonable for us for one moment to decry a country that produced such fine physical specimens of men as Hanlan or McKinnon? If that is not sufficient, let me call your attention to something with which you are more familiar, perhaps, than the exploits of those individuals. Let me call your attention to the circumstances that unfortunately took place in 1885 at the time the rebellion sprang up in the North-West. What did we find on that occasion? We found young men from the counting house, from the college, from the farm and from various avocations and callings, responding gloriously to their country's call; and their physical power of endurance during the time they went to subdue that rebellion would command the admiration of any veterans. You know full well, Mr. Speaker, what they were called on to endure. You know that they were called on to go to the North West without the necessary comforts that ought to have been supplied to them—that after they started on their journey they were obliged to ride on the cars day

after day and night after night without the rest and refreshment which are necessary to the sustenance of the human system. Not only that, but they were compelled to make forced marches through snow in a temperature which was almost enough to freeze them to death. They endured all that, and when they reached their destination, they subdued one of the most grievous rebellions that was perhaps ever recorded in the annals of any race. Within ninety days after they had reached their point of destination, they put down the Indian rebellion. With these facts before us, will any one attempt to decry for a moment the human product of this Dominion. Take the people of Canada as a whole, and there is not a finer race under the sun. This being the case with the people, let us consider what sort of a country we have. Have you found, Sir, any individual who attempted to speak upon this question say that our soil, our climate, our situation in every respect, is not only equal but in many respects superior to that of the United States. We have as good soil as they, we have as good a climate as they, we have as good water communication as they, and having a race equal to theirs, we ought to march onward in civilisation, in the advancement of manufacturing industries and of farming industries, with a pace equal to that of the people of the United States. But have we so advanced? Have we made progress equal to that made by our neighbors? If we have not, there must be some reason for it, and we ought to consider wherein lies the fault. If a fault exists it is our bounden duty to remedy it. I might, perhaps, follow the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hoatson) through some of the remarks he made, but I really think, as I have said, that he was hardly sincere in his remarks, and was merely endeavoring to take up as much of the time of the House as he could without touching at all on the question of unrestricted reciprocity. True, he read a number of letters from Mr. Wiman, and I should judge from his speech that he had taken extensive notes, before coming to Parliament, on the question of commercial union, and, having neglected to separate unrestricted reciprocity from that question, fired off the unprepared, half digested, very crude speech, he had intended for some other purpose. Therefore, it is hardly worth my while to take up the various points, if points I could call them, and answer them in the manner in which the hon. gentleman presented them to the House. I have said to you that our territory is as great as and equal in every respect to any portion of the United States, and I may say to many portions of the old world. Take, for instance, the Province from which I come, not that I consider it is any better than any other Province of the Dominion, for I believe every Province is equally adapted for the maintenance and support of the human race, but let me take the Province of Ontario and compare its extent with that of other countries. From Point Pelee on Lake Erie to Fort Albany on James Bay, it is more than 700 miles wide. It is larger than the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Michigan by 10,000 square miles; yet the population of each of these States far exceeds the population of Ontario, and you will also find that the manufacturing industries of these States far exceeds those of the Province of Ontario. What is the cause of this? Why have we not made as great a progress as those States across the border? The Province of Ontario is also larger than the six New England States, and is larger than New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Maryland by some 25,000 square miles. It is larger than Great Britain and Ireland by 75,000 square miles, and is only 4,000 square miles less than the French Republic and 8,000 less than the German Empire. Let us take the Dominion of Canada and what do we find? We find, if we compare it with the United States, that the territory of the Dominion with its 5,000,000 of population is greater than the whole territory of the United States. We have in the Dominion of Canada some 3,500,000 square

miles of territory, whereas in the United States they have only 3,036,000 square miles, but we have less than five millions population, while the population of the United States is nearly 65,000,000. Why is it that the United States have increased so rapidly while we have to remain comparatively stationary? It is not on account of lack of energy on the part of our people or lack of ability to perform the duties which are essential to the prosperity of the country. There must be some cause why we have not made the same progress as the people across the border. We have ample territory for the founding of a great kingdom, or a great nation, and I can well understand the aspirations of the people of Canada that the time may come when we may be one of those glorious empires or kingdoms compared with other nations of the earth; but I am afraid that, at our present rate of progress, if we do not make more rapid strides than we have made, it is a distant future before we can expect to emulate other nations. Besides this broad expanse, we have a fertile soil, an invigorating climate, vast forests, great mineral wealth and water power of limitless capacity. Let us consider for a moment the advantages which we would have if we were a manufacturing country as our friends on that side of the House say they are endeavoring to make us. What might we not accomplish in consequence of the water privileges we possess? But have we not since 1879 attempted to build up factories in this country at the expense of the consumers? Have we not raised our duties and protected articles that could be manufactured in Canada in order to prevent their importation from foreign countries, and have we succeeded to the extent to which we ought to have succeeded? Have we accomplished what it was expected the new fiscal policy would accomplish? I think that every ardent lover and well wisher of the fiscal policy which was inaugurated in 1879 will admit that as much as he desired has not been accomplished, and, if it has been in the past so fruitless of results, can we expect in the future to receive any greater advantages in that direction than we have in the past?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). No doubt some of my hon. friends will cry "hear, hear" to anything which conveys the impression that the National Policy is performing some wonderful duty. I might perhaps give you the opinion of some in reference to what they consider the condition of Canada. I would read to you what is stated by Mr. J. R. Larned, of the United States Treasury Department in 1871:

"Ontario possesses a fertility in which no part of New England can at all compare, and that particular section of it around which the circle of the great lakes is swept forces itself upon the notice of any student of the American map as one of the most favored spots of the whole continent, where the population ought to breed with almost Belgian fecundity."

Here we see that the American people do not hesitate to tell the truth in reference to the condition of Canada, but, if we unfortunately on this side of the House should happen to make a favorable remark in reference to the territory across the line, we are held up as being inclined to annexation or as having a desire sooner or later to throw ourselves into the arms of the United States. Here is an American opinion in regard to the condition of Canada. Is it right that we on this side of the House, knowing these facts and feeling an inherent desire for the welfare of Canada, should be branded by every member who happens to get upon his feet on that side and should be charged with degrading or belittling our country? Have our people, as a people, proved themselves worthy of the Dominion of Canada? Have they done their share individually to increase the prosperity of the country? Are they individually to blame for the condition in which Canada is to-day? I think they are not. If we look at the various Provinces of the Dominion, what do we find? In Ontario we find that every care is taken to better the condition of the people, and the

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

same remark may be made of every one of the other Provinces. We have a good form of government in the Province of Ontario, and we have good forms of government in all the other Provinces, and, thanks to the intelligence of the people and to their cautiousness, we have to-day a reform government, a progressive government, in almost every Province of the Dominion of Canada. That being the case, we would naturally expect that they would have the interests of the people at heart; and if we examine into what they have done in the various Provinces, we find that it is not owing to any lack of duty on the part of the Local Governments that the Dominion has not improved as rapidly as it ought to have improved. Take, for instance, the encouragement to agriculture. They have adopted every means to render assistance to the people to foster and encourage the industry of agriculture. They have established an agricultural college in the Province of Ontario, where young men have an opportunity of receiving instructions which will render them more competent to perform the duties of successful farmers. Our educational system will command the admiration of any country under the sun. We have expended enormous sums of money for the purpose of constructing railways. The Local Government of Ontario has granted large subsidies to railways; and not only that, but the municipalities have granted bonuses to various roads with a view of enabling every farmer to have an opportunity to dispose of everything he has to dispose of to the best possible advantage, and at as little expense as possible. Not only that, but we have constructed various roads so as to render the country more accessible to the markets. Good markets are built up in almost every town and city in all parts of the Province. We find that the people are prepared, and have been prepared, to submit to what is so obnoxious in the ears of many, direct taxation, whereby the municipalities may have a certain amount to expend for educational and other purposes. We find that every Province is well managed by its Local Government, and why is it that the Dominion, as a whole, has not been as successful as it ought to have been? It must be either on account of the fiscal policy of the Government or the bad management of the Government. Sir, if that be found to be the case, if it is on account of their fiscal policy being inimical to the best interests of the country, the sooner the Government come down and submit some means whereby the evil may be remedied, the better it will be for the country. Sir, it is no great sin if they find they have been going wrong, candidly to confess it and try to repair the wrong. It is not cowardly to confess they have been wrong. I do not suppose there are many hon. members in this House who would regard them as perfect. We had an illustration a few days ago of a case wherein they had resisted for four or five years the entreaties of the members on this side of the House to grant certain concessions so as to put us in a better position with regard to the people of the United States. They firmly resisted our entreaties. I can remember well when the late Minister of Finance, now the Postmaster General, was entreated by members on this side of this House not to increase the duties upon small fruit trees coming into this country from the United States. It was pointed out to him then that the United States had passed an Act in 1883, removing duties from these very articles upon which the Government had taken authority, by Order in Council, to reciprocate with the United States. They resisted that request. They said it would injure a very large class of the citizens of Canada; they said we have a large number of nurserymen and small market gardeners, and if we allowed these fruits to come into the country, it would destroy these industries, and the market gardeners would not be able to get as good a price for their strawberries, their peaches and other fruit. They said it would be a wrong, it would be, to a certain

extent, abandoning the National Policy that they had been fostering for a number of years. A large number of their supporters on that side of the House raised their voices in strong condemnation of any such gross injustice, being inflicted upon the nurserymen, the market gardeners and the small fruit men of Canada. But, Sir, did we not see the spectacle a few days ago of the announcement that a proclamation had been issued, placing upon the free list the very articles that we had contended for a few years ago? Where were the responsive voices that stood up a few years before and condemned us for advocating the very same thing that was done a few days ago? Quiet they say, unresponsive; no voice was raised, still as death. They may have felt grieved, they may have felt annoyed, but their master has said that they were to submit, and they quietly submitted and took the dose without a grimace. Sir, if it was a proper thing to make that concession and give away a portion of their National Policy, I would entreat them to come forward now and be still more generous and still more just. If they say the country has not made that improvement which it ought to have made during the last few years, they should come forward now and say: Here, we have virtually conceded that the National Policy has not been a success; we have had to do away with a portion of it, and we will concede the balance; we will allow the United States to send in not only the cereals and natural products of the soil, the mine and the forest, but we will allow them to send in their manufactured articles. Let me make a comparison. Take for instance the State of New York, and put up a high tariff wall around it, what would be the effect? Do you suppose the State of New York would go on and prosper as it has been doing? I think we would find that in a very short time its population would decrease, its manufacturing industries would decrease, and that, instead of being the banner State of the Union, in a short time it would fall to the third or fourth place. Now, Sir, we find that if we take the natural fertility of the Province of Ontario or any other portion of the Dominion, and compare it with that of some of the other States of the Union, our country will compare most favorably; in fact we in Canada will be able to raise a larger percentage of grain than they can in the United States. Let me compare fall wheat in Ontario with some of the States of the Union wherein that grain is most favorably grown. If you take the years from 1832 to 1886, the fall wheat would average 14.8 bushels per acre in Pennsylvania; in Ohio, 13.3; Michigan, 16.4; Indiana, 13; Illinois 12.9; Missouri, 10.9; California, 12; Kansas, 15.2. What was the average in Canada during that period, and, mark you, I take from 1882 to 1886 inclusive, during one of which years there was almost a total failure in the Dominion, much worse than in the United States. The average for Ontario during those five years was 21 bushels per acre, a larger average than they have in the United States. Next take spring wheat. The average during the same period in Wisconsin—and I select the States most favorable to the growth of spring wheat—was 12.7; Minnesota, 13.2; Iowa, 11.4; Nebraska, 12.7; Dakota, 13.1; Ontario, 15.1, thus exceeding Iowa by 4.7 bushels and Dakota by 2 bushels. Next I come to oats. The products in New York State on an average during the same period, and it is a State favorable to the growth of oats, was 29.6; Pennsylvania, 28.8; Illinois, 34.5; Ohio, 32; Michigan, 32.9; Indiana, 28.8; Wisconsin, 34; Minnesota, 34.6; Iowa, 34; Missouri, 26; Kansas, 31.9; Nebraska, 32.2; Ontario, 37.1. We have heard during this discussion something on the question of barley. Perhaps there is no country, neither the United States nor any foreign country, where the same quality and same quantity of barley can be raised as in this Dominion. The production of barley on an average taking the same number of years, was as follows: New

York, average per acre 23.1; Wisconsin, 24.2; Minnesota, 23.4; Iowa, 22.5; Nebraska, 22.3; California, 19.3; Ontario, 26.9. These facts show that Ontario exceeded any of the States of the Union in the quantity per acre and the quality is superior to any raised in any State. If we could obtain reciprocal trade or unrestricted reciprocity with the United States we would there find a market for all the barley we could possibly raise. All the barley we could raise would not in any way overstock the market of the United States, therefore it would not in any way reduce the price. Again, if you take the very small acreage of barley in Canada, it shows that it is on account of the 10 cents a bushel we have to pay to send barley into the United States that causes our farmers to raise less barley than they otherwise would do. The average quantity of land occupied is about 43 acres to the 1000. If we had reciprocity between Canada and the United States we would be able to occupy a much larger acreage per 1000 than at the present time, and, therefore, even that should induce the Government to consider favorably anything that would, to a certain extent, relieve the farmers from the condition in which they are at the present time. You may say that the farmer is prosperous, that he has succeeded in his occupation; but remember what the hon. member for North Perth said, that it was quite out of the question at the present time that a farmer in the Dominion could cultivate as much land as a farmer cultivated on the prairie, and it was unreasonable to expect our farmers to do so. If that be true, as stated by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), is it not the duty of the Government to make an arrangement with the United States if possible? But the House knows well that the Government do not feel anxious to do so; that rumor is that whenever election time comes round that one portion of the community is more liberal towards assisting to secure the present Government in power than the other portion, that the farming community do not respond so readily to calls, they are not willing to supply the sinews of war and furnish assistance to keep the Government in power, and therefore the Government turn their back upon those who do not extend aid. That is the reason why the Government treat with indifference the portion of the community that includes 75 per cent. of the whole population. But the time is not far distant when they will find the farming community rise in their might and say they are no longer going to have a Government legislating in the interests of a certain class against the masses of the people, and the sooner the day comes the better it will be for the future hope and aspiration of those who regard and wish their country well. But this is not all. If we have not succeeded as well as we might expect in establishing our various industries, how has our population increased compared with what it ought to have been? I will not detain the House to show that the population has not increased in the ratio in which it should have increased. The population increased from 1873 to 1879, and mark you that was a period when there was a great depression in the country, and when there was a very small amount of money spent in public and other improvements. The population then increased by 78,961 or 22 per cent. From 1879 to 1885, when very large sums of money had been expended upon railways and other subsidies, and for the purpose of influencing the electorate at the polls, we find that the population during that period increased only 41,883, or 10 per cent. We know that during the latter period a very large number of supposed immigrants were brought to the country, when several million dollars were expended for that purpose, and, Sir, if we compare the number of immigrants that were reported to have been brought here and the number of the natural increase that ought to have taken place, we find that the population

in 1885 was really less than it was in 1879. Why ought this to be the case? You can all understand full well that it must be partially owing to the fiscal policy, or the restrictions that the people of the Dominion of Canada had to sustain on account of the fiscal policy inaugurated by a Government which could not fully comprehend what really was in the interest and for the welfare of the Dominion. Taking the years 1873 to 1879 we find also that the assessed lands of the municipalities increased by 1,001,233 acres or 5 per cent. During the second period when the Government was expending money lavishly on railroads and expending money in our North-West, we find that the assessed acreage increased only by 622,978 acres, or about 3 per cent. During the time that the present Government then in Opposition, charged the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) with neglecting the interests of the country and driving the people out of the country to the United States, while we find that the assessed value of the land increased more rapidly than it did when this "heaven-born" Government assumed power and promised to make everyone prosperous in the country—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Yes, you might well cheer when I ironically said "heaven-born Government." The Government that appealed to the people under the pretence that they were going to make the country prosperous have been in power since 1879, and during that time, on account of mismanagement and misgovernment, they have driven thousands of people out of the country. During that time they inaugurated a policy that we feel and we know has not conduced to the welfare of the country. Not only that, Sir, but they have run this country hopelessly in debt during that period by a lavish and extravagant expenditure. Yes, Sir, I said a "heaven-born" Government. I retract that, and you can retract your cheers. If we take the urban municipalities we find that the acreage during the first decade was much greater than it was during the second decade. In the first period it was 22 per cent, in the second decade it was only 10½ per cent. Although the times were regarded as hard in the first period I refer to, we find that the rural sections and the urban portions of the country raised a much larger amount of taxes during the first year to improve their farms, improve their conditions, educate their children, and for necessary expenses, than during the second period. The percentage during the first period was 27½, and during the time that our friends opposite have managed the affairs of the Government it has only been 16½. The people were unable since to raise the necessary taxes to educate their children and defray their expenses. Sir, we know full well what all this means; we know what will be the ultimate outcome if we go on in this way. We know full well that we in Canada cannot remain in the condition that we have been in for a number of years past. We know, Sir, that we must have an opportunity to extend our trade greater than what we have had. We are not like the frog in the well, nor like the coon that can retire into his seclusion during the winter. We must have an extended trade to other countries and not merely be traders with ourselves. The doctrine advocated by the First Minister that we should keep entirely within ourselves, that we should manufacture everything that we want, and that we should trade amongst ourselves and be excluded from the rest of the world is the most unreasonable doctrine ever preached by a man calling himself a statesman. Suppose the hon. gentleman had carried out that policy that he announced he would carry out at the time he appealed to the country, I ask you what would have been the result? The grievous wail that we hear against the members on this side of the House, that we are doing an injustice and a wrong to the mother land on account of asking reciprocal trade between

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

the United States and Canada, would not have been indulged in by gentlemen opposite, for the hon. gentleman then said that he was going to manufacture everything and import nothing from other countries. Sir, if he carried out the doctrine that he then preached, a grievous wrong would have been committed by him. If we seek to become a great nation, if we expect to extend our trade with other nations, we know that we must adopt a different policy to that which we have adopted. We know full well that even now with the restriction placed upon the articles coming from the United States to Canada that a very large amount of those articles do come and that we raise a considerable amount of revenue from their importation. We know that with free trade with the mother country, and with every opportunity of conveying everything that we have to trade to them, we have extended our trade from 1879 up to the present time but by a very small amount. The hon. member for Centre Toronto said that England gave us market enough for all the surplus cereals we raised in Canada now or will raise for a hundred years. I would ask him, have we not had England for our market for the last ten or twelve years? Shall we have it any the less if we enter into unrestricted trade with the United States? It is perfect nonsense to say that it would injure our trade with the mother country. Everyone knows that the mother country desires the prosperity of Canada, and that anything we may do to promote its prosperity and increase its population would only endear Canada to the mother country; and I say he is not a true patriot who would try to restrict the progress and success of the Dominion. I am not aware that we should be doing any injustice to the mother country at all; but if unrestricted reciprocity injured anyone in the mother country, it would only injure a few Birmingham and Manchester manufacturers. True, we receive from them about \$40,000,000 worth of goods a year. True, there are about 500 people in all who realise a profit on this trade. They might be affected; but they are not the mother country; they are only a few of the citizens of the mother country. Are we not citizens of the mother country just as much as they? Are the 5,000,000 people of Canada to suffer what we conceive to be injurious to our country, for the sake of pleasing a few manufacturers in Birmingham and Manchester? The whole profits that those manufacturers realise from us might be, perhaps, \$2,000,000 a year. But you must bear this in mind, that the manufactures of Birmingham and Manchester are not the only people in England who have an interest in Canada. There are others in England who have enormous sums invested in Canada; I suppose \$500,000,000 of English capital is to-day invested in this country. Are we to do what will mar the success and the enterprise of those investments for the purpose of pleasing a few of the manufacturers of Birmingham and Manchester? We know that a great proportion of the money invested in our railroads comes from England; we know that the greater portion of the money invested in our loan societies and manufacturing industries comes from England; and I ask you, Sir, if we should get unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and by that means increase the wealth and prosperity of the Dominion of Canada, whether in benefiting that large number of capitalists in the mother country who have their money invested in Canada, we should not be benefiting the mother country. Then consider our railroad interest. If we could get unrestricted reciprocity, whereby we could increase the traffic between the United States and Canada, the earnings of the railroads would increase enormously, more than to the extent of \$2,000,000 that the manufacturers of Birmingham and Manchester might lose. Therefore it is most unreasonable to say that we should be dealing unfairly with the mother country by adopting unrestricted reciprocity. I say that it would be in the interest of the mother country for

us to obtain it, and we should do everything in our power to bring it about. But, Sir, there is another consideration in this matter. If we do not extend our trade, it is just possible that some fine day the bonding system may be done away with, that the United States may say to us that no longer is it in the interest of the United States to continue the bonding system; what would be the effect on the Dominion if such a thing took place? We know that it would be an almost fatal blow to railroading in the Dominion of Canada. There are many here whose interests are considerably identified with railroads, and I appeal to them to consider whether it would not be better for us, when we have an opportunity, when the olive branch is held out to us by the American Government, to embrace their offer at the earliest opportunity. Now, I am well aware that many statements have been made to show that our population has not to any greater extent gone to the United States during the last decade than it did during the Administration of the hon. member for East York. I agree that we must always expect that there will be more or less interchange of population between the two countries which no Government or people can prevent. I think you will find that during the last decade, a larger number have left Canada than during the previous years; and that being the case, it is evident they must have thought Canada was not the best place for them to obtain either work or cheap lands. If then it be found that it is to our interest that we should have unrestricted reciprocity, is it not our bounden duty, as true loyal Canadians, to do that which is in the interest of Canada. You can rest content, Sir, that England will look after herself and that the United States will look after themselves, and that in Canada we must look after the interests of our own people. I feel thankful for having had this brief opportunity of making the remarks I have made. Let me say before sitting down, that I am strongly in favor of unrestricted reciprocity, and I will appeal to my friends from down by the sea, whether they can conscientiously vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Halifax in favor of our coasting trade. We know the great advantage that would accrue to us were we permitted to have the privilege of the coasting trade from one port to the other of the United States. It would also be a great benefit for the people on the great inland waters along the lakes between the United States and Canada. On account of our not having that reciprocal privilege, the shipping along our coast has disappeared almost completely, and unless we can obtain something in that direction, we will not be able to carry on that business which a country such as this Dominion should carry on, and I appeal to them to lay aside party feeling and do that which they ought to do in the interest of the people of the whole Dominion. Entertaining those views, I shall cordially support the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), believing that the policy it embodies will, in the future, if carried out, make Canada one of the first nations under the sun. I also believe that if our trade and our relations with the people of the United States remain restricted our interests will be crippled, our trade will be curtailed and Canada will not be the country we all desire it to be.

Mr. KIRK. As this is one of the most, if not the most important question, perhaps, that has been before this House since Confederation, hon. gentlemen should approach the discussion of it with at least clear heads and at a time when they are not drowsy for the want of sleep. It is now nearly 2:30 o'clock, and I rise to move the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. KIRK. I believe there are several other gentlemen who wish to address the House on this question, and it is unfair to try and shut them off or force them to speak at

this early hour in the morning. However, we are able to stand this thing as well as hon. gentlemen opposite. And as they evidently intend to continue the sitting for some time longer, I shall ask the indulgence of the House whilst I give some of my opinions with regard to this question from a Nova Scotia standpoint. Before entering on my subject I wish to say a word with regard to a remark made by the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). This hon. gentleman said that the leader of the Opposition had declared that the Maritime Provinces were in a state of revolt. Well, the leader of the Opposition is in his seat. He may have said that, but I did not hear him say so, and I do not think he did. I believe he said something quite different. At any rate that led the hon. gentleman to talk of repeal, and he said that no constituency in the Maritime Provinces would return a member to this House on a question of repeal. I said he was mistaken with regard to Nova Scotia, and I believe the hon. member for Digby said he was not mistaken. Let us see which is right. I happen to have the honor of being elected to this House as a repealer, by a constituency in Nova Scotia.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct the statement he imputed to me. What I said was that in the Province of New Brunswick, and I was speaking for that Province alone, no member could secure his election as a repealer.

Mr. KIRK. That makes it all right so far as the hon. gentleman is concerned. I understood him to say no constituency in the Maritime Provinces. The hon. member for Digby, in reply to the statement that the hon. member for Albert was mistaken with regard to Nova Scotia, said he was not mistaken. I issued an address to the electors of my county when the House was dissolved, and announced myself as a candidate. In that address I laid down my platform. I pointed out among other things that I was in favor of repeal, and this is what I said:

"I am fully convinced that the only effectual remedy for this unbearable state of affairs is the entire and complete separation of the Maritime from the Upper and Western Provinces, and in a union of the Maritime Provinces; and should New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island fail to co-operate, then the separation of Nova Scotia from the other Provinces of the Dominion and a return to a state of an independent Province of Great Britain, with sole control—subject to the Imperial Government—over all its internal affairs, including tariff and taxation.

"Should you do me the honor of renewing your confidence in me by re-electing me as your representative to the Canadian Parliament, I shall deem it to be my duty to cordially co-operate with the Local Government and Legislature in effecting a repeal of the British North America Act so far as it affects Nova Scotia."

I think that declaration of my position in regard to repeal and of what I myself would do proves at any rate that the Province of Nova Scotia had one constituency that returned a repealer.

Some hon. MEMBERS. One.

Mr. KIRK. Do the hon. gentlemen mean to say that I was the only candidate who was returned in favor of repeal?

Some hon. MEMBERS. What did you do?

Mr. KIRK. Never mind what we did. That proves that the people of Nova Scotia are dissatisfied with the condition of things, and they are dissatisfied because the pledges of those who brought us into Confederation have not been carried out. We were dragged into Confederation without our consent and against our will, and every prediction which was made by the leaders of the anti-confederate party has been more than fulfilled, for we have been taxed more than any one of those leaders ever anticipated, and, until the present time, we believed there was no party in the Dominion, there was no party in Ontario, which was willing to adopt the policy which has been taken up in this Parliament, viz., the advocacy of full and free reciprocity with the United States.

The United States of America are our nearest and our best market. There is not a man in the Province of Nova Scotia who is old enough to remember the condition of affairs when we had reciprocity with the United States, but remembers well that all things prospered, and the people were contented and happy. But things have changed, and are the people contented and happy?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. KIRK. Not a bit of it. They would not have voted as they did in 1886 if they were contented and happy. We know that in 1886 the Local Legislature went to the people at the polls with a square issue of repeal. We know that both parties, those opposed to repeal and those in favor of repeal, had the same chance of success at the polls. What was the result? Out of 38 members, only 7 were beaten—31 were returned pledged to vote for repeal. That was the condition of affairs in Nova Scotia in 1886. It may be true that in 1887, one year afterwards, there was seemingly a reverse vote, but it was not a reverse vote. We find that to-day only those on the Liberal side are elected from Nova Scotia who pledged themselves for repeal. Those who went to the polls not pledged for repeal were defeated, every one of them. Had they taken up the repeal cry, as they should have done, we would have had more members on this side of the House than we have. And why is it so? We know that in 1878, when the policy of protection was propounded, or rather when the change of policy was propounded, because it was in 1878 only a readjustment of the tariff that was announced which was not to increase the taxes of the people, the leader of the Opposition at that time, who is now the leader of the Government, stated that he did not intend to increase the taxes, he stated that tariffs did not increase taxes, but it was only debt that increased taxes, and they would not increase the debt and therefore they would not increase the taxes. It was to be only a readjustment, which would make everything boom, and would bring prosperity to the agricultural, the mining, and every other industry; but we find that, instead of a readjustment of the tariff so as not to take money out of the pockets of the people and not to increase the taxes, which the people have to pay, the tariff has been, not quite doubled perhaps, but enormously increased, the taxes have been enormously increased and, because of that, the people have become dissatisfied and have desired to be relieved from the Union.

Mr. MADILL. Why does not your leader take up repeal?

Mr. KIRK. I will promise the hon. gentleman one thing that, if this Government will make it a plank in their platform, if they will say to Nova Scotia, if you vote for repeal you will get repeal, nine-tenths of the people of Nova Scotia will vote in that way, and nine out of ten of the representatives of Nova Scotia will be elected pledged to repeal. Will the right hon. gentleman take up the challenge? Of course he will not, because he knows that what I say is true. What is the condition of affairs? They say that in 1882 they had the majority of the votes of the people of Nova Scotia. They went to the polls a year before Parliament expired by limitation, and why did they dissolve a year before the time? The reason was given that there were foreign capitalists who were ready to expend millions upon millions of dollars in order to develop the mineral resources of the country, most of which, or at any rate a very large proportion of which are in the Province of Nova Scotia. We are a small Province, and it may be a poor one. It is poor in consequence of the fiscal policy of the Government, but I say that in its mineral resources there is no country under the sun wealthier than that little Province. It is true that the Province of Nova Scotia is not as great an agricultural Province as the Province of Ontario, but she is an agricultural Province notwithstanding. We have in that

Mr. KIRK.

Province as fine agricultural lands as can be found in Ontario, and we have a great deal of ordinary land. We have fine forests, we have mines the like of which are not to be found anywhere else in Canada, we have gold, and silver, and coal, and copper, and iron and many other minerals. These lie undeveloped. I ask, why is it that the Province of Nova Scotia, in common with the rest of the Dominion of Canada, is so far behind the United States in the development of the resources of the country? Why are the iron mines there lying untouched, although the Government promised in 1882 that millions of money would be introduced into the country if the people showed they had confidence in the Government of the day? Why, after six years have elapsed since the people showed that they had faith in the Government, not one dollar has been expended on those iron mines? The people were deceived into voting for the Government at that time. There are but 160 men employed in the Province of Nova Scotia in developing the iron mines of that Province, on which the Government promised that millions of money would be expended. This is why the people of Nova Scotia are dissatisfied with Confederation, and want to get out of it. They remember well the flourishing condition they were in between 1854 and 1863, and they desire to see that prosperity brought back again. I was glad to hear the Minister of Finance the other day declare himself so strongly in favor of reciprocity with the United States, in the natural resources of the country; I was exceedingly pleased to hear it. I know that he and the leader of the Government had always declared that their object in imposing a high protective tariff, was to force the United States to give us reciprocity in the natural resources of the country. Well, we have been nine years under this National Policy and we have not forced the United States yet, but it looks very much as if the United States are going to force us. It seems there are two sets of opinions in the Government ranks. We have the Premier declaring against reciprocity in natural resources, and we have the Finance Minister declaring that he was in favor of it, and whether the Prime Minister liked it or not he was obliged to support the view of the Finance Minister, notwithstanding that only a week ago he had declared against it. The Government appear to have a Mikado and Tycoon; which is the Mikado and which is Tycoon, I cannot tell. But we do know that almost every hon. gentleman behind the Premier who has spoken, has agreed with him against reciprocity, either in manufactured goods or in the natural resources of the country. Scarcely an hon. gentleman opposite has spoken who did not declare that if we had reciprocity with the United States in the natural products of the soil it would ruin the farmers, yet almost every one of them says that he is willing to support a policy for reciprocity in the natural resources, although the whole tenor of their speeches went to show that it would ruin the farmers. They are willing to ruin the farmers by reciprocity in natural resources, but, oh, do not touch the poor manufacturers! The Secretary of State declared that he was in favor of reciprocity in the natural resources, but he said he was in favor of protection to the manufacturers. Now, I find it is admitted on all hands that both in the United States and here there is no hope of a reciprocity treaty in the natural resources of the country. That has been stated over and over again by leading business men in the United States and Canada, and even by the Premier himself. I will read what the First Minister said on that point in 1884, when he spoke to the resolution moved by my hon. friend from Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies):

"I believe that you will never get a treaty between the United States and Canada for reciprocal trade in the natural productions of the two countries. The Americans said—whether truly or not, I do not know—that it was a nominal reciprocity, but all the advantages were on the side of Canada. We had no market of sufficient importance to offer to them for their productions of grains, and cereals and fisheries, we, on

the other hand, had to gain everything by their market being opened for the articles specified in the treaty. That feeling, I believe, still exists, and unless the United States will come, at some time or other, to a conclusion that they will be willing to enter upon a reciprocity Treaty, not only for our natural productions, but for our manufactures as well as our natural productions, we will never have a treaty."

Here is the hon. Premier himself saying that he is willing to have a treaty with the United States in the natural products of the country, and we have this follower behind him saying that they are willing to have a treaty with the United States in the natural products, but they are not willing to have an unrestricted reciprocity in manufactures as well as in natural products; whilst the Prime Minister said only three or four years ago that it was impossible to get a reciprocity treaty of any kind unless it included both classes of articles. Now, why will hon. gentlemen stand up here to-day and tell the people, deceive the people by telling them, that we are in favor of a reciprocity treaty in the natural products, and lead the people to believe that we could get it, while they know as well as they are sitting in their seats, that we cannot get it unless we go the whole figure? Hon. gentlemen say that it is useless to have a reciprocity treaty with the United States in articles which they export as well as we, and in articles which they grow as well as we. They say, if you have reciprocity with the United States in cereals, horses and sheep, the United States export these as well as we, therefore it will be an injury to us if we open our markets to them and they open their markets to us. They say that we must protect ourselves against the Americans, in order to be able to compete with them in the markets of the world. Why, Sir, we compete with them successfully now in all the markets of the world. All we want is that the barriers be broken down between the United States and Canada, so that we may have the privilege of trading with them on equal terms in their market. We then will have an additional market of 60,000,000 of people, whilst they will only have an additional market of 5,000,000. It appears to me that the advantages are very much on our side, and if we can but get it, it would be a blessing for us. Well, Sir, Nova Scotia, previous to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, exported to the United States \$1,529,721 worth of goods, and we imported in 1865, the last whole year of the treaty, \$3,691,797 worth of goods, or more than 200 per cent. of an increase. Now, in 1887, twenty-two years afterwards, we exported to the United States only \$2,733,990 a decrease of \$857,798. We exported to the United States last year \$857,798 worth less of goods than we did twenty-two years ago. Why was this? Was it because we had not the goods to export? That could not be the reason. The reason was that the high tariff wall standing up between us and that country forced us to find other markets. Last year Nova Scotia exported to the United States \$304,096 more goods than to Great Britain's free market, notwithstanding the fact that we had to pay an enormously high tariff in the United States. The total exports of the Dominion last year was of the value of \$77,964,020, of which \$32,275,033 went to the United States, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite say the United States is no market for the Dominion. If the barriers were thrown down between the United States and Canada, I venture to say that the exports of this country would double in a very short time. Hon. gentlemen opposite have stated that the United States is not our best market for fish. I find that we exported of fish last year to the United States \$2,717,519 worth. Every one who knows anything about the fisheries is aware that the United States is our only market for fat mackerel. When we send mackerel there they meet a duty of \$2 per barrel; when we send herring there, and it is our best market for fat herrings, they meet a duty of \$1 per barrel, and codfish meets a duty of 50 cents per 100 pounds. It has been said that the people of this country

are leaving for the United States. The fishermen can scarcely do anything else. They leave for the United States because they can get better pay on United States' vessels than they can on Nova Scotian vessels, because the custom is that the captain and crew of fishing vessels work on shares and seldom on wages. They receive a certain portion, I believe one half of the whole catch, the owner of the vessel receiving the other half. The fishermen have an advantage in hiring with American outfitters, taking shares on American vessels, because they get clear of the duty levied on the fish, \$2 a barrel on mackerel, \$1 a barrel on herring, 50 cents per 100 pounds on codfish. They have that advantage over men who hire with outfitters of Nova Scotian or Canadian vessels. Take two vessels fishing together, one American and the other Nova Scotian, New Brunswick or Canadian. Each vessel catches 1,000 barrels of mackerel, which is taken to the United States, the only market. The crew of the American vessel receives one-half of the catch, 500 barrels. These are sold in the market at \$10 each. They have to pay no duty, and \$5,000 falls to the share of the captain and the crew. The Nova Scotian crew have the same number of barrels, which are sold also for \$10 per barrel; but they have to pay to the United States \$2 per barrel duty, and they thus lose \$1,000 on the transaction, they receiving \$4,000 for their fish instead of \$5,000 obtained by the crew of the American vessel. Will anyone tell me that the Nova Scotian fishermen are not placed at a disadvantage under that state of affairs? It is very obvious that the men will seek employment on American vessels, and that the Nova Scotian vessels will have great difficulty in obtaining crews. Next take the case of codfish. The duty on dried and green codfish is the same, 50 cents per 100 pounds. That practically shuts green codfish out of the American market, it is actually a prohibitive duty, and therefore the Nova Scotian fishermen must send all their green codfish to other markets. The effect of that is to overstock the other markets and reduce the price of their fish. For these reasons our fishermen are exceedingly anxious that the duty should be removed from fish. I heard the hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) state that the Americans paid the duty on fish and not our fishermen. I maintain that such is not the case. I find in discussing the question as to who pays the duty, the Premier in 1878 placed himself on record with respect to this matter. Here is what he stated in regard to who pays the duty on barley, and I say that if the principle is true that the Canadian barley raiser pays the duty, I hold that the Canadian fisherman also pays the duty, in fact the fishermen know they do pay the duty. Here is what the First Minister said in regard to the duty on barley:

"I find that the farmers of western Canada could not understand there was anything in their barley, for instance being obliged to pay a duty of 15 per cent. upon going into the United States. It is said the consumers paid the duty and that the farmer does not suffer anything. That is the statement, but when I put a simple case, which I have done frequently, I can get no answer. I put a case in the Eastern Townships of a man upon the imaginary line which was between this country and the United States. Suppose a man has 100 acres on the Canada side of the line and 100 acres of land on the American side of the line. Suppose he grows 1,000 bushels of barley on each of his farms. He takes his 1,000 American bushels to the American market and gets \$1 a bushel for it. He takes his 1,000 bushels of Canadian barley to the American market and gets but 85 cents per bushel, because he has to pay 15 per cent. duty for taking it across that imaginary line. How can it be said in this case that the consumer pays the duty. It comes out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers."

Can the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) contradict those figures?

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if Canadian barley is not quoted 15 cents higher than American barley in the city of New York?

Mr. KIRK. No,

Mr. TAYLOR. I say it is, in any quotation you wish to refer to.

Mr. KIRK. I will leave the hon. gentleman for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) to settle that question with his leader. Now, Sir, we are told that the West Indies was our market for fish and that the United States was not our market. The hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Freeman) told us this, and the Government pretend to make us believe that they are doing all they can to open up markets in the West Indies and other places. Notwithstanding the fact that this duty stands against us in the United States the exportation of fish from Nova Scotia to the United States is increasing, while the export to the West Indies is decreasing. Notwithstanding the boast of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he is doing such great things by scientific means to open up markets in the West Indies for the products of this country, I find that in 1878 the export of fish to the United States was \$1,073,449, while last year it was \$1,358,024, or an increase in 1887 over 1878 of \$284,575 worth. We exported to the British and foreign West Indies, in 1878, \$2,411,044, worth, while last year we only exported \$1,494,983 worth, a decrease of \$916,061, or nearly 40 per cent. Then we have a large lumbering interest in Nova Scotia as well as in other parts of the Dominion, and we find that the United States is a good market for our lumber, but it has to meet with the very heavy duty there, and consequently it is impossible, for Nova Scotia at least, to send much of her lumber to the United States. I find that out of a total export of \$20,484,746 worth of lumber from the Dominion, we sent \$9,353,506 worth, or nearly one-half of the total lumber export to the United States. We are not a very great agricultural Province in Nova Scotia, but we have a surplus of agricultural produce to export from the country and do we send it to Ontario or Quebec? Not a bit of it. The hon. gentleman from Shelburne (Gen. Laurie) is a farmer and I would like to know if he sends the products of his farm to Ontario or Quebec? I venture to say he never sent \$100 worth, unless some gentlemen in Canada bought some of his thoroughbred stock.

Gen. LAURIE. I send it to Newfoundland.

Mr. KIRK. Yes, he sends them to Newfoundland, but the Government here promised to give us an inter-provincial trade, they promised that under the National Policy we would be able to send goods to Upper Canada as well as Ontario and Quebec sending goods down to us. We know the trade is all one way. We have heard a good deal about jug-handled free trade, but this is a jug-handled trade within the Dominion. We are obliged to buy goods from Canada at a dear rate and pay for them cash, without the privilege of sending anything we raise to Ontario in return. Ontario imports about \$600,000 worth of fish annually, and, according to Mr. Fairweather, of St. John, Ontario and Quebec take about \$53,000 worth of fish from Nova Scotia.

Mr. HESSON. We take 650,000 tons of coal.

Mr. KIRK. I am talking of fish. I say that although Nova Scotia exports about \$4,000,000 worth annually of fish, Ontario and Quebec only take about \$53,000 or at most \$60,000 worth. Of the \$600,000 worth of fish imported to Ontario and Quebec the greater portion of it comes from the United States and not from Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said the other day that he had got an order from some firm in Prince Edward Island for \$20,000 worth of buggy tops, and he thought the people were well off down there if they could afford that. He admitted that if there was not a higher tariff the people of Prince Edward Island would have gone to the United States for their buggy tops. Why should they go to the United States if you could sell them in Canada as

Mr. KIRK.

cheaply? They would not come here unless the high tariff forced them to come. The fact of the matter is the people of Nova Scotia are ground down between the upper and the nether millstone. We meet a high tariff when we send our goods to the United States, and we meet a high tariff when we bring the goods back. The tariff is so high that we cannot afford to bring the goods back, but we have to bring the cash back in our pockets, and send it to Ontario to pay for those \$20,000 worth of buggy tops and other goods which we are forced by this high tariff to take from Ontario.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is about as true as you generally put anything. I did not say I had got an order; I said a firm in Gananouque had got an order, and I said it was for top buggies.

Mr. KIRK. I just transposed the words.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what you generally do.

Mr. KIRK. Instead of saying top buggies I said buggy tops, and I will say that it was a firm in Gananouque, of which I believe the hon. gentleman is president.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, he is not. He has nothing to do with it.

Mr. KIRK. I have been informed with regard to that that there was no order at all, but was simply a consignment sent down to an agent in Prince Edward Island of that amount of goods to be sold on commission.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can tell the hon. gentleman that that statement is not true.

Mr. KIRK. I did not say it was true. I said I was told that it was. Well that is the thing we complain of, that we are forced by this high tariff to come 1,500 miles to get our goods when we ought to get them by stepping across the street, and when you take nothing from us in return except our cash. Now, Sir, I find that the United States is a good market for our agricultural products. Canada exported to the United States last year, \$2,214,338 worth of horses, and to Great Britain only \$38,230 worth, notwithstanding the fact that those we sent to the United States had to pay a duty of 20 per cent., while those we sent to England were admitted free. We imported from the United States only \$100,115 worth of horses. Of horned cattle we sent to the United States last year 54,765 head, and imported only 1,192 head. Of sheep we exported to the United States 363,046 head, and imported, exclusive of British Columbia, only 9,182 head. Of eggs we exported to the United States last year \$1,121,361 worth, and if there had been a duty on eggs, I venture to say we would not have exported that many. Now, the only industry in the Province of Nova Scotia which the National Policy has in the slightest degree benefited is the coal mining industry. Every other industry in the Province has been injuriously affected by that policy. I will admit at once that the duty on coal has benefited the coal industry there to some extent, but not to the extent claimed by the supporters of that policy. I say that this National Policy is simply making the people of Nova Scotia hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Upper Provinces, nothing more and nothing less. When this policy of high protection was being advocated in this House, its advocates declared that its object was to force the United States to take off their duty, and it was declared on the floor of this House that if the United States would reciprocate in coal the eastern cities of the United States would be supplied by the coal mines of Nova Scotia, whilst Toronto and the other cities of western Canada would be supplied by the United States. We were promised that if 50 cents a ton were placed on coal, we should get the markets of Quebec and Ontario for Nova Scotia coal. Here is what the Finance Minister said with regard to that matter:

"He believed that the effect of his policy would be to give free coal to both the United States and Canada at a very early date. The whole object of the imposition of the duty on the part of the United States would fall to the ground the moment Canada adopted a policy similar to theirs. Then the natural result would follow that the coal mines of Nova Scotia would supply the Atlantic States, and the coal mines of the United States would supply coals to Toronto and the western portions of Canada."

A duty of 50 cents a ton was placed on bituminous and anthracite coal; but hon. gentlemen have found that their policy has failed to accomplish what they pretended it would accomplish, so far as coal was concerned—that it has not given the markets of Ontario to the Maritime Provinces; and what did they do? They took the duty off anthracite coal. It is true more coal has been sent from Nova Scotia to Quebec than formerly, but no coal is sent from Nova Scotia to Ontario at all. Ontario gets its coal from the United States, while at the same time we have not secured any of the markets of the United States for our coal. As early as 1865, under the Reciprocity Treaty, we exported to the United States 404,252 tons. Last year we exported only 73,892 tons.—I am taking the calendar year in both cases; the last fiscal year gives 81,574 tons. The increased sales of coal in Nova Scotia, and they have largely increased, can be accounted for very largely without reference to the National Policy at all. We know perfectly well that about the time the National Policy was adopted the Intercolonial Railway was completed. It was only opened up for traffic in 1876, and at that time the Intercolonial Railway and all the other railroads in the eastern parts of the Dominion burned wood. Now they all burn coal. Then the villages and towns which were opened up by these railroads formerly burned wood, but to-day they burn coal. Many farmers now also burn coal, who formerly burned nothing but wood. A large quantity of coal from the Cape Breton mines is also sold to steamers as bunker coal. I find that Ontario and Quebec imported last year 2,172,561 tons of coal, of which 1,207,870 were bituminous. In 1878, Ontario and Quebec imported 852,466 tons, and last year they imported 2,172,561. Why has not the National Policy operated as the Government claimed it would? Why has it not displaced this United States coal? We find that the coal market in Ontario and Quebec, and the importations from the United States, have increased in a much larger ratio than the sales of coal have increased in Nova Scotia; and the Government, recognising the fact that the National Policy had failed in its object, took the duty off anthracite coal. I now come to another important industry, the shipbuilding industry. There was a time when the Province of Nova Scotia boasted of having more ships per man than any other country in the world of the same population. It was our boast that the sails of her ships whitened every sea, and we were told in 1874 by the Finance Minister, who was then acting leader of the Opposition, that a protective policy would have the effect of destroying the shipbuilding interests of the Maritime Provinces. He declared that a protective policy had swept the American flag from the seas. Well, it has had that effect in this country, the very effect he predicted it would have, since it has been introduced into this country. Here is what the Finance Minister said with regard to a protective duty and its effects upon the shipbuilding interests of the United States. He said:

"Let the hon. the Minister look at the neighboring republic, and he will find that the policy of that country has swept their flag off the seas, and given to others the trade of the world. A protective policy would close down thousands of shipyards in the Maritime Provinces."

Well, we never had thousands of shipyards in the Maritime Provinces. Many of those we had, however, have been closed down since the introduction of the National Policy. In 1865, Nova Scotia built 31,038 tons of shipping; in 1877, just previous to the adoption of the National Policy, Nova Scotia built 72,101 tons of shipping, and that industry began

then to decline immediately on the introduction of the National Policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Iron ships.

Mr. KIRK. I know hon. gentlemen will say that the National Policy had nothing to do with the decline of shipping, but that it is to be attributed altogether to iron ships. I admit the latter have had something to do with it, but not all. Were there no iron ships previous to 1874 and 1877? It is only nine years since the National Policy was introduced, and the effect of the change was to reduce the shipbuilding industry from 72,101 to 14,866 tons last year, or a decrease of 57,735 tons.

An hon. MEMBER. Prove it.

Mr. KIRK. Let the hon. gentleman look at the report. If the National Policy has had nothing to do with it, ask the Finance Minister what is the cause of the decline? I am not called upon to prove that fact. We have heard a great deal about the number of men who have obtained employment in the factories since the introduction of the National Policy, but what does this amount to in comparison with the number of men who have been thrown out of employment by the destruction of the shipbuilding industry in this country. Last year we built 57,735 tons of shipping less than in 1877, and if you take the nominal value of that shipping what will it amount to? Say the value is about \$40 per ton, we find more men thrown out of employment in this one industry than are engaged in the manufactures of the whole Dominion altogether. How many men are employed in the manufactures of Canada? I have taken the figures from the statistics prepared by the statistician of the Government, and I find he gives the number of operatives at 5,848. Well, I will venture to say it would take more than 10,000 men to build 57,000 tons of shipping and sail them. Therefore, I maintain that whilst the Government have perhaps increased the number of operatives in the manufactures by some 2,000 or 3,000, they have thrown out of employment by the destruction of this one industry more than three times that number. I have no desire to detain the House any longer at this late hour. Had I the opportunity of speaking earlier I would possibly have touched upon other features of this question, but I shall not do so just now. I have only to say that I heartily coincide in the resolution moved by my hon. friend for South Oxford, and that I do not believe in the amendment moved by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. What is the resolution? That amendment reads as follows:—

"That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people."

It is as clear as anything can be that that resolution means that we are to have no reciprocity at all, not even in the natural resources of the country. Do we not find that gentlemen on the other side of the House declare that this National Policy has fostered not only the manufacturing industries but the agricultural and all other industries of the country? We find hon. gentlemen from Nova Scotia declaring that the National Policy has fostered the mining interests of the country; they claim that it has fostered the whole of the interests of the country, and, therefore, this resolution declares that we are to adhere to that policy which fosters all the interests of the country; and I think it may be assumed that it is only when the Government cannot resist the pressure from the United States that we may ever expect to have any reciprocity on any other article that we have not reciprocity on now. For that reason, I am entirely opposed to the amendment of the Minister of Marine, and I shall, with great pleasure, vote, not only for the resolution

which has been moved by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), but also for the amendment to the amendment which has been moved by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), because I believe that if anything can be done for the shipbuilding interest, in order to restore it to something like the position it was in before the National Policy was introduced, it will be by a reciprocal coasting trade with the United States and by our having a right to reciprocally register our vessels.

Mr. PLATT—

"The breath of night's destructive to the hue of every flower that blows,
Go to the field and ask the humble daisy why it sleeps
Ere the pale moon her oriental veil puts off.
Think why, nor let the fairest flower of which nature boasts
Be exposed to night's unkindly damp.
Well may it droop and all its freshness lose
Compelled to taste the rank and poisonous air
Of midnight theatre and morning ball."

I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As this is the maiden speech of the hon. gentleman since he went to his constituents, I think the courtesy of the House requires that a member addressing it for the first time after his election should have a fair show.

Mr. PLATT. I have no objection to proceeding with the few remarks which I intend to make. It was out of compassion for the House and for yourself, Mr. Speaker, that I moved the adjournment. I do not think it wise or consistent with the deliberations of this assembly that we should be compelled to sit to this early hour in the morning, when I am certain that this debate would close at as early an hour this afternoon if we were to adjourn as if we went on. I am certain that most of the members assembled here now will agree with me that, at the close of every long continued debate, our proceedings are not conducted with that amount of decorum, with that amount of solemnity, I may say with that amount of dignity that becomes an assembly of this kind. We understand the reason why this course is adopted, but I ask hon. members to recollect that, behind and beyond us there is an audience that is listening to the debates of this assemblage, an audience that is weighing the remarks which we make here, and which is perhaps more deeply interested in the result of this discussion than we may seem to be ourselves; and I think that, notwithstanding the pressure which is brought to bear upon us to continue this discussion even at this hour of the morning, it should be continued with that degree of decorum and that respect for the people whom we represent and whose interests we are attempting to subserve here on this occasion which—

Mr. LAURIER. If my hon. friend will excuse me, I would suggest to the First Minister that at this hour of the morning we might adjourn, and might possibly come to some understanding to close the debate this afternoon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course it is getting very late, or rather very early, and, if we can come to a positive understanding that the vote will be taken at the next sitting to-day, we might adjourn.

Mr. LAURIER. There are a good many members on this side of the House who would be anxious to speak, but we think that this debate has been already sufficiently protracted, and we are ready to come to a vote at the next sitting of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think under that understanding we may adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 3.30 a.m. (Friday).

Mr. KIRK.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 6th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that Messrs. Roome and Platt be appointed to the Committee on Railways and Telegraph Lines and also the Committee on Agriculture and Colonisation.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 92) to amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. Bowell.)

SPEEDY TRIALS ACT.

Mr. THOMPSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 93) further to amend the Speedy Trials Act, chapter 175 of the Revised Statutes. He said: The object of this Bill is to confer the powers of the Speedy Trials Act on the judges of the districts of Algoma and Thunder Bay and of Muskoka and Parry Sound.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT.—AMENDMENT.

Mr. COOK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 94) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The object of the Bill is to compel railway companies to land passengers at the platform of the station. In some places this is not done. For instance, on the line of the Grand Trunk between Montreal and Toronto, I find the station at Morrisburg has three tracks and two sidings. The company will have two freight trains on the sidings and run a passenger train in the centre, and passengers will be landed between two trains at a place where there is no platform, this being attended with danger and great inconvenience. Another provision in the Bill is intended to compel railway companies to handle baggage with care and prevent the damage that now frequently takes place.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. AMYOT. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg leave to rise to a personal explanation. I learn that in some quarters a wrong interpretation has been given to the words that I uttered on the 4th instant, before this honorable House, and that some profess to find in them an expression of disloyalty on my part towards the Crown of England. I should be very sorry if my words could bear any such an interpretation, and I feel it my duty to declare that they would not then express my meaning. I have been, I am and I intend to remain perfectly loyal towards Her Majesty. When she did me the honor of calling on my services as a soldier, under painful circumstances for myself, I did not hesitate to comply, and in all contingencies she will find me the same, ranking amongst her most devoted subjects. I took an oath of allegiance which binds me as well in conscience as in honor, and under all circumstances it is my duty to be faithful to that. I may add, moreover, that so long as the Sovereigns of England challenge the admiration of the world as does Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria, I will be faithful to that oath, not only as a matter of duty but as a sentiment of heart. When I spoke of our dealings with England in the above

circumstance, I had in view the discussion which, I believe, would soon take place about political Imperial federation; but I have always understood that no political change in regard to Canada, in fact that no alteration even in our commercial treaties with other countries, can take place without England's consent, which removes all possible idea of practical disloyalty. Besides, in speaking of America I meant North America, the whole of this new continent; I was thinking of it in contrast with the old world. If any of my words are susceptible of another interpretation, I desire that what I now say may be added in order to remove all possibility of misconception.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other (articles subject to duties of excise or of internal revenue alone excepted).

That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith.

And the motion of Mr. Foster in amendment:

That Canada in the future, as in the past, is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of its people.

And the motion of Mr. Jones (Halifax) in amendment to the amendment:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

Mr. PLATT. Early this morning I was very anxious that the debate should be adjourned. I am now sorry, Sir, it was adjourned, as I wish I had finished my part of the work at that time. As I succeeded in getting through with the poetry of my speech I shall now have the pleasure of giving the House my prose. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I have no desire to weary the members of this Chamber by adding to the length of this discussion, which has already extended beyond the ordinary limits of debate. Nor is it my wish to burden the pages of *Hansard* with vague and meaningless platitudes, or burden it still further with figures and statistics which have been given time and again from the various seats in this Chamber. I shall, therefore, content myself by stating that I think, under the circumstances, owing to the peculiar position which I occupy in this Chamber, having recently returned from my constituency bringing with me the mandate of the people who sent me here, that I may fairly accept the challenge that was offered yesterday by the hon. the Secretary of State when he asked this House to announce what part of the people had sent petitions here or what county had been heard from which had spoken in favor of the motion now before the House. I am here, Mr. Speaker, as one indication, at any rate, that the people of Prince Edward county are not only willing that the motion of my hon. friend should pass, but are anxious that it should be crystallized into law, and become part and parcel of the policy of this country as soon as pos-

sible. I have very great pleasure, Sir, in returning to the House of Commons at a time when this debate was going on. I was one, I think, of the first to take a deep interest in the matter outside of this House. I remember distinctly, Sir, about a year ago, or a little over a year ago, when the discussion commenced among the agricultural population of this Dominion upon this very subject, that I soon became concerned, and I soon felt that the voice of that class of the people would sooner or later have to be recognised by the Parliament of Canada. It was no sacrifice on my part whatever, and I had to sacrifice no opinions to bring myself into full accord with the opinions that were then being expressed by the farmers of Canada. I have heretofore announced myself, and I am not ashamed again to classify myself, as a Liberal to the full extent of the term so far as the trade policy of the country is concerned. I may add, however, Sir, that I am a free trader at heart, and I only rejoice that the occasion has occurred in which I can join heartily with those who are advocating a measure of free trade, at any rate, and to do the utmost that lies in my power to assist in carrying it out. It has been said that those who take an active part in the earlier stages of any campaign of reform, are generally subjected to harsh criticisms and to more misrepresentations, perhaps, than those who engage in the warfare a little later on. I have borne my share during the past year of those criticisms and of those misrepresentations, and in looking upon my career during that time, outside of this House, I can think of nothing that I have said during the past year that demands an explanation at my hands at the present moment. I have been subjected, Sir, to the charge of disloyalty, I have even been called "Annexationist Platt" during the last few months, but, Sir, when I come here on the floor of Parliament I feel those charges are to a great extent removed from my shoulders and placed upon the shoulders of the men by whom I am surrounded. Charges that have been hurled against me are now being hurled across the floor of Parliament against my friends, and especially against my hon. friend who has brought the motion to the attention of this House. I am sure, Sir, that we shall be able to bear, and to bear without very much suffering, all such charges, for we know, Sir, that such charges are always brought against those who attempt to advance any reform in the interests of the people. I have stated, Sir, that my own course, during my parliamentary life, at any rate, has ever been in the direction of freer trade relations with the United States, and if possible with the rest of the world. So long ago, Sir, as 1878, I was a candidate for election to this House, and upon that occasion the trade policy of the country was the chief subject that was discussed at the polls. Although I was at that time aware that, owing to the depression which had universally existed in this country, people were anxious to devise some new plan or policy whereby their interests might be subserved, I being a candidate at that time issued an address, which, fortunately for myself, I found a copy of a few days ago. The House I trust will bear with me in reading that portion of it which will define my position so far back as 1878. I said in that address:

"I am willing to pay taxes to the State, and to the State alone. I am not willing to pay taxes to enrich a class, to bolster up reckless or incapable manufacturers, or to foster aristocratic monopolies. The people of Prince Edward are essentially consumers of manufactured articles, and I shall consider it my duty to oppose any increase of taxation upon articles of general consumption; but, recognising, as I do, that agriculture is, *par excellence*, our principal industry, I shall favor a readjustment of the tariff in recognition of the farmers' interests. In all fiscal legislation, however, I apprehend that the chief objects to be kept in view are, to reduce the volume of taxation to the lowest possible limits consistent with the efficiency of the public service; to regulate the imposition of taxes so that the burden may fall equitably upon all classes of our fellow subjects; to encourage, rather than discourage, the reestablishment of commercial reciprocity between Canada and the United States, and to break down, rather than build up, all trade barriers between the nations of the earth."

These, Sir, were my opinions in 1878 and they have not changed. In fact, Sir, by the arguments which I have listened to from this side of the House during the past week they have been materially strengthened. And I think that the views I held at that time are more strongly favored by my constituents, and I may be pardoned if I say that I believe they are more generally favored by the people of this Dominion to-day, than they have been at any period during the last ten or fifteen years. I have remarked that about a year ago or a little more, the discussion of this very question which we have now in hand was taken up by the people of Canada. It has been stated on the floor of this House that this great question has not originated among the people of this country, but first, that it was introduced to us by a gentleman from a foreign country, and secondly, that it was seized upon by the Liberals in this House as a new plank in their platform, in order that they might go to the country and say that at last they had found a policy. The hon. Secretary of State told us yesterday that great issues of this kind should spring from the people. He told us the people should be the first to move, and asked us what petitions had come from the people, and where we had heard their views expressed on behalf of this measure. If he had paid attention to the discussions which have been going on throughout this country during the past year, he would have recognised the fact that we have recognised, that in this case, far beyond any case of which I have any recollection, the people themselves were the first to move. You may say that Erastus Wiman is the father of this movement, but I will tell you the farmers of this country are the real fathers of this movement. A year ago the farmers' institutes all over the Province of Ontario were discussing this very question. You may say they were discussing commercial union, and some may go so far as to say that they were discussing annexation. The terms they used at that time were crude; but they were discussing the same question that is now engaging our attention, they were discussing how they should act in order to secure for themselves more extended trade relations with the United States. That was the question that the farmers of Ontario throughout the length and breadth of the Province, without regard to party considerations, were discussing; and one association after another pronounced almost unanimously in favor of it. In my own county the membership of the farmers' institute was about equally divided between the two political parties; and the members who were most active and energetic in favor of this measure, which was then called commercial union, which simply meant extended trade with the United States, were Conservatives of long standing, and are Conservatives to-day. Their argument was that they were merely carrying out the policy of their own party as placed on the Statute-book, and the famous resolution of 1878 was repeatedly read in those associations in support of that argument. It was not until the fiat had gone forth from headquarters, I presume, that this question was not to be considered separately from party politics, that the Conservatives began, in vulgar phrase, to take a back seat; but I am glad to say that many of the most able and intelligent among them still retain their places in those institutes, and are arguing as strongly as before in favor of commercial freedom. When I discovered, as I did last Session, that in my own county this question had taken strong root among the people whom I then had the honor to represent, I did my utmost to bring the matter before the attention of the House through abler means than I could employ myself. Of course, the leaders of the party with which I was then allied did not see fit at that time to bring the matter before the attention of Parliament. Within a very few hours of the close of the Session, wishing that my opinion, at any rate, should be placed before my constituents, I took the opportunity of giving notice of a motion on the subject; and

Mr. PLATT.

in order to convince the members of this House that I have always taken one stand on the terms of commercial reciprocity, having nothing to do with tariff amalgamation or political union, or anything tending in that direction, I beg the indulgence of the House while I read the motion of which I gave notice last year:

"That the admission of all products and manufactures of the Dominion of Canada into the markets of the United States free of import duty, and the like concession by the Dominion of Canada to the products and manufactures of the United States, would afford an amicable settlement of present controversies and existing commercial difficulties, benefit the most important industries of Canada and promote the harmony and cement the friendly relations existing between the Governments of the two countries.

"2. That it is the duty of the Government of Canada to anticipate the result of the agitation now going on in both countries, by preparing (by the appointment of a commission or otherwise) for the negotiation of a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, based upon broad and comprehensive principles, and without prejudice to the political relationship at present existing between Canada and the British Empire."

That, Sir, at the very earliest stage of the campaign, was the resolution which I placed before the House; and I am flattered to know that my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), accidentally I presume, has followed very closely the wording of that resolution. Well, Sir, I do not suppose it matters very much to those with whom I have associated here—it does not matter very much to myself, at any rate—what opinion may be held by anybody as to my loyalty or patriotism. I care very little for the opinions that have been expressed on that subject, for I make bold to say that men in political discussion, sometimes hostile, express opinions which do not lie very deep in their hearts; and sometimes, I am willing to acknowledge, I believe hon. gentlemen opposite, in making charges of disloyalty against hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, do so more in the sense of political harangue than in any other sense. I shall not take up the time of the House in attempting to defend my loyalty or my patriotism. Now, there are a few things which I have been unable to fathom in this debate. I have listened with attention to the speeches made on the other side of the House, and although charges of inconsistency have been frequently hurled across the floor against hon. members on this side, I have found myself unable to discover a very great degree of consistency amongst hon. gentlemen opposite. I have discovered that all of them have been anxious to convince the House and the country that the party to which they belong stand pledged, and have stood pledged for years, to the principles of commercial reciprocity—reciprocity in natural products. That, Sir, has been the beginning and end of their song; but in almost every speech there has been an attempt to show that commercial reciprocity of any kind would be not only injurious, but absolutely ruinous to the farmers of this country. I might go over a score of speeches to show how these hon. gentlemen have labored to convince this House and the country that utter ruin would sweep over this land if we had reciprocity in natural products, and then closed their speeches by saying that for years they have been pledged to reciprocity of that kind, and they have given evidence within the last few days of their willingness to carry it out. I remember the discussions that we had upon the subject of reciprocity during the last electoral campaign. During the elections of 1887 I was honored by a visit from my esteemed and hon. friend the Minister of Customs, and the speech of the hon. gentleman which he delivered in the village of Madoc was reported in the *Belleville Intelligencer*. According to that report the hon. gentlemen used these words, and I wish to give the House the benefit of the argument he then used, which goes to show that reciprocity in natural products would, in his opinion, prove ruinous to the farmers in Canada:

"I will show you in what way the grain market has been retained to the Canadian farmer. From the years 1873 to 1879 inclusive, the period

during which there was no duty upon any kind of grain coming from the United States, or elsewhere, we imported and entered for consumption no less than 44,929,452 bushels of grain, and 4,095,460 barrels of flour. From 1880 to 1886, inclusive, the period during which duty had been imposed on breadstuffs, we imported and entered for consumption only 15,006,105 bushels of grain and 3,009,333 barrels of flour. These figures show that during the seven years that a duty was imposed there were 29,923,327 bushels of grain and 1,086,127 barrels of flour less imported than under the seven years of free trade tariff. Reduce the barrels of flour to bushels of grain and you have a total of 35,353,962 bushels less imported and entered for consumption during seven years under protection than under free trade, and consequently an increased home market to that extent."

Then, speaking of the grain market which then existed in Manitoba and Dakota, he went on to say :

"If the duty of 15 cents a bushel was removed, as the *Liberals propose*, what would be the result? Why, the Dakota farmer would have flooded the markets of Manitoba and the North-West with his surplus grain, which would have poured into the markets here, and down would have gone the prices. Do you want better evidence that the imposition of a duty upon wheat secures to the Canadian farmer not only his own market but gives him better prices than he would otherwise obtain? I need not elaborate these benefits. They are incontrovertible."

These were the arguments used by my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, a little over a year ago. He was then endeavoring to convince the farmers that they should stand by the National Policy, in so far as to insist that the Government should not remove the duty imposed upon grains coming into this country, as otherwise their markets would be destroyed and they would not receive profitable prices for their produce. Now we find the hon. gentleman coming here and giving assent to a proposition to remove the duty from all kinds of farm products. A year ago he argued that reciprocity in natural products would be destructive to the farmers. To-day he supports hon. gentlemen who argue that they were pledged to commercial reciprocity for years, and who have given evidence that, when obliged to do it, they are willing to put that pledge into effect. The farmer, evidently, in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite, may be sacrificed to suit their will and pleasure, so long as that particular class which they have taken under special care is looked after. Many hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken on this same line during this debate. What was the burden of the remarks of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson). He told the House that he had received petitions from scores and hundreds of farmers in his section of the country, who were fruit growers principally, to have the duties increased, and he thought he stood pledged to these people and was not afraid to so express himself in this House. He thought he had convinced them, and they had convinced him, and they were one in opinion as to the effect of commercial reciprocity on the farmers of this country; and he read us a long list of figures which went to prove that the market prices of all the products of the farm in that section of the country were greater at home than in Buffalo and Detroit or other adjoining American cities. What was there, he asked, if those duties were taken off, to hinder American products from finding their way into our markets and lowering the prices of our products? Yet, within a few hours of the delivery of this argument by that hon. gentlemen, the Minister of Finance informed the House that the Government were prepared to take off the duties from those articles; and I suppose the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) will stand in the same relationship to those hon. gentlemen that he did before. I would like to know what the farmers of Welland will say when he goes home to them. Will they petition him to see that those duties are replaced? If he had succeeded in convincing them that they were liable to be ruined by our giving up these trade restrictions, I do not see how he is now going to convince them that the opposite is the case. We find the same old story repeated in the case of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), who spent a large portion of last evening discussing this question, and who read a long list of prices to show that every

product of the farm brought a higher price in Canada to-day than it does in the border States. Yet we find the hon. gentleman, this self-constructed guardian of the farming interests of the country, the man who, more than all others, has taken the farmers under his special care, and who charges hon. gentlemen on this side with trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the farmers—we find this man, after attempting to prove with great labor that our farmers would be ruined by a reduction of the duties on American products, standing up as a firm supporter of the First Minister who told us a few hours previous that the duties would be taken off these products. I might go over the speeches of a great many hon. gentlemen opposite to show that they all argue in the same way, and still are inconsistent enough to say that they were always pledged to a policy which, to use their own words, would prove destructive to the farmers of the country. There is this difference between hon. gentlemen on that side and on this. Even were it true that hon. gentlemen on this side had inadvertently used arguments in the presence of the farmers which caused them to believe something as being in their interest which was not strictly in their interest, it cannot be charged against any hon. gentleman on this side that he did so intentionally. If he did so, the chances are it was done unwittingly. But we have hon. gentlemen opposite telling the farmers that they know what they say, and proving it from the records and figures, and then coming before this House and supporting a Government which is going to ruin the farmers. While acting thus in contradiction to their declarations, they have the effrontery to pose before Parliament as the special guardians of the agricultural class of the community. The time has come, however, when the farming population of Canada have made up their minds to speak for themselves, and because they have so made up their minds, the resolution we are now discussing has been placed before this House. It has been submitted to this House, not from any desire to gain any party advantage, but simply because there is one member of Parliament, at any rate, who saw fit to recognise the voice of the people. This resolution is merely a recognition of the mandate from the farming population of Canada that their interests must and shall be served, and although hon. gentlemen opposite may talk lightly of the farming community here and tell them their interests are going to be destroyed, should this resolution be adopted, the farmers, when they meet in their institutes and discuss the question, will come to the conclusion hon. gentlemen on this side are their real friends. I have not been charged, but other hon. gentlemen who support this resolution have been charged, with disloyalty and treason, because they ventured to tell the people exactly their opinion as to the condition of public affairs. Never have I heard any of these hon. gentlemen deny, to any extent whatever, the resources of our country; never have I heard them say anything against the country; but they rightly cry out against the policy of this Government as a policy of misrule. I suppose there is no other way of getting a matter of this kind before the people. If there be nothing to complain of, then the farmers have no reason to ask for a change, and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would not be justified in bringing a resolution of this kind before Parliament. But the farmers have something to complain of, they have something to bring before Parliament, and, in stating why a change in the fiscal policy is necessary, it is desirable to show the condition of the country which leads to that necessity. There is nothing whatever traitorous or disloyal in these statements. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim that they never have denied their country and that the Americans never deny their country, that they never speak of periods of depression. We have heard extracts read from the speeches of certain hon. gentlemen, and especially from the speeches of the leader of this House, which prove

that, when those hon. gentlemen were in the cold shades of Opposition and hoped to obtain some advantage by what they said, they did not hesitate to tell the people what the condition of the country was, and to give the reasons why it was necessary to make a change in our fiscal policy. I have here a few extracts taken from speeches which were made by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1877 to the people of this country, which I think it will be very interesting to read at the present time. Then the Conservative party were advocating a change in our fiscal policy. Why did they ask for that change? They had to go before the people of the country, and, if we could recall all that was said at that time about the depression of the country's industries, it would put to the blush all the jeremiads, as they call them, of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) I will read from a speech of a late member of the Government, who went into the Government after the fall of the Administration of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). The Hon. Mr. Macpherson speaks thus:

"The Dominion, in all its Provinces, has now for some years been suffering from commercial depression and financial stringency, unexampled in severity in the memory of the active men of to-day. These have gone on increasing in intensity, aggravated by the failure of the crops of last year, until now, it may be said, that the sound chiefly heard in our streets is the voice of complaining. The farmers, in many parts even of our favored Province of Ontario, have been compelled to import large quantities of corn for provender, and in some districts even wheat for bread. The aggregate amount of money borrowed by them, and secured by mortgages on their homesteads, during the last nine or ten months, is undoubtedly larger than was ever before borrowed by them in the same space of time. The manufactories of the country are unprofitable or closed; the lumberman is either selling his lumber at a loss or holding it to sell, perhaps, at a still greater loss; the country merchant, unable to collect his debts, is, in turn, unable to pay the wholesale merchant, and, with deplorable frequency, both are launched into insolvency. It may be said that loan societies and official assignees are the only classes who are at present doing a prosperous business. Such has been the universal and great shrinkage in the value of property of every description, that there is scarcely a man in the country who is not poorer to-day than he was a year ago."

Will hon. gentlemen point to anything which has been said on this side of the House during this debate or before this debate, which is stronger in the depreciation of the position of this country than what was said at that time by that Minister of the Crown? They talk about blue ruin. Was ever bluer ruin depicted than that which was depicted by that Minister of the Crown? He tells us in that pamphlet:

"The country is groaning under a load of debt which it is hardly able to bear."

And it was then only half what it is now,—

"I think you will agree with me that the situation is truly alarming."

Now, if we say that the depression has been so great and that the value of farms has decreased to such an extent, we are to be termed traitors to the best interests of the country. But, let me point to another distinguished example as to how the position of this unfortunate Dominion was described. I think you will agree with me that I am justified in using this language, when the present leader of the Government, speaking in Montreal, on the 7th July, 1877, said:

"Instead of confidence, there is distrust; instead of solvency—look at the official *Gazette*, and every Saturday you will see a long string of insolvencies. Look at our manufactories closed! Look around you, and you will see the horny hands of toil asking leave to labor. They are now beggars, asking a fair day's wages for a fair day's work. What more do we see? We see them drifting off to the United States. We see the skilled artisans, the strong-handed young men of Canada, and the active young women of Lower Canada, drifting off to Lowell, to New Hampshire, to Connecticut, adding to the wealth and power of a foreign nation, and depleting poor, unfortunate Canada!"

Poor, unfortunate Canada. If an hon. member on this side had made use of that term at this time, he would have been received with a howl of disapprobation, and would have been described as a traitor of traitors to his country. But a few years ago, the leader of the Government at present

Mr. PLATT.

could tell the people that this country was poor, unfortunate Canada. There is more blue ruin. The same hon. gentleman said, in the Eastern Townships:

"I hear the cry echoing from rock to rock, across the bosoms of the lakes, and over the emerald fields—come to our rescue, John A., or we are lost."

If we spoke of the people of the Eastern Townships in that way now, would it not be represented as worse than treason. Again, at the same place, he said:

"Look where you will and you can see enterprising, vigorous men who had entered the field full of hope and heart and confidence, with business cut down just as a boy cuts the heads off of thistles in the field. You feel, you see, distrust, despondency and bankruptcy everywhere."

Blue ruin again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who said this?

Mr. PLATT. It is credited to the present First Minister of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. PLATT. Yes, that is so. Again, at Sweetburg, the hon. gentleman said:

"All about us we see despair instead of hope, despondency instead of faith, distrust instead of credit—everywhere you see distrust instead of confidence and bankruptcy instead of enterprise."

That was the description of Canada a few years ago, and it was left to the First Minister of the Crown of to-day to state the condition that we were in. It was not treason to say so then, but it is now. These are only specimens of a number of extracts which I might read, but hon. gentlemen can find them for themselves in the public prints of that date, and in the files which are in this building you can find column after column of just such language as that. Now we hear from hon. gentlemen on the other side a great deal of talk about the pessimistic doctrines of hon. gentlemen on this side. Those who have spoken in favor of the resolution moved by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) have been accused of holding all sorts of views. We have been told that not only are we in favor of commercial reciprocity with the United States, but that half of us are commercial unionists, that commercial reciprocity means commercial union, and that commercial union means annexation, and we have had hours taken up in this debate by reading extracts from newspapers to prove that. Because those extracts show disagreement in the views expressed by those newspapers, we have been told that hon. gentlemen on this side are not at one on this subject. Now, I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, in all fairness, if it makes any difference by what course we arrive at a conclusion so long as we all get there at last? I admit that various opinions were held in Ontario during the last election as to what would be the best course to take. We know what Mr. Erastus Wiman's scheme was, but we have not got Mr. Wiman's scheme before this Parliament. The scheme proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford is the result of the deliberations of the people of this country, and he has formulated a resolution to show what he believes to be the true and genuine sentiments of the great masses of the people of this country. Those who favor commercial union are, no doubt, in favor of this resolution, simply because they are commercial unionists, because they wish extended trade relations, and if there be any annexationists in this country I believe they, too, will be found supporting this resolution. It could not be otherwise, because they are annexationists only because they desire extended trade relations, and if they can get the benefits of commercial union, or the benefits of annexation, by adopting this scheme, who can say that they may not join in support of it. I hope that all the annexationists in Canada will join with the men who do not desire political union, who never think of annexation except as a means to procure for this country commercial reciprocity with the United States. We have

have taken the simplest means, the easiest method, whereby we can obtain this object. I say that although there may be annexationists supporting the resolution in the country, and there may be those who think that an amalgamation of the tariffs will be better for Canada, they are all supporting this measure for the same reason that we are supporting it, because we favor an extension of our trade relations which we believe would be in the interest, at any rate, of the agricultural population of this country. It may be said, Sir, and said with some force, that we are seeking to divide the different classes of the community by raising the cry of the farmer against the manufacturer. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution makes no such distinction whatever, that the speeches of hon. gentlemen upon this side of the House have not had a tendency to divide the classes of the community, nor were there any evidences or signs of division taking place until the amendment to the resolution was moved. That amendment says plainly and distinctly to the farming population of this country, that they need not expect any more at the hands of the Government of Canada, that the Government has elected to stand by the manufacturers, who are afraid to battle with the Americans in open field. That is the meaning of the amendment. It simply states to the farmers that our fiscal policy must be so arranged as to benefit one class of industries; and it further states that the Government are willing that the National Policy, so far as four out of five industries are concerned, shall be thrown overboard. Why not hold to the National Policy that was going to benefit the farmers? Why not hold to the National Policy that was going to benefit the miner, that was going to benefit the fisherman, that was going to benefit the lumberman? But no, this precious National Policy of 1878, which was to be all in all to the people of Canada, is now, four-fifths of it, to be thrown to the wind, and the Government have taken into their hands the protection of the one class out of four or five that they named in their once famous resolution. The farmers of the country will, I think, commence very soon to ask the Government why it is that they who were led to support the National Policy in 1878, when they were promised an increase of prices, and that protection would be afforded to them, to the lumbermen, to the fishermen, and the same to the miner should be cast aside. Why, if it was good then, has it failed to be good now? Why should they be placed at the mercy of our competitors all over the world, while the only class of the community that is still to be afforded protection, are the pampered manufacturers of the country? Now, Sir, it may be said that that resolution provided that reciprocity in trade should some day be effected. But that resolution did not say anything about a sort of jug-handled reciprocity, nor about a jug-handled protection. That resolution treated all these classes of the community as one, and the people were given to understand that if we had reciprocity, if we could ever get it through the operations of the National Policy, it would be reciprocity and not partial reciprocity. Nothing was said there about reciprocity in natural products only, but, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, the largest possible reciprocity of trade. Well, if the largest possible reciprocity of trade does not mean pretty nearly unrestricted reciprocity, then I do not know the meaning of those terms. If it be treason and ruin to the country to advocate unrestricted reciprocity, is it not pretty nearly treason, is it not pretty nearly ruin, to advocate the largest possible reciprocity between the two countries? At most, Mr. Speaker, we only differ in degree. This side of the House is advocating a little more than the other side, who say that they are willing to take, but not to grant. The question is only one of degree, and I am only sorry that this discussion, which the country was led to believe, before it was commenced, would be conducted aside from party politics, has become one of party politics, and

that it has so happened, just by mere accident, I suppose, that the table divides the two opinions in the House. I suppose it is a mere accident, nothing but a coincidence, that all those hon. gentlemen opposite are opposed to the opinions expressed by the hon. member for South Oxford upon this question. But it is an unfortunate thing that it is so. It, to some extent, must be the same in the country, but happily for Canada that state of affairs is fast passing away. The day when political predilections, political likes and dislikes which have divided the farming community for years, is likely soon to be passed, and then the farmers are going to consider their interests, regardless of old party lines, and when that day comes, you will find whether the weight of opinion, fearlessly expressed, will be for or against this resolution. I have already remarked that this discussion must show the country that you, Mr. Speaker, preside over a very peculiar assemblage of people. We find that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House claim that if unrestricted reciprocity be granted, commercial union must follow, and annexation is sure to come; and therefore if the resolution of my hon. friend carries we are sure to have annexation. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, many of them, say that if it be not granted an annexation spirit will arise in this country, and it will be largely fostered; and those who want commercial reciprocity will naturally favor annexation for the sake of getting it. So, therefore, it seems that whether we carry the resolution or not, somebody must be a good deal mistaken, or annexation is going to follow. We find, again, that on the other side of the House, where hon. gentlemen are so jealous of the credit of this country, are so fearful lest some one may say something disparaging of this country, they are not quite so careful of themselves. It may be an unfortunate thing that we are called upon, now and then, to state exactly the condition of the country, to state the depression that exists and the causes of that depression, but all that can have but very little effect upon the outside world. But, Sir, when we hear the expressions that we have heard from the other side of the House, and draw the natural deductions from the arguments the hon. gentlemen have used, the matter becomes more serious. What do they say about this Canada of ours? Why, Sir, I know of nothing that can be said that can so injure the country in the eyes of the world as to tell the people of foreign nations that Canada is inhabited by a class of traitors, by a class of men who have no love for their country, by a class of men who are doing all they can to throw their country into the arms of a foreign nation. Now, Sir, I just happened to strike to-day a paragraph from a very strong Conservative newspaper. It starts off in these words:

"It is safe to say that there is no people outside of Canada—possessing a title of our freedom—that can produce so many citizens who are avowed enemies of the country, or who are so outspoken in their hate towards the land of their birth."

That is merely emphasising the language of hon. gentleman opposite, it is merely stating that one-half of the people of Canada are traitors to the interests of their country. They tell us that the enterprising men of Canada, the business men, the manufacturers are altogether unable to cope with the manufacturers and business men of other nations. We are told time and time again that every industry must be crushed if our people are compelled to compete with the manufacturers and business men on the other side of the line. Is that a proper way in which to speak of the country which we profess to love? Why not declare that man for man we are equal to the men of any other nation on the earth; why not stand up like men and say, as many of our manufacturers are doing, "Give us an open field and no favor, and we challenge the rest of the continent to compete with us in the general markets of the world." That would be saying something in favor of Canada. But they tell us we do not have a class of men

able to compete with the Americans, and statements of that kind are more degrading and dishonorable to Canadians than anything hon. gentlemen said on this side of the House. We find that hon. gentlemen opposite continue to tell the country that we are unable to compete with the Americans even in any treaty negotiations, that we will have to yield to them, that this would lead to the absorption of this country by the United States, acknowledging that man for man we are weak and puerile as compared with our American neighbors. Are we afraid that commercial relationship would have the effect of swallowing us up? Is our regard for Canada so weak that we are afraid even to trust ourselves to framing a commercial treaty with our great neighbors to the south? That is simply telling the people of the world that we Canadians have so little individuality that we are afraid even to trust ourselves to associations with our great neighbors. Truly, Canada must stand in a despicable light before the rest of the world, after this discussion comes to be understood by those who may read it. In regard to matters social and political as well as matters commercial, the stand for Canada to take is that we will remain Canada whether commercially related to the United States or not. If we were federated with the Empire, if the new-born idea of Imperial federation were carried out, we would still be called Canada. Are we afraid of being swallowed up by the Empire or by the home Government? No. But we are afraid of being swallowed up by the terrible people to the south, who know so much more than we do, who are so much more ingenious that we are afraid of entering into trade relations with them. That is not the estimate that I place upon the people of Canada, and I hope it is an estimate far below that which they deserve. I will not go over the objections made to the proposition contained in the resolution further than to state that the objection spoken of that the scheme would lead to direct taxation was another bugbear thrown in the way of its adoption. We have been told that we will lose \$7,000,000 of revenue. I take the opposite ground, and I say the country will save \$7,000,000. How can the people lose that which they keep in their pockets; how can the people, when they are not called upon to raise that amount of revenue, lose it? There certainly will be no reason why, if it is not paid into the treasury, it should be lost. The mover of the resolution has told the House in what way the demands on the revenue might be reduced, and the feeling in the country to-day is—and I have had, perhaps, an opportunity, equal to that of any hon. member, of feeling the pulse on this very question—that we do not need the amount of revenue that we are collecting, that it would be possible and advisable for us to get along with less revenue. They doubtless think the country could get along with \$7,000,000 less, and I believe we could do it. If you go and ask the honest farmers how we can get along with a less revenue, they will give you a few plans; they will say: Cut down the civil service by one-half, cut off the thousands who are now feeding at the public crib and whose services the country does not need, dispense with the services of the Senate and save \$200,000 or \$300,000 in that way, dispense with the Franchise Bill and save \$400,000 or \$500,000 in that way, and by one way and another the horny-handed sons of toil, as the leader of the Government calls them, will very soon figure up the items which will effect the saving of more than \$7,000,000. The history of our revenue and expenditure shows that there is a tendency for the expense of the Government to increase just as rapidly as the revenue increases, and the larger the revenue the greater the expenditure. Then, if you want to economize, adopt some plan that will give us less revenue, and cut our clothes according to the cloth we have. That is the feeling of the people of the country in regard to this question. We have also been told that the exodus of the country is a mere bag-

Mr. PLATT.

atelle, that it did not amount to anything, and was hardly worth mentioning. In 1887, however, the First Minister told the people that the young men and young women of the country were being driven away to build up a foreign nation; and depleting this poor, unfortunate Dominion. But hon. gentlemen opposite think the exodus is not worth mentioning now. Every hon. member must have heard, during the last six months, of the tide of emigration going from this country. I felt at one time compelled to say that one of my chief duties, as a public man, during the summer was to write recommendations of character for young men going into the States. That is a matter to be regretted by us all, and we on this side of the House believe that the adoption of the policy indicated in the resolution now before us would do something to keep our people at home. The Secretary of State told us yesterday that Canadians were coming back by thousands to their old homes. What was the reason he gave? He said there was to be a Presidential election, and it was expected that the Democrats would gain the victory, that protection would suffer to a certain extent and factories would be closed, and therefore they took time by the forelock and came back to Canada. The reason why they are coming back, if they are coming back, is because they have hope that the policy which is now being advocated on both sides of the line will be adopted, and that manufactures in Canada will increase to a considerable extent. Then the Secretary of State read an extract from the *Montreal Witness*, and he spoke very highly of that authority, and I suppose it is as good an authority as almost any newspaper he could quote. I have here a copy of the *Witness* of April 5, one day later than that quoted by the hon. Secretary, and in it I find a despatch in these words:

"It is said that nearly 1,200 persons belonging to the adjoining counties of Bellechase, Montmagny and L'Islet have removed to the United States during the past three weeks."

This authority, which is undeniable and unquestionable and which the Secretary of State quoted, states that 1,200 persons belonging to three counties have removed to the States during the past three weeks.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Have they the National Policy there?

Mr. PLATT. The democrats, we are told, are coming into power in the States; people are on the wing, finding no resting-place because the trade policy on each side of the line is being disturbed. Mr. Speaker, I think that I may bring my remarks to a close without disappointing the House to any very great extent. I was striving to avoid any reference to this delicate question of loyalty and patriotism; I admire it where I believe it to be honest. I like to hear it where the occasion is suited; but I have concluded, in looking over the duties that devolved upon me as a member of Parliament, that higher functions than these devolved upon me as a representative of a portion of the people in this Dominion. I have asked myself to what extent I was called upon to speak about the old land, or the old flag, or the interests of the Empire. In my simplicity I have been led to think that I come here to serve the people of Canada and I have been led to believe that the duty imposed upon this Parliament was to look after the material interests of the people for whom we legislate. I do not think that we are called upon to waste the time of Parliament, or the money of the people who know us best, by proclaiming our loyalty by the hour on the floor of this House. I know, Sir, that loyalty is an attribute which we all admire, but I have come to the conclusion, and I am forced to that conclusion very largely by what I have witnessed in this Parliament, that it is quite possible for a man to bubble over with loyalty and at the

same time not have a grain of patriotism in his whole carcass. I do not consider that loyalty and patriotism are synonyms by any means. A man may be very loyal and still lack the patriotism to serve the interests of the people we have been sent here to serve? I think, Sir, that the people of this country did not ask us to come here to look after the interests of the old flag. I have said before, and I say it now, that the people of the old land are quite capable of looking after the old flag and quite capable of taking care of themselves. They never asked us for our assistance. They look after themselves, and they would think more of us if we spent more of our time in looking after our own selves. I do not think that the history of Canada, nor the history of Canadians, will lead the Empire or the people of Great Britain to fear that we will not come to their assistance in the time of need. But the time of need is not now, the time of need has not been for years past, and the time of need will not be for years in the future. If it ever comes, then is the time for hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to show their love and admiration for the old land. Until that time comes let us do in Canada as they do in England—look after the material interests of our country. We know what Mr. Chamberlain, speaking under the Great Seal of the Empire, has said regarding this sentiment of British connection. He told us that it was a material band woven from material fibre and liable to be snapped asunder at any time, even by the caprice of the merchants of Manchester and Liverpool. Have we on this side of the Atlantic to look upon it as a structure of flesh and blood, as something not to be severed until the last man has died in the last ditch in the land? That which makes England great and grand and makes us all admire her people, is, that they look after their own interests; and shall not Canada look after her own interests? We in Canada should stand up like men for our own country and say, although we admire the mother land our policy shall be Canada first, Canada last, Canada in the middle and Canada always. That shall be my policy while I remain a member of the Canadian Parliament. When I want to speak or vote in the interests of the Empire I shall not do so at the expense of my own country. If I want to take that course I shall seek a seat in the British Parliament, which, in my opinion, is the proper place for men who are always talking about Great Britain and the Empire. Let us have "Canada for the Canadians," to use the words of hon. gentlemen opposite. I have spoken beyond the time that I allotted to myself but I never know how to measure time very well when I am speaking, and if I have wearied the House I regret it. I think, Sir, I gave you my excuse when in my opening remarks I stated that having come fresh from the people who returned me to support the principle of the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), I had a right to speak on this question. It was the question which was debated during the contest in my county and I do not want any contradiction of that statement to go to the country unless it bears with it my distinct statement that that was the public issue on which the contest was fought in Prince Edward county. The Secretary of State may call again for a voice from the people. I do not know what was the issue in Missisquoi, I do not know what was the issue in L'Assomption, but I do know what was the issue in the County of Prince Edward. My hon. friends around me know that I refused to be a candidate on any other issue, and that I put that issue and that alone to the people. I refused even to discuss the old issues and hon. gentlemen opposite who came there (to assist me, of course) persisted in talking over the old matters which we talked over and decided upon a year ago. I refused even to discuss them. I discussed simply the question of commercial reciprocity with the United States, and, Sir, the character of the literature put before the people in Prince Edward will show that. Here are some

of the papers. "Vote for Platt and fair play to the farmers," "Vote for Platt and unrestricted reciprocity." Those are the questions that went to the people and those are the views which I represent. Although I never yet said I could not have been elected if I did not take up this platform, I know that I would not have been elected, because I would not have been a candidate under other conditions. I have taken the stand that we needed some change in our fiscal policy, and the present leader of the Liberal party knows full well the opinions I expressed to him some months ago on this question. I have spoken on behalf of the motion of the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and in so speaking I am voicing the wishes of the people whom I represent.

Mr. JONES (Digby). I did not intend to take part in this debate, but I listened to the leader of the Opposition and I must say that I took great pleasure in his remarks, because I always had a great desire to hear that gentleman. A statement was made by him yesterday in reference to Nova Scotia which I believe the hon. gentleman did not make intentionally to mislead the people, but I think he was misinformed. It was with regard to the question of repeal. The hon. the leader of the Opposition stated that nineteen-twentieths of the people of Nova Scotia were in favor of repeal. Now, Mr. Speaker, at the last election the Liberal Government in Nova Scotia ran on that question and there were 27,000 people who voted for repeal and 23,000 who voted against it, so that this is a long way off from nineteen-twentieths of the people. The hon. gentleman also stated, at least I understand him to state, that never did a candidate for the Dominion House of Commons go to the people on this question of repeal. I beg to state here that in the County of Digby the Hon. Mr. Vail who many of the gentlemen in this House will remember, ran at the general election of 1887 and made repeal his platform, and the only time he ever contested that county on the question of repeal he was defeated. I was greatly surprised, moreover, to hear certain gentlemen, especially gentlemen from the Province of Nova Scotia, refer last evening to the question of repeal. Our Provincial Secretary of State, addressing a meeting at Weymouth last August, stated distinctly on the platform that by the election of Mr. Jones we had gone back upon the repeal issue in the Province of Nova Scotia. The Hon. Mr. Longley also addressed the electors on the question of Commercial Union, and I would not be doing my duty in Parliament as a representative of the people of Digby if I did not challenge the statement that they were in favor of this policy. I do not accuse the leader of the Opposition of wilfully stating facts which were untrue, for I firmly believe he was of opinion that what he stated was correct. I heard gentlemen from the Province of Nova Scotia say that our Province was ruined. Our six Liberal representatives out of twenty-one is a pretty good index of the feelings of that Province, and I cannot understand how they can rise in the Canadian House of Commons and so misrepresent the Province of Nova Scotia. We, Sir, have a fine Province, and I am not ashamed to be a representative of that Province. I am not ashamed to stand in the Canadian House of Commons and state that the Province of Nova Scotia, according to size and population, will compare with any Province in this Dominion, and to state further that the Nova Scotians are not in the desperate condition that hon. gentlemen from that Province on the Opposition benches would lead you to believe. Mr. Speaker, I am just making a few brief remarks because this question has been thoroughly discussed. Not much more can be said upon it, but I wish to mention a few facts with particular reference to my own county. I take the town of Weymouth. That town is not in the desperate condition hon. gentlemen represent. Any one who remembers the condition of that town a few years ago, and who goes there to-day, will see

a wonderful change. Its imports and exports have quadrupled in the last ten years, and everywhere in the country you will see signs and evidences of prosperity. With regard to the shipping interest, I was greatly surprised to hear the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) make a statement last evening, which, though true, was misleading. He tried to make this House believe that the decline of shipping in the Maritime Provinces was due to the National Policy, but it is nothing of the sort. You cannot legislate to turn wood into iron. I think the hon. member for St. John will bear me out in what I state with regard to that port. About four years ago I happened to be there, and I remember that two or three steamships came there to load meal for the United Kingdom. It was the first time they ever came there to carry meal direct to the old country. The next year about forty steamships came to that port for the same purpose, and the year after I believe about 120 came there. That shows why there has been a decline in the wooden sailing vessels of the Maritime Provinces. Regarding the manufacturing industries of the Maritime Provinces, I am perfectly amazed to find gentlemen stand here and assert that we do not send anything to the Upper Provinces. Three-fourths of all the manufactured goods of the Maritime Provinces go to the Upper Provinces. I was at the factory of William Parks, of St. John, about a year ago, and he told me that three-fourths of all the goods he manufactured were taken to the west of Toronto. Now, I am in favor of reciprocity; I do not wish to be misunderstood as to that; and if the resolution moved by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) had not been fastened on to the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, I would possibly have voted for it—in fact I would have; but, attached as it is to that one, I cannot support it, because I believe it would be detrimental to the best interests of the country to do so. But I wish it to be clearly understood in the Maritime Provinces that I do not vote against a free coasting trade. Then, we have the question of revenue to consider. Hon. gentlemen opposite admit that we should lose \$7,000,000 of revenue, and the amount might possibly reach \$12,000,000. I understood the hon. member for South Oxford to say that the public money spent in Nova Scotia consisted of bribes to that Province. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the public works in that Province are bribes—that we do not need them? I cannot understand how hon. gentlemen expect that we can cut down the expenditure of the country \$7,000,000 at one sweep. The expenditure of the country must increase, but if the population increases in proportion, where is the great evil? In closing these remarks I am reminded of what the Hon. Henry Grattan stated in his first session in the English House of Commons. Speaking of the Parliament of Ireland he said: "Of that assembly I have a parental recollection; I sat at its cradle and I followed its hearse." I trust that those who are sitting at the cradle of the factories of the Dominion of Canada will never follow their hearse.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if any stranger were in this House listening to the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, he would have very great difficulty in ascertaining what was the subject of discussion. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said a great deal as to the mischievous consequences that are likely to flow from the adoption of such a policy as that foreshadowed in the resolution before us. But if one were to read the resolution, and then listen to the speeches of those hon. gentlemen, he would, I am sure, suppose that they had not taken the trouble to read, or if they had, to understand the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from South Oxford. Sir, that resolution foreshadows a very important public policy. That much, I think, has been admitted by almost every hon. gentleman who has spoken on that side of the House. It is admitted that it would have a very great effect on the indus-

Mr. PLATT.

trial and commercial interests of this country. As to what that effect would be hon. gentlemen opposite hold very different views from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Even the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches who have addressed the House on this subject admit that the resolution is one of paramount importance. I, Sir, agree with them in that view, but it does seem to me most extraordinary that a resolution involving such vast consequences should have been under discussion for a period of three weeks, and that the First Minister, and those who have long been his colleagues in the Government, have not yet expressed any opinion to the House on the question. The hon. gentleman who now leads the Government, a few years ago, proposed for the consideration of the House of Commons a resolution foreshadowing his views of the fiscal policy that ought to be adopted in this country. Although at that time in Opposition, he thought it was of sufficient importance to indicate his views on the subject. But, Sir, we have here a resolution proposing to change that policy, and to adopt one which we believe to be much more in the public interest, and which will not be such a disastrous failure as the policy embodied in the hon. gentleman's resolution, and I would like to know how it is that the hon. gentleman has not seen proper to give his views to the House on this question, or to guide those who follow him in this House, and who will scarcely venture to express an opinion without knowing what the views of the hon. gentleman are. Sir, it is a remarkable fact that since this discussion began, we have had it made manifest to us that a very large number of the hon. gentleman's supporters have been loaded up the wrong way. The views they have expressed, while they may have agreed with the views entertained by the Government when this resolution was first proposed, no longer harmonise with the policy on which the Government has now entered. I think there is some excuse for the Finance Minister. We know that he is suffering from ill-health, and that his health will not permit him to take an active part in this discussion. But the First Minister, the Minister of Public Works, and Postmaster General, who have long been members of the Administration, have remained silent during the whole of this discussion. Why have these hon. gentlemen not taken part in this discussion? Are they afraid that they may be obliged to make a further change? They have made very considerable progress during the past three weeks, and must we now come to the conclusion that the hon. the First Minister supposes that further change may be necessary, and that it is not well he should be tied by a speech as well as by a vote? We know the views of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, we know the views entertained by the Minister of Interior, but those gentlemen are junior members of the Administration; they have been but a short time upon the Treasury benches, and they are not those whose views the House and the country have a special interest in hearing. There are older and more experienced members of the Government, and those older and more experienced have, up to this moment, expressed no opinion upon the important resolutions before us. Is this the outcome of caution? Is this because these hon. gentlemen have had so recently to come down from the lofty and independent position which they assumed? It looks very much as if that were the case, and that this discussion which the hon. gentleman who leads the Government has during the last twenty-four hours been anxious should come to a conclusion, he is about to allow to be closed without giving to the House the benefit of his opinion. Then, too, there is the Minister of Justice. That hon. gentleman has remained silent, although he took an active part in the discussion of a question which is intimately connected with this question, relating to a larger degree of free interchange of products between Canada and the United States. The hon. gentleman is, no doubt,

eminently well informed upon the subject, and yet he has been as discreet as the First Minister. How is it that he remained silent? How is it that we have so large a number of Ministers in this House, and yet that it is, so to speak, the boys of the Administration who have been put up to speak for those hon. gentlemen? The House and the country can come to but one conclusion, and that is that the right hon. First Minister finds that the argument is altogether against him; that he feels the interests of the country are to be served by the adoption of the policy marked out in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. There is no hon. gentleman in this House, on either side, who better understands and more thoroughly appreciates the advantages this country would derive from the adoption of this resolution, than the hon. gentleman who leads the House, and yet we find him permitting his followers to stand up here and argue for more than a fortnight, not only against the interchange of manufactured goods between Canada and the United States, but against the free interchange of any products, whether natural or artificial, between the two countries. It is true that the hon. gentleman, within the past three days, has changed his position upon the principle, at all events, of the policy marked out in this resolution. But it is pretty obvious that between the First Minister and those who follow him, and the Minister of Finance, there is some disagreement on this question. Let me call the attention of the House to the resolution itself proposed by my hon. friend for South Oxford, and which hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to have read. The resolution is:

"That it is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States, and that it is expedient that all articles manufactured in, or the natural products of either of the said countries should be admitted free of duty into the ports of the other."

That is the resolution which has been proposed, and that is what hon. gentlemen on the other side have been speaking against, from various points of view, for the past three weeks. The remaining portion of the resolution merely indicates the desire that the Government should take the initiative, and seek to ascertain how far the Congress of the United States would be disposed to agree to the proposition here set forth. I have here the proposition of the Minister of Finance, which he made as High Commissioner. That proposition is almost the same as the resolution which my hon. friend for South Oxford proposes. The Minister of Finance, in making the proposition for free trade with the United States to the Secretary of State of the United States, did not propose a limited free trade. On the contrary, he was careful not to submit to the United States a proposition to which exception might be taken upon that ground. He said:

"That with the view of removing all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the Fishery Articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of a natural arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada and Newfoundland."

"Greater freedom of commercial intercourse." How great that freedom was to be, the hon. gentleman did not say. He did not say it was to be greater freedom in the interchange of natural products; he put no such limitation or restriction in his proposition. On the contrary, he put forward a proposition, which, in its terms, was almost identical with that which the right hon. the First Minister is calling upon his friends to vote down. It is important that we should look at this with a little more care than hon. gentlemen opposite who have discussed this question, have. Looking at what was proposed by the hon. the Minister of Finance, this resolution is one which most people would be disposed to support. Almost any man who is not a supporter of the hon. the First

Minister would support a resolution of that sort. Ordinary mortals could find little in the resolution to take exception to, but the Conservative or Tory who supports the First Minister is not an ordinary mortal, and has different views of the wants and interests of the country, views which he is capable of adjusting to suit the political exigencies of the moment; and there is no doubt whatever that the speeches of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) and the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), had these gentlemen known beforehand how handsomely the right hon. the First Minister was going to come down at the threat of the American Congress, would have been very different indeed from what they were. Now, I think that this is the most important resolution which has been submitted for the consideration of Parliament since the Union. It is a resolution of immense consequence. We have come to a period in our political history when the roads part, and when we must decide which way we will take. We had, Sir, a dispute with our neighbors with regard to the fishery treaty, into the merits of which controversy I will not enter at this moment, as this is not the appropriate occasion to discuss that subject; but I will say merely that no State ever had a stronger case in its favor than had Canada in the dispute. I agree with everything that was said in the memorandum of the Minister of Justice on this question. He had a case as strong as any case with which any party ever went into a Court of Justice against an adversary, and we were supported in our views by the Government of the United Kingdom. What has been our position? We have surrendered almost everything, and, if when we were aided and supported by the United Kingdom, by the Government of England, we were unable to maintain our rights on a question where our rights were so clear, how can it be supposed that we are going to be supported successfully by the Government of England where our rights are less obvious. That being the case, we would be in the highest degree foolish if we did not look at the situation as it really is. England, as between Canada and the United States, is no longer able or willing to render us assistance. She will give us friendly advice, and aid our cause so far as it does not jeopardise the preservation of peace between her and the United States. Further than that she will not go, and to speak about the last man and the last gun being used by England in our defence is simply to talk nonsense. Our future depends upon our own conduct, and it is of the first consequence for us to make our relations with our neighbors secure. Therefore it is of the first consequence to this country that we should adopt the resolution which has been proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). What we propose is to put all classes on the same footing. The hon. gentleman who leads the Government has sometimes said, and sometimes has unsaid, that free trade with the United States would be a good thing for the farmer, that free trade in natural products would be a good thing for the farmer in Canada. The Minister of Customs has taken a different line. He argued that it was as important to the farmer as it is to the manufacturer to have protection, and the hon. gentleman from Montreal said protection was a very important thing for the farmer, and called upon the House to notice what calamities would be the result if free trade in natural products existed with the United States. Then an hon. member from Nova Scotia told us, in the course of this discussion a day or two ago, that if we had free trade in coal with the United States it would be of no advantage to Nova Scotia, because there would be ten tons of coal sent into Canada from the United States for every ton that was sent from Nova Scotia to the United States; so that would be a misfortune, and things are better as they are. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries informed the House that the products of the two countries are too much

alike to allow of any important trade taking place between them. It is true that, somewhat inconsistently, he argued that we could have a successful interprovincial trade. He could not see that Ontario could trade with New York or Michigan, he could not see that that was a natural interchange, and thought there could be no great trade between Canada and the United States, and argued that if the barriers were thrown down we would be disappointed at the result. The hon. gentleman from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) argued in the same way. He told us, if we were to repeal the duties on the natural products of the two countries, the United States would take very little more of our products than they do now, and, if they did take more, it would not be to the advantage of the people of this country. It is therefore evident that these hon. gentlemen do not think that much advantage can be derived from a free interchange of products between the United States and Canada. I do not agree with those gentlemen. If what they said was true, why do these high barriers exist, what necessity is there for this high tariff? The hon. gentleman has put a tariff to prevent barley coming into Canada, but no barley came into Canada before. It is true that he has undertaken to keep out, in the interest of the farming population, things that were never brought into the country, but it was said that this was to put the farmer on the same footing as the manufacturer. That can be said no longer. We find from the Trade and Navigation Returns that the facts contradict the theory of the hon. gentleman, and that a very large trade, in spite of the artificial barriers, that Parliament has established, has been carried on between the people of the United States and the people of Canada. We have been told by almost every speaker on the other side that the adoption of any such policy as we propose would inevitably lead to annexation. That view has been expressed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who told us that there was nothing of so much consequence in uniting a people together as commercial intercourse, and that if commercial intercourse was once established between Canada and the United States, the result would be that Canada would be drawn to the United States and away from England, that the present relations between Canada and England would be weakened and ultimately severed, while the relations between Canada and the United States would become stronger and would ultimately result in annexation. I do not agree with that view. I do not see any reason for it. I have listened to the hon. gentlemen opposite, I think I have heard almost every speech which has been made in that particular, and I have not heard, except in the case of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, any attempt to assign a reason for the effect which is attributed to a measure of this sort. What has been the effect in the United States themselves? They have free trade between the different States. There is no restriction upon the trade between those States. Are the principles of local self-government weaker to-day than they were when their independence was first established? Are these States weaker to-day in the exercise of their state authority than they were before? Is not the love of local government and the attachment to local institutions as strong to-day in the different States as it was when the Constitution itself was adopted? Everyone who knows the history of the country knows that it is. In what way would it affect this country if we had free trade? Would it weaken the authority of the Local Governments? Would it interfere with the administration of justice? Would it interfere with the local elections? Would not the local authority be just as strong after the adoption of such a policy as before? How could it affect this Parliament? Would it take away anything from this Parliament or from the Government of the country? Unless the hon. gentleman can say that it would work a revolution in the sentiments of the people, he cannot say

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

that it would have any effect whatever in altering the political relations existing at this time between Canada and the United States. We have free trade with Great Britain. She has put no barrier in our way; she has the supreme authority. But does any one say that our attachment to local self-government, our disposition to maintain our own autonomy, is weaker in consequence of the Imperial policy on the subject of trade, than it was before such policy was adopted? Is Canada any more disposed to-day to give up her Parliament and her local self-government, and to merge herself into the Imperial Parliament, than she was 30 or 40 years ago, when a different fiscal policy existed in the mother country? Why, Sir, everyone knows that that is not the case, and what reason is there for supposing that the political effect of free trade between Canada and the United States would be different from the effect of free trade between Canada and the United Kingdom? We have but to look at the nations making up the United Kingdom. They have there a consolidated Government, they have a legislative union, and yet the Scotchman is not less a Scotchman to-day than he was a hundred years ago; the Welshman is as distinctly national, and his attachment to his local institutions remain unchanged, and so with the Irishman. Now, Sir, there is much more to be said in favor of the views of the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), than of the views put forward by every other hon. gentleman on that side of the House who has made any allusion to this question. The hon. member for Montreal Centre declares that the effect of free trade between Canada and the United States would be commercially injurious, it would not draw us together, but would repel us; instead of creating a political alliance, it would be in danger of creating political hostility. He instanced Ireland, and he quoted from Mr. Barrington. He undertook to show that Ireland had lost enormously by the adoption of unrestricted intercourse with Great Britain. That was the argument of the hon. gentleman, but he did not undertake to show, nor did he insinuate, that the love of Ireland for the Union had amounted to infatuation. On the contrary the hon. gentleman argued against Confederation. The whole line of his argument was to show that the union that existed between the different Provinces was a calamity to the smaller Provinces. He pointed out the effects of the union upon Ireland, and there was not a thing he said with regard to that—and I may say here that I do not agree with him—that would not be equally applicable between the union of old Canada and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. But, Sir, if Ireland was injured by the union, the argument that Nova Scotia was injured by this union would be equally applicable. But the whole drift of the hon. gentleman's argument was to show that the effect of free trade between Canada and the United States would be calamitous to Canada, and that it would have the effect of separating us in sentiment and in feeling more widely from the United States than we are separated at the present moment. On the contrary the hon. gentleman seems to think that a high protective tariff between the two countries was a strong bond of union. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite have not undertaken to show what is to be destroyed, or changed, what revolution is to be wrought, and how it is to be effected, by the establishment of free trade between the United States and Canada. Does the hon. gentleman think that the public virtue and patriotism of those on the other side of the House are not equal to the strain? Do the hon. gentlemen think that they are in danger of being seduced from their allegiance, and of being won over in sympathy and feeling to the neighboring republic? Sir, if the hon. gentlemen are of that opinion, why do they agree to the adoption of free trade in natural products? What is it that is to become, by the adoption of this resolution, a bond of union between Canada and the United States? Is it the trade, or is it the absence of the tax? How are the people

to be united? How is this political fusion to be brought about? I can understand hon. gentlemen arguing that if you allow trade to exist, that trade promotes good feeling, and tends to bring people together that otherwise would not come in contact, that it increases the chances of the maintenance of peace, and diminishes the chances of hostility and antagonism. That is a clear proposition. Hon. gentlemen say that you may have free trade in hoofs and hides, that you may have free trade in cattle and sheep; you may have free trade in agricultural products, but you may not have free trade in cottons and calicoes, and if you do the union is gone—that is the position. You may send a horse into the United States without taxing him, with perfect safety to the political interests of this country, but if you allow a harness to go in, whether it is on the horse or off, you will imperil the whole political fabric—that is the position taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite. They say if you put a tax on the sheep, or if you take a tax off the sheep, no harm is done; if you take the tax off the wool it may be that no very great harm is done, but if you take a tax off the carpet made from the wool, why, your institutions are ruined, your political fabric is pulled down, and you will be looking to Washington. That is the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite. I would like to know whether they think that the voters of this country can be imposed upon by any such statement as that. Sir, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) was very much afraid of being brought into contact with the people of the United States. He wants to have nothing to do with them. Evil communications are in danger of corrupting good manners; and the Olympic light, the patriotic fire, that glows in his bosom is in danger of being extinguished by the repeal of the taxes that are imposed upon the products of the United States if they are brought into Canada. I am not afraid of anything of that sort. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are not afraid. We believe that our patriotism, our devotion to our country, are proof against any danger from any quarter of that kind. We look to our literature, we look to our arts, we look to our historical and literary associations with the mother country, and we believe that there are other ties than material ties which have no little strength in holding together people speaking the same language, having a common history, and looking forward to a common progress. But hon. gentlemen on the other side take a different and more material view, and they say that if you allow our people to enter into more extended trade relations with the neighboring republic, the result will be that you will pull down the political fabric that has been erected here, and you will merge this country in the United States. Now, why will it have that effect? If hon. gentlemen are earnest in putting forward that proposition, why do they allow free trade in anything? Why do they allow any trade at all? Why do they not make the barriers so high as to prevent all trade? Because, if ruin is to be the effect, then every consideration requires that the people of the Lord—this modern Israel—who sit on the benches over there, should protect themselves against the evils of contamination with the neighboring republic. Hon. gentlemen have told us there is very great danger of political fusion, and there is one instance that has been related by two or three hon. members who have discussed this question on the other side—the Zollverein which existed between certain of the German States, and they have told us the effect of that unrestricted trade that existed after 1818 has been the abolition of all local divisions and the unification of the German people into an Empire. I do not think these hon. gentlemen have taken the trouble to make themselves acquainted with the history of the German Zollverein. I am inclined to the opinion that the Zollverein was not the cause of union, but it was the effect of union among the German people. Germany was divided by her

petty dynasties, but united by her race and by her literature. Her people had long been one people, but they were kept apart by the interests of families and dynasties, and when the opportunity came, when a man with a strong will and great courage came to the head of affairs, he did what he said he would do: he brought the King to the ditch, and when there he made him jump, and so Germany was united. Those hon. gentlemen do not appear to know that when the German union took place a very considerable number of the Provinces were not within the Zollverein, and those outside were united before those in the Zollverein came in. Austria was, after 1853, in a limited sense, a member of that union, and Austria and all the Provinces of South Germany remained outside after 1866, when the union was effected. There were Holstein and Odenburg and Mecklenburg which never were inside the union, and they were united to Prussia before those that were actual parts of the German Zollverein. The truth is that the commercial union between the different states was a matter of political convenience, and it had no perceptible effect upon the history of that people. It was in no sense a factor in the revolution that took place in 1866 which made the North German states one people. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to trespass upon the indulgence of the House in discussing other features of this debate. We have been told over and over again that we have complained of the depressed state of trade and industry in this country, that we have complained of the depression in the value of property. So we have. Sir, if the hon. gentlemen are disposed to dispute our position on that question let them summon here those connected with the various loan societies of Ontario, and they will get but one testimony. The testimony will be this: That property has, during the past six years, greatly depreciated in value, and the annual income of the farmers in the Province of Ontario has diminished over \$30,000,000. You cannot take \$30,000,000 annually from the income of the farming population without seriously injuring the value of property and the general trade and commerce of the country, and you have produced that effect by increasing the public burdens and by taxing the people in a way that has taken an enormous sum out of their pocket, beyond that which has gone into the public treasury. We have marked out in this resolution a better way. We propose to remove the restrictions that exist upon trade. Some hon. gentlemen opposite have told us that but one-tenth of our cereals are sent out of this country and the other nine-tenths are consumed here, and they ask what importance is to be attached to the one-tenth when the nine-tenths are consumed here in the home market. It must be remembered that a large portion of the nine-tenths is consumed by those who produce the cereals, and it does not form part of the marketable commodities of the country. The value of the remaining nine-tenths is determined by the value put upon the one-tenth. What determines the value of every bushel of wheat and every pound of flour sold here is the value of the one-tenth on the Liverpool market, and therefore it is the value of what we send abroad that fixes the value of what remains and finds a market at home. And this is true not only of the cereals, but it is true of almost everything else produced here that we send out of the country. We ask Parliament to relieve trade of its burdens, to remove the shackles which have been imposed upon industry, and we propose to this House a plan by which this can be adopted. But some hon. gentlemen opposite say that trade with the United States will seriously interfere with our trade with England. I say it will have no such effect. If you increase trade between Canada and the United States you will so far increase our prosperity that our trade with England will be scarcely perceptibly affected. I look forward not merely to the adoption of this resolution, but that at an early

period, as a consequence of its adoption, the taxes imposed on commerce between this country and the United Kingdom will be greatly diminished in consequence of the increase of our population, the diminution of our liabilities, the reduction in a large degree of our present fiscal burdens, which will enable us to do what under existing circumstances we cannot do. At this moment one thing that the people of this country must remember is this: that the necessities of this Government are greater than the necessities of the Government of the United States, and if the Americans were to reduce their customs duties much below ours, the result would be to seriously embarrass us in the collection of revenue, and therefore we are the people who above and beyond all others have an interest in securing trade with the people of the United States. The earlier we secure that trade the more advantageous it will be for us, and the promotion of our prosperity in consequence of securing that trade will enable us at no distant day to diminish our customs duties on commerce between Canada and other portions of the civilised world. Several hon. gentlemen opposite have denied that there is a great expatriation of our population. Look at these facts. From 1881 to 1886, inclusive, according to the report of the Minister of Agriculture—which the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) says is strictly accurate—155,000 people who emigrated from abroad came into the North-West, and we took a census in 1886 and found there 43,000, so 112,000 of those people who went there have left the country. You have 43,000 people left out of 155,000. And that state of things is going on all over the Dominion. Hon. gentlemen say they are justified in complaining in our day because of the large expatriation of our population. The American statistics show, and our own statistics bear out, the statement that during the period from 1868 to 1873, 43,000 people left the country annually, from 1874 to 1878, 23,000, from 1879 to 1885 not many short of 80,000 yearly have left the Dominion. You, hon. gentlemen opposite, promised to keep our people at home. You proposed to adopt the National Policy as a means to an end. Two ends were to be secured—free trade with the United States was one, and the employment of the people of Canada was the other. You have accomplished neither, and having failed to accomplish either we say the time is come to mark out a better way, for you have had ten years' trial of the experiment which you asked permission to make, and it has proved an egregious failure.

Mr. CAMERON. I have no desire to prolong this discussion, but I feel it to be my duty to say a few words relative to some remarks made by some hon. members for Nova Scotia. I am one of those, Sir, who happen to have been in the House at the inception of the National Policy. I was here in 1870 when the policy was originated, but, unfortunately, it did not then last for any length of time, as it was repealed in 1871. The National Policy embraces the protection of the industries of Canada, and it embraces also reciprocal free trade between Canada and the United States in the products of the soil, of the sea, of the mines and of the forests. This policy is one which commended itself to the people of this Dominion in 1878, in 1882, and also in 1887, which proves that the people are satisfied with the National Policy, and I believe the people have failed to see any necessity for a change at this particular junction. I believe, Sir, that the remedy which is now proposed for the exodus and for the other grievances which exist in the Dominion will fail as a panacea for the evils which hon. friends on the other side think it will cure. I believe that unrestricted reciprocity would prove ruinous to the manufacturing industries of this Dominion immediately, and that it ultimately would prove ruinous to the farmers of this Dominion. I believe, Sir, that the immediate result

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States would be, as has been admitted on all hands, an immediate loss of over seven million dollars to the revenue of this Dominion, and there is no one who will doubt that the indirect loss to the Dominion Treasury would be at least seven million dollars more. I want to know, Sir, how do the hon. gentlemen opposite propose to remedy that deficit? We find that they propose to remedy it by the reduction of the expenditure. They promise, if they ever come into power, that they will largely reduce the expenditure of the Dominion. We find that the expenditure at the commencement of federation amounted only to \$13,000,000, but it was increased in the first period when the Conservative party was in power to \$23,300,000. The Opposition of to-day denounced strongly the large increase in the expenditure of this Dominion at that time, and they promised then, as they promise now, that if they acquired power they would largely reduce that expenditure. But after a term of five years instead of reducing that expenditure, as they had promised, they increased it, and the expenditure will continue to increase it matters not which party may be in power. Every reasonable person in this House will admit that this will be a fact, and every reasonable person in the country well knows that the increase in population and the increase of public expenses requires it. The expenditure of the Dominion at the present moment has reached to no less than \$35,000,000, and I hold and I believe that every reasonable person in this House will practically admit it cannot be reduced below \$35,000,000 a year without prejudice to the interests of the people at large. Now, Sir, if that be the case and if the immediate result of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States be to reduce the income to the extent of \$7,000,000 directly and to \$7,000,000 more indirectly, how can this be provided for except by direct taxation? If we must resort to direct taxation as every honest person in this House admits that we will have to do, then I fail to see how direct taxation will benefit the farmers of the country. It is not my intention to dwell at any great length upon that phase of the question, because I know that it has been completely threshed out already by both sides of the House. I desire particularly to refer to some expressions which have been made by my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), by my hon. friend the senior member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), and by other gentlemen from Nova Scotia. First in reference to the exodus. I think that every person who lives by the sea must admit that there was an exodus from the Maritime Provinces to the United States before the treaty of 1854. I believe that the exodus from the Maritime Provinces was as great before 1854 as it has been during any other period since that time. I am one of those who believe that no policy adopted in this country can effectually arrest the exodus from the Dominion to the United States. There are various reasons why the people go, and no policy adopted by this Parliament can totally avert it. But I do hold that the National Policy adopted by the present Government has largely arrested the exodus from Canada, and that is only what any reasonable person in this Dominion would naturally expect. During the continuance of the reciprocity treaty it is true that the Maritime Provinces were prosperous. But I hold that the prosperity did not arise as much from the effect of the reciprocity treaty as it did from other causes. There is not a reasonable person in the Eastern portion of the Province of Nova Scotia particularly, who will not admit that fact. The prosperity of the eastern part of the province was largely owing to the enormous development of the coal industry during that time, as compared with the trade previously. But the trade in coal between eastern Nova Scotia and the United States during that period was not altogether owing to the reciprocity treaty. It was owing to the fact that the price of coal in the United States was then at least double

what it is now and as has been stated by my friend the member for Cape Breton County (Mr. McKeen) the reciprocal trade in coal would not be to-day as advantageous to the coal interest of Nova Scotia as it had been then, from the very fact that the price of coal to-day is not more than one-half what it was at that time. Every reasonable person must admit that the increase of trade in coal between the Province of Nova Scotia and the United States would not enhance the price of coal in that market. Therefore instead of it being advantageous to the coal interest to have a reciprocity treaty there is no person who is acquainted with that industry in Nova Scotia but will admit that it would prove injurious as compared with the existing state of that industry under the National Policy. Between 1871 and 1885 we had the Washington Treaty, and there can be no doubt that during that time the fishery industry prospered very well, but if it did prosper there was also a large exodus from the Province at that time. I believe there was just such an exodus during that time as there is at present. My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) stated to this effect:

"I know from my own experience that a large number of vessels last season were prevented from going into the fishery business because they could not obtain a crew as the men had all gone to the United States."

My hon. friend made the assertion, but he should have stated the reason. The reason the fishermen of Nova Scotia go to the United States is simply this; they are engaged on American vessels during the fishing season, and in that way, when there is no reciprocal trade in fish between Canada and the United States, they secure the free admission of fish caught by them into the American market. During the period when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power there was just as large an exodus of fishermen to the United States. Our people who have no capital themselves, go to American ports to secure employment on board of vessels belonging to Americans, who are more enterprising than our own people, and who provide vessels for those who have no capital. In fact, a large portion of the American fleet is manned by men who have been employed around our own shores. Instead of the shore fishermen going to the United States, as was represented by my hon. friend from Halifax, it is the deep sea fishermen who are obliged to go because our own capitalists fail to provide vessels for them in which they can pursue their industry at home. But the shore fishermen do not go away from Nova Scotia. My hon. friend from Halifax went on to say:

"Go down to the Island of Cape Breton. My hon. friends from Cape Breton here will bear me out—"

"Gen. LAURIE. Hear, hear."

"Mr. JONES (Halifax). The hon. gentleman confirms my statement as I knew he would from his frankness. But I say, go down to the Island of Cape Breton, and there you will find that almost all the population, a large number of people there who used to be engaged in our shore fishery, have gone to the United States."

"An hon. MEMBER. No."

And it happened to be the person who made that denial—

"Mr. JONES (Halifax). I know better, for I am engaged in that business myself. Years ago we used to have tens of thousands of valuable shore fish brought to the Halifax market and exported all over the world; that branch of commerce, as far as regards the shore fishery, is a thing of the past. Those men have gone banking, and under the new condition of affairs, and when they found that our fishing vessels could not fish on as favorable terms as the Americans, they emigrated to the States and engaged on board American vessels."

I have stated the reason why they go; the same cause existed not only during the continuance of the Washington Treaty, but previously, and will continue as long as the Americans provide ships for our fishermen. One hon. member stated that 120 had left his county in the spring, but he knows that they return in the fall after their summer's work is over. He knows that although they go to the United States, they go to obtain vessels in which to fish

near our own shores, and that they return with the receipts from their labor in their pockets. But in order to convince my hon. friend that there is not an exodus of fishermen from Cape Breton, I have obtained statistics which prove the fact. I find that in 1877-78, the last year the Liberal party were in power, there were 8,830 men engaged in the fisheries of Cape Breton, whereas, during the year 1887-88, the number engaged was 9,591, an increase of 761, or 11 per cent. in the decade. This proves that the information which has been imparted by the senior member for Halifax was largely inaccurate. But let me come to the county I have the honor to represent. I find that in 1877-78, the last year hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, there were 1,118 fishermen, whereas in 1887-88 there were 2,382 engaged, an increase of 1,264, or 113 per cent. And yet we are told that the shore fishermen of the Province of Nova Scotia have been expatriated and have gone to the United States. Now, the hon. member for Prince Edward stated that the Premier made an assertion in Quebec that the country was literally going to the dogs under the régime of hon. gentlemen opposite. When he suggested a remedy, it was one that Canada could accept with honor and pride. It was an appeal to rely on our own resources with a National Policy. But hon. gentlemen opposite propose a policy which the United States alone can control, and which will immediately prove ruinous to the manufactures of Canada, and ultimately recoil on the farmers from end to end of this Dominion. The policy adopted by the Premier of this Dominion has proved advantageous to the people, and they will refuse to displace it by a policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. This is especially the case, because the remedy proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite in order to make up the deficit which must unquestionably result from unrestricted reciprocity to the extent of \$15,000,000, is one that will fall heavily on the taxpayers of this country. There is no remedy but direct taxation. Every hon. gentleman who has spoken on the opposite side of this House has admitted that. The remedy they propose, is direct taxation, with a large reduction in the expenditure on wharves, piers, and public works, and a discontinuance of subsidies to railways. Now, I believe that such expenditure is one of the most important provisions of the National Policy. That policy is not only calculated to secure sufficient revenue to maintain the public service of the Dominion effectually, but to facilitate the distribution of the products of the country throughout the Dominion, and a curtailment of the expenditures on public works or of the usual subsidies to railways in any section of the Dominion would be disastrous. Every honest man must admit that whatever exodus we may have now, it would become much larger were there any curtailment of public expenditure in that direction. I exceedingly regret having occupied such a long time at this late stage of the discussion, but I thought it necessary to give my expression of opinion against the idea that the National Policy had any tendency to promote an exodus from the Maritime Provinces. I believe the Maritime Provinces are more prosperous under the National Policy than they ever have been since they were first settled, and I believe it is only the continuation of the National Policy that will insure the prosperity of our people down by the sea.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Pontiac and Renfrew Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 63) to amend the Acts relating to the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Perley, Assiniboia.)

Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Chatham Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon, St. John)

Bill (No. 66) to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Bronsons and Weston Lumber Company.—(Mr. Perley, Ottawa.)

SECOND READINGS—IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 46) to amend the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Scarth.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Buffalo, Chippawa and Niagara Falls Steamboat and Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Davis, Alberta.)

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the New York, St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Bill (No. 84) to incorporate the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor)

Bill (No. 85) to incorporate the Emerson and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Watson.)

Bill (No. 86) to authorise the construction of Bridges over the Assiniboine River at Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie for Railway and Passenger purposes.—(Mr. Watson.)

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House resumed debate on the proposed resolution of Sir Richard Cartwright, the amendment of Mr. Foster, and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Jones (Halifax).

Mr. Fiset. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain you long on this question. It is pretty well exhausted, and I fancy it were presumption in me to think that I might shed new light thereupon or adduce new arguments in support of the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). But really, speaking appears to be contagious on this topic, and, as I am possibly taken with the complaint, I feel that I should say a few words on the subject, trusting that my hon. colleagues on both sides of the House will bear with me for a short time. The proposition before us is, I take it: Would reciprocity with the United States be profitable to Canada under present circumstances? The hon. gentlemen opposite hold a negative opinion; we of the Opposition are in favor of the affirmative. What are the chief reasons which the hon. members of the right allege in support of their views? They may be reduced to four. The first is, that the people have chosen protection; the second, that our manufacturers would be harmed by reciprocal trade; the third, that we should be wanting in loyalty to Great Britain by making a reciprocity treaty with the United States; and the fourth, that our revenue would be lessened by the free entry of American goods into the country, and the consequence would be direct taxation. I shall attempt a reply to these four objections. First—The people have elected protection. Certainly, in 1878, that word, that one word carried the electorate by storm, and they overturned an honest Government, such, perhaps, as the country had never seen before, and a most economical Administration. Owing to the business depression of that period, the people were blinded, held the Administration of 1878 responsible therefor, and withdrew

Mr. Fiset.

their support. The crisis, which lasted from 1876 to 1880, was due to the excess of the importation into the country of foreign manufactured goods, and the foreign markets being glutted, there was no outlet for our farming products, and still less for our timber. Thence came the numerous failures of that time. But it does not follow hence that the farmer class, the most numerous in the country, suffered more from 1873 to 1878, than from 1878 to 1888. During the former period, in spite of the prevailing business crisis, our farmers were able to sell their produce on better terms than they have done since 1878. During that term, between 1873 to 1878, there was no such event as the wholesale emigration of our people to the land of the stranger, in quest of the head which a protective tariff took from them. We beheld no such spectacle there as that of broken windows, hanging shutters, and large buildings, silent, bleak and empty. But since the establishment of the famous protective tariff, I should invite my hon friend, whose speech I heard with pleasure the other day, without sharing his views,—I should invite the hon. member for Bigot (Mr. Dupont) to visit my part of the country. He would see there homes abandoned that were formerly filled with happy families; he would see not, indeed, large factories closed and partially demolished, but lowly huts with barred sashes and planked over, deserted and forbidding in look—and that in whole concessions. He would see, in my own county, a small town that flourished till 1878—Rimouski, so beautifully laid out on the banks of the St. Lawrence, and he would find out for himself that one third of its inhabitants has gone in search of a livelihood elsewhere. I should next invite him to go down by the Intercolonial and ascertain the number of French Canadians who, even to-day, abandon their homes and seek, over the frontier, the subsistence which a protective tariff prevents them from enjoying in their own country. Formerly the young men would leave the old people to travel abroad in pursuit of money, for the Canadian people, brought up in an almost boundless country, are fond of travelling. To-day, however, it is no longer the youth that go; but father, mother and the whole family follow into exile. This may look like exaggeration, but it is the truth. Next, Mr. Speaker, we are told that the people have thrice renounced in favor of protection. The first time, perhaps; allow for the second also; but the third time is saying too much. It will be remembered that the election of 1882 was declared one year before the expiration of Parliament, on pretences moved or less flimsy, and with the object, doubtless, of taking the people unawares. As to the election of 1886—although I should, perhaps, not say so on patriotic grounds, they were made as issues of race and creed. I trust that such a thing may not happen again, and there are in this House hon. gentlemen who, if they had had only the watchword of protection to secure their return would not hold their seats in the Parliament to-day. Furthermore, if protection is so advantageous and most favorable to our interest, why is it that a certain number of hon. gentlemen on the right are in search of another system to-day? Why do the upper classes seek to impose on us the scheme of Imperial Federation? Protection is, therefore, not the salve destined to remedy all the evils which the public are exposed to. We are told, in the second place, that reciprocity would ruin our manufactures. As was so well said by the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), there is no doubt that a certain number of manufactures would certainly suffer, but they would be only a few, possibly belonging to those gentlemen whom we see, almost every year, in the lobbies of Parliament, trying to worry the Government into raising the duty on the goods which they manufacture, in order to shorten their way to fortune. I should fancy it were an insult to honest and intelligent manufacturers to tell them that reciprocity would prove their death-blow, as, on the contrary,

I am of the opinion that, with Confederation, a new impulse would be imparted to their business and would tend to perfect their methods of manufacture. Taking only one example, of least bearing indeed: see what happened to our poor Canadian fishermen—sturdy and needy men—when we allowed Americans to go and fish in our waters. These poor people fell, for several years, to a condition of real inferiority—they are perhaps that yet, remaining always poor—but they nevertheless took a lesson from the Americans, and adopted the methods which they saw the latter use. Owing to their pluck, I shall not say that they can now cope with the Americans, but they are able to maintain themselves. I will admit that a great number among them have gone into the service of the Americans, as for that matter, other French Canadians have done. It is useless, Mr. Speaker, to enumerate the large number of lines of business in which we can meet the Americans with advantage. We can cope with them better in the liberal professions. We have statesmen in this House as eminent as any American statesmen. Our lawyers are as distinguished as those of the United States, and even among our physicians we find practitioners as learned in the healing art. Was not a Canadian physician summoned some years ago, to add the benefit of his knowledge and experience in the case of President Garfield? Americans are acquainted with us, Mr. Speaker. They know our aptitudes, esteem us, seek us out and respect our abilities. The proof of this is the marked preference they show our people when the latter go among them. By the tariff with which we have been burdened, a great number of our countrymen have been forced to leave the country. They have been driven to ask Americans for the bread which this unjust tariff has taken from them. I speak advisedly when I say unjust tariff. Being under a constitutional government, where the majority rules, is it fair and just to tax the farmers and workingmen—who comprise more than three-fourths of our population—to support the balance and enrich them at the expense of the poor? I repeat, therefore, Mr. Speaker, believing I am right in doing so, that this tariff is a grievous injustice. We are told, furthermore, that in demanding reciprocal trade we are acting disloyally towards Great Britain. Now, what is meant by loyalty? According to the French lexicographer Bescherelle, loyalty, in a nutshell, is the synonym of faithfulness and honor. In what way should we lack honor or faithfulness by seeking to better the condition of our people? In my view, fidelity and honor should be exercised first and foremost toward our common Canadian fatherland. It were disloyal to place her in the background, and if this mode of reasoning is right, I should exclaim with my hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Dupont): "Canada for Canadians." Let the members of the other side of the House cease charging us with less loyalty than themselves, for the less we say about loyalty, the better. But we are told again that if reciprocity is adopted, our revenue will be so palpably lessened that a recourse to direct taxation will be inevitable. Well, Sir, it is precisely to obviate this misfortune that the Liberal party have labored since the establishment of Confederation. To frustrate direct Taxation, the Liberals have ever warned their constituents against an increase of expenditure, and the increment of the of public debt. I can still recall the memorable words uttered by a great patriot now departed—another of the political victims—the Hon. Luc. Letellier, who, in 1873, went through the district of Quebec, haranging the people and carrying all the counties, so to speak, by his eloquence, from Levis to the extreme bounds of the Province. His words were: "Electors, I am not a seer, but I do not think I am mistaken in saying that if you do not take your cause into your own hands, if you do not replace the present Administration by another, that shall put a stop to the increase of expenses and the public debt, you have reason

to fear that the end will be the burden of direct taxation." These were the great patriot's words in 1873. Now, it seems unfair to insinuate that we, who favor reciprocity, are thereby in favor of direct taxation. For my part, Mr. Speaker, I would prefer even protection to such a tax. But my belief is, that we can have reciprocal trade with the United States without having recourse to this alternative. Let us curtail the expenditure, bringing it back to the standard of 1873; that is, to 25 or 26 millions, and then I think that we could meet our outlay. I have the honor, Sir, of representing one of the largest and most thickly-settled counties in the Province. For several years, I have had the honor of sitting in this House, with the exception of the break from 1882 to 1886, a defeat, the causes of which need not be dwelt on here. Up to 1878, this immense country flourished. Since the establishment of the protective tariff, things have assumed a different aspect, and emigration to the United States is all the talk there. And how can we expect they are different with the burden of taxes weighing on the people? In that county there are three special products which are chiefly taxed—potatoes, butter and horses. Even this year again, we shall export over 150,000 bushels of potatoes, the tax per bushel being 15 cents. These 15 cents a bushel on 150,000 bushels make at once \$22,500 which the Rimouski farmers lose. We export 50,000 pounds of butter at 4 cents a pound duty, which makes \$2,000 more taken from the husbandman, and these products are principally destined for our brethren in the United States. The Americans coming over to purchase these goods say that they would willingly pay more, but that they have so much to lay out before crossing the lines. It is the same with horses. Our horses have a good name in the United States, not only for their good looks, but for their excellent points. They are fine roadsters as a rule, a quality which Americans prize. At least one hundred go to the United States from my county every year. At 20 per cent. duty, you have again a loss of \$2,000 to the farmers. Add up these several sums, and you read the figure of \$26,500 on three items only. I might say as much about oats, barley and many other products that are also heavily burdened by the protective tariff. Shall we be told after all this, Mr. Speaker, that the representatives of agricultural counties should vote against the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)? For my part, I should feel I was failing in my duty and betraying the most precious interests of my county, if I pursued such a course.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). Mr. Speaker, in rising at this late stage of the debate, when nature is almost exhausted, not only in this House of Commons, but throughout the country, I do not propose to occupy the time of the House at any great length, but even at this late hour, although I had almost relinquished the task of replying to the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, I cannot help but get on my feet and reply, in order to protect a class of individuals in this country that has been malignd by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. I have the honor to represent a rural constituency in the interior of the Province of Quebec, and on that account, more particularly, I have a right to be heard. It is a very strange thing that, notwithstanding all the assertions made by hon. gentlemen opposite, of the bleeding of the poor farmer by the bloated monopolist and capitalist manufacturer, that an agricultural county in the interior of the Province of Quebec should have chosen to send to this House one of that class of individuals. I am satisfied that if these hon. gentlemen had to go back at the present time to their constituencies to be elected, with the cry they have adopted in this House, many of them would never see the inside of the House

of Commons again. I was very much amused in reading the speech of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beauvoil). I regret that he is not in the House at this moment. It is not well to speak of a man behind his back, but sometimes we have to do it. That hon. member, in trying to depreciate his country, began to malign his constituency, and he stated to the House that at least one-fourth of the farms and houses in his county were deserted; and he made a statement almost at the same time in which he admitted that the Province of Quebec had certainly progressed to some extent, but not to the extent that he had expected. Now, there must be something very strange in the county that he has the honor to represent; I think it must be misgoverned in some way, because it appears to be receding while the other counties in the Province of Quebec are advancing. Another statement made by that hon. gentleman was that we were here, not to legislate altogether for the benefit of Canada, but for the benefit of America. Now, Mr. Speaker, are the people on the south side of the line 45 not capable enough to legislate for themselves without deputing an hon. member elected for one of the constituencies of Canada, to come to the House of Commons of Canada to legislate for them? I think that in this field they are showing themselves very well able to take care of themselves. Mr. Speaker, we do not hear of late so much from hon. gentlemen opposite about the importance of this question. About ten days ago almost every speaker who got up on that side of the House commenced his oration with the statement that this was the most important question that had occupied the attention of the House of Commons since Confederation. But they seem to have dropped that line, and why? Because they have learned, both from their own speakers, and from the speakers on this side of the House, that the importance of that question must be dropped. I admit that it is an important question, a decidedly important question, but I think it is still more important that this resolution should not be adopted. A debate has been going on in this House for the past three weeks, but we have actually nothing to deal with. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has given us a lot of statements, but he has not given us a *modus vivendi*. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen have not been so here to make statements about the country's depression without showing us whereby that depression may be remedied. I have observed that hon. gentlemen opposite are not agreed in the remedy that ought to be adopted. One says it is arrant nonsense to talk about unrestricted reciprocity, another says we must have commercial union, while still another says that we want free trade. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the question is to resolve itself into a question of the National Policy, then let it be so. Are hon. gentlemen not satisfied that they were defeated on that question during three general elections, in 1873, in 1882 and in 1887? And do they want to bring up the question again, and be defeated once more in the general elections of 1892, when, I presume, the general elections will take place? Sir, the people of this country have pronounced upon that policy, they have prospered under that policy, and that policy is going to remain the prop and the stay of this country. The hon. member for South Oxford and many of his friends, have maligned and belittled this country to such an extent that I think it would be well for me, or some other members on this side of the House, to take the hon. member for South Oxford to some high and mighty mountain in the centre of this country whence he can look down upon it from east to west, and let him see the country that he has belittled. We will take the hon. gentleman up to this high mountain, and ask him for a moment to leave the vitiated atmosphere of the House of Commons, to put on glasses of greater magnifying power than those he is accustomed to wear. We will ask him to leave the small cabin in which he has been living for a number of years

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil.)

past, in order that he may obtain a broader view of this country than he seems to hold, according to his resolution. When we have climbed up this high mountain, and after the hon. gentleman has put on those great magnifying glasses, I will ask him to look down upon this country, washed on the east by the mighty Atlantic, and I will ask him to turn his head to the west, we cannot see over that reach of mountains. Well, let us go up higher, for there is a still higher peak. We will climb to that peak, and we will look over those mountains and look on to the broad Pacific, where it washes the shores of our western land. We will turn again to the east, and with those larger glasses we will ask him to look at that mighty St. Lawrence, which comes from the northern waters and sweeps away down towards the eastern sea, washing the Island of Newfoundland, and we will tell him that in that vista there is an amount of wealth that is not to be found in any other nation in the world, such wealth as that not only the people of the United States, but all other nations of the world have coveted ever since it became known. He will find that eddy on the south of Newfoundland dotted over with specks, which are the craft of our fellow-countrymen who inhabit our Maritime Provinces. While he is looking in that direction, I ask him to trace that line of ships that are making their way back and forth from the old world to the new, and I will tell him—and it may seem a very strange thing that the eastern portion of our land is 700 or 800 miles nearer to that goal, that market for which we are all striving—and he will notice that the vessels coming from the ports of New York and Boston all pass within 200 or 300 miles of our shores. Are not these riches which we should be careful not to part with? I say most decidedly they are. While he is looking in that direction, and since I have told him that on the edge of this current there exists that immense wealth that belongs to us, and while I have told him of the position of the country, that we can reach the old country and the trade of Great Britain and Europe much more quickly than can be done from any port in the United States, I will ask him to look at the pineries of New Brunswick. I will tell him that in that Province of New Brunswick, a Province that has been so derided by hon. gentlemen opposite, there still exists immense wealth for future generations. I will tell him that in the northern part of the Province of Nova Scotia are vast coal mines from which the people of the Province are reaping riches which are their just reward. I will now turn his attention to Ontario and to the northern portion of Quebec, and point to the greatest pineries in the world. I do not believe the hon. gentleman thinks we have these pineries, he has never taken the trouble to visit the country and examine into the matter, or he would not be willing that we should part with them on such easy terms. But while he is looking west he will cast his eye across the vast plain—he has left the lake region—and he sees a vast plain stretching for a thousand miles. He looks away to the north and finds a vast country watered by magnificent rivers. I will tell him that here we have the greatest agricultural country that the world has ever seen, a country watered by magnificent rivers. Then if he looks across the Rocky Mountains to the pineries on their western slope, and in British Columbia and Vancouver he will see coal sufficient to supply us for years to come. I will also tell him that we are bounded on the north by a frozen sea and we are not afraid of the hordes that may come down from that quarter, that we are bounded on the east and west by vast oceans, and on the south by a friendly, industrious and peaceful people. Is not this something to guard well? Is it not possible that we might part with this great inheritance too cheaply instead of preserving it for our children who may follow us and fill our places in time to come? This is the important question of the day. This is why unrestricted reciprocity could not for one moment be accepted by us. When the hon. member for

South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has seen this vast country with all its resources, when the hon. gentleman has seen our vast inheritance and has examined into its riches, he will be more enlightened, and will not engage in blackening this fair land after he has seen its importance. But while we say we have this vast possession, let us look back a few years and see our position formerly. I wish to show that, notwithstanding the exertions made by hon. gentlemen opposite who have supported the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), this country has progressed, and in order to do so I must take the hon. gentleman back many years. We have heard a great deal from hon. gentlemen opposite and through their press of the slow advancement of this country and they compare twenty years of long ago with twenty years recently. Let them go back to 1778 in the United States and follow up to 1796 and compare those twenty years with the first twenty years of our Dominion, and they will see substantial progress made since that time by this Dominion of ours. But I must go back to 1841 which I cannot say was the birth of the Dominion, because such was not the fact, but I might say that that was the year in which Canada was born, not the Dominion of Canada but old Canada. In 1841 she received that responsible government which has given her a name and a position. In that year we had only the two Provinces of Canada, and Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, British Columbia was not yet born—it was then a trading post. In 1841, of the Provinces now forming the Dominion, there were the five before mentioned. Let us see what progress was made between that time and 1867, the date of the actual birth of the Dominion. Before proceeding to the date of the birth of the Dominion, I may dwell at not very great length upon this important period in the history of what is now the Dominion of Canada. We all know, Mr. Speaker, that between the years 1841 and 1848 these were troublous times for Canada and at that time we had not settled down properly to develop our country. In 1849 and 1850 some years after the union of the Provinces into eastern and western Canada, the country found out that they wanted an outlet for their trade to the sea-board, and the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Railway was built to take our product to the town of Portland in Maine, a seaport on the Atlantic. In 1852 the English capitalists who formed the Grand Trunk Company seeing the great prospects for a railway from the east to west of old Canada came here with their capital and invested it in railway enterprise. They bought out the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Railway that they might possess the whole system from east to west, and from that time we may say that the greatest progress of our country dates. Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to make a point, that because the country was prosperous between 1854 and 1866 under the Elgin treaty, that we would prosper the same now as we did during that period, if we had unrestricted reciprocity. But, Sir, a very different state of things existed at that time from what exists to-day. The enterprise of the Grand Trunk Railway by which a large sum of money was spent in our country and towns gave a great impetus to trade and gave us a large home market. Although at that time we had free access to the American markets, we must not forget that the greatest market was at the door of the farmer of that day—the home market created by the Grand Trunk Railway and by its operations. In considering the effect of reciprocity between us and the people of the United States we must always remember that circumstances between 1854 and 1866 are entirely different to what they are to-day. In 1854 and 1855 we had the Crimean war and all the surplus cereals of the United States were sent to Great Britain. At that time we had reciprocity, and the Americans took all the cereals we could afford to send to them and practically acted as middlemen between us and

the people of Great Britain in exporting our products there. In 1857 and 1858 we had the Indian Mutiny, which caused a state of things similar to the time of the Crimean War, and at that time again we furnished all the surplus produce we could to the middlemen of the United States for shipment to Great Britain. In 1857, in the middle of this treaty, the greatest disaster that ever befel Canada came upon us in the way of financial difficulties. I contend that this disaster was brought about largely by the reciprocity treaty, and the same might befall this country again if we entered into a reciprocity treaty of that kind again. We did not then handle our own produce, but it was handled for us in the markets of Boston and New York very largely. While we handed over our products to those people we were their creditors, and when financial ruin fell upon the United States in 1857 those men having our money, we being their creditors, we were financially ruined like themselves. Such a state of things may never occur again in Canada as during the latter part of the Elgin Treaty between 1859 and 1866, and such facilities for the increase of Canadian trade may never again arise. There was a civil war in the United States during this period, and the farm and mill hands were taken to do duty for their country. There was a deficiency in the products of the country for this and other reasons, and the United States took whatever surplus produce we could afford to give them. That treaty was suspended in 1866, and it has been said by some gentlemen on the opposite side of the House that the reason of the suspension was the antipathy of the northern people to Canada at that time on account of our sympathies for the south during their war. I do not believe that this was the reason. I believe that the reason was that after the war they wanted to protect their own products and protect their country for their own people. The people of that country had been engaged in war from 1861 to 1865; they had gone back to their farms and workshops, there was larger agricultural and manufacturing products in consequence, and if the people of Canada had access to their markets, it would have caused a decrease in the value of their own products. They said: "Now, since we have an extra number of people to till the soil, we will protect our own country and snap those reciprocal trade relations between Canada and ourselves." I believe the abrogation of that treaty was brought about not by any ill feeling towards us, but because the people of America wanted to protect their own farmers. It then became necessary for us to look around for some means to protect ourselves, and Confederation followed. I believe the statesmen of that day were wise in their generation. I believe they thought the matter out well; I believe they saw that if we did not unite the Provinces, it was altogether likely that those Provinces would be absorbed by the great nation to the south. They set about confederation, and wise men on the other side of the House, men occupying the position that the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House occupy to-day, sank their political opinions and joined with the statesmen who belonged to the party that rules our country to-day and aided in framing this Confederation. That was a noble spirit on their part, and one that shall never be forgotten by the people of Canada. In 1869 after Confederation, we acquired that great land which was leased to the Hudson Bay Company—a land that was scarcely known up to that time. In 1870 we formed another Province out of part of that land, the Province of Manitoba, and we also formed what was called the North-West Territories. In 1882 those territories were converted into individual territories, which have since sent to this House representatives. In 1871 we accepted British Columbia. And in 1873 that little Garden of Eden down in the Gulf, Prince Edward Island, which is so much maligned by the hon. gentlemen who were sent here to represent it, who say it is not prospering, which I claim to be not correct—that little garden sought fit to throw in its

lot with us, and in 1873 this vast Dominion was made complete. But yet it will not be complete until that other Island, with its vast wealth of fisheries, is brought in; then we shall be one vast Dominion stretching from ocean to ocean. Since I have shown that we possess this vast country, is it possible for any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House to make a statement here, and send it broadcast to the country, that we have made no progress? No, Mr. Speaker, it is false. We made vast progress between 1867 and 1873. Are we not as wealthy in land as the whole country to the south of us? Yes, we have more square miles than they have; we own more of this North American continent than they do. It may be said by some that we are land poor; but we are laying up an inheritance, not for ourselves, but for our children. Could we have acquired all that land at this day? No; if we went into the market to acquire it now, we would have to pay ten times the price we paid for it; and was it not wisdom on the part of those hon. gentlemen who made that arrangement and who confederated all these Provinces into this grand Dominion? I say it was; and is it not proper for the statesmen of the latter part of the nineteenth century to be careful to preserve this inheritance for their children, and for those who may think fit to throw in their lot with them? Let us see if the statesmen of those years, from 1874 to 1878, thought so much of this vast inheritance as to properly preserve it for their children. No, Mr. Speaker, they did not. In the first place, in their treatment of that little Province on the other side of those vast mountains they showed their unwisdom. In fact they would have allowed it to be cut adrift and go to the nation to the south of us rather than spend a few paltry millions of dollars to track the prairies and cut through those mountains. They were wrong again in their railway policy. That was shown by the leader of this Government the other day, in speaking of the crop of Manitoba in the past year, that had they had their way, it would have taken sixty-six years to carry that crop out of the country. Was that a wise railway policy? Did it commend itself to the people of Canada? No, it did not. Now, come to the third policy in which they were wrong; I am going to speak of their commercial policy. Were they wise in their commercial policy? No, Mr. Speaker. When they struck their commercial policy, they wrecked themselves and almost wrecked our country. But, Sir, we had behind the throne a hidden power; we had those who had piloted this ship of state, and left it in good shape; and the country said to those hon. gentlemen who were only waiting to come to our assistance, those true and tried men: Take this country from the hands of these men, and bring us into a state of prosperity, as you did before. In 1878 the manufacturers of this country were coming to this city of Ottawa; cringing before the Finance Minister of that time, and crying, help us; we are being slaughtered, our market is being taken from us, give us a little more protection, and we will be able to work out our own salvation. But there was no attention paid to them. They were told, you must live without any protection; we will not protect you. They gave them a paltry two and a half per cent. advance in the tariff. Why, Mr. Speaker, that only aggravated the case. Now, since we have been living under the National Policy which hon. gentlemen opposite have been trying to riddle, to dissect, to tear to tatters during this debate, and since we have been prospering under it, why change from this policy to embark on a sea of doubt? Why give up a certainty for an uncertainty? Why, Mr. Speaker, are we wrecked in mid-ocean that we should be taken up by those people to the south of us, no matter how good, kind, peaceful and prosperous they may be, and be fostered by them and lose our nationality? No, I say we are not. Does our great mother country think we are a wreck? Do the nations of the world think we are a wreck? Do the United States think we are a wreck? Why, no. My answer to those

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil).

people who have been trying to prove for the last fifteen days that we are a wreck is that our exhibits, not only in England, but in other nations of the world, even in the United States, have proved that we are a prosperous, industrious and intelligent people. I come now to the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. In that resolution he says:

"It is highly desirable that the largest possible freedom of commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States."

I will not go any further. I will agree with him if he will modify that resolution. I am quite agreeable that it is highly desirable that the largest possible commercial intercourse should obtain between the Dominion of Canada and the United States. Now, you will notice, Mr. Speaker, that I have eliminated the word "freedom." Freedom is too much to grant to that people to the south of the line. To prove his case, the hon. member stated that the exodus of the people from this country was a proof that this country was retrograding; and to prove that, he declared that one out of every four native born Canadians and one out of every three immigrants had left this country in the last twenty-five years. He stated further, that, between the years 1860 and 1880, no less than 700,000 Canadians had left Canada. Where he obtained those figures, I, of course, do not know, but I will accept his statement, and prove that it tells against the hon. gentleman's own case. He could not have chosen a worse twenty years in the history of this country for his argument. He went back prior to the date of Confederation, 1867. He might have taken the years 1867 to 1887, but he chose to take the years between 1860 and 1880. Let us see whether the hon. gentleman was wise in his choice. The hon. gentleman's memory does not, I am sure, require to be refreshed in matters of recent history, and I am sure he is quite old enough to remember the civil war that took place in the United States. That war broke out in 1861 and was terminated in 1865; and during that period the exodus from this country was caused, to a considerable extent, by the warlike propensity which is inherent in every people, and which the hon. gentleman knows well existed in Canada at that time. In fact, Canada furnished as many soldiers to the American civil war as did any State in the Union. Another reason for the exodus lies in the fact that fully one million of able-bodied men left the farms, the workshops, the mills and the factories in the United States and went to the front, and the places of these men had to be filled by others. Who then were more likely to supply their places than the people living to the north of them, people of the same habits and instincts? This was another cause of the exodus of Canadians during that period. The exodus was not on account of any lack of progress or prosperity in Canada at that time, because the reciprocity treaty was then in force, and we know from hon. gentlemen opposite that during the existence of that treaty Canada was exceedingly prosperous. But in that twenty years we are confronted with another period, the period from 1875 to 1879, concerning which hon. gentlemen opposite in their own interests, would have done better to say nothing. Although they were not to blame for the exodus of Canadians from 1861 to 1866, they cannot escape responsibility for the exodus from 1875 to 1879, when they held the reins of Government. They had failed in their commercial policy, they had wrecked themselves and had almost succeeded in wrecking the country; they had caused our mills and factories, from one end of the Dominion to the other, to close down, and the operatives in these establishments had to find work somewhere. They could not go to Great Britain, because their habits and their mode of living unfitted them for work in the workshops of that country, and the only country to which they could go in search of employment was the country to the south of them, where the wages and the modes of

living were similar to those at home. They were driven to the United States by hon. gentlemen opposite, and they took with them their families, and have remained there ever since. I have thus given you the chief causes of the exodus from 1860 to 1880, and have proved to you that the point was not well taken by hon. gentlemen opposite that it was due to any misgovernment on the part of the Conservative party. The hon. member for South Oxford has stated that the country is on the road to ruin, and on this point I must take issue with him. Of course hon. gentlemen opposite will stop at nothing to prove that the country is going to the dogs; they have even gone so far as to say that the population of Canada since Confederation has only increased 20 per cent. If hon. gentlemen opposite will look at the figures, they will find that at the time of Confederation we had a population of about 3,250,000, and, accepting the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite, that our population to-day is 4,800,000, I would like to know by what course of arithmetical reasoning they can come to the conclusion that the increase is only 20 per cent. I say it is an increase of 50 per cent. And to lay greater stress on their statement they draw a comparison with the United States. The hon. member for South Oxford has said that while we have increased in population only twenty per cent., the United States have increased 100 per cent., or, from 30,000,000 to 60,000,000. Let us examine into the figures. In 1865 the population of the United States was between 37,000,000 and 38,000,000, and taking the population in 1885 at the figures the hon. gentleman gave of 60,000,000, we find that the increase is no greater than the increase in the population of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman said that the United States population had increased from 30,000,000. Why did he take 30,000,000? Their population was more than 30,000,000 in 1865; but he took a figure lower than the fact, so as to make the difference appear greater than it is. Why are figures distorted in this manner if not to make the people of Canada believe they are not prospering, and that if they would transfer their allegiance to the United States, if they would hand over to the United States their workshops and their farms, they would be better off and increase in population more rapidly. But throw in that one million of Canadians, who are in the United States to-day, to the 4,800,000, who are in Canada, and we have 5,800,000 in all, which shows that Canadians have multiplied in a greater degree than have the Americans. The hon. gentleman dwelt at some length upon the retrogression of Canada, and the first proof he gave us was in reference to the price of farm lands. Are the hon. gentlemen honest in these statements? If the hon. gentleman knows anything of commerce at all, he must know that the price of a farm depends entirely upon the value of the produce of that farm. If the value of the produce decreases, the price of the farm must decrease also. Therefore that argument must fall to the ground. I will not weary the House much longer. I may show that in regard to our debt and our taxation the hon. gentleman has made misstatements to the House. He says that our debt has been trebled. When he knows that we took over a debt of \$109,000,000 from the Provinces when they were confederated, and that we have to-day a debt of \$229,000,000, by what process of arithmetical reasoning does he make out that statement? Is that three times the amount? No, it is not much more than twice. Again, he states that the taxation of the country has trebled in this time. The proportion between the taxation of that day and this is as nine to nineteen. Is that three times? No, it requires only an ordinary school boy to detect the difference. But there is a subject which is more dear to me, and to others of my class in Canada, than much of the debate which has been going on for the last 16 or 17 days. I could scarcely sit still in my seat, and hear that class of people, the manufacturers, those bloated capitalists and monopolists, as

they are termed, maligned. Of course, the object was to show the poor farmers of Canada that they are a much burdened people, so that at the next general election they may take up this unrestricted reciprocity cry, which is an impossibility. What do they mean by unrestricted reciprocity? Is it possible? The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), said it was not possible. How are we going to work unrestricted reciprocity? Are we going to have a tariff against England and all the world of 25 per cent., and the United States to have a tariff of 40 per cent. against the same people? Could that exist for one day or for one year? No. Do you mean to say that the people of the United States are not so alive to their interests that they would import their goods by way of the St. Lawrence and ship them by rail-ways to the United States? Unrestricted reciprocity is impossible. Commercial union is possible, but unrestricted reciprocity is not possible. Free trade is entirely different. These poor manufacturers who have been so much maligned—let us say something in regard to them. I find the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in sizing up the manufacturers of this country, like the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) in belittling our population, stated that the manufactures of this country only amounted in value to something between \$26,000,000 and \$30,000,000. That is as false as false can be. In the city of Montreal alone, I will wager that there is invested, not only in lands and buildings, because you must take into account the capital which is required to run these institutions, over \$50,000,000 in manufacturing institutions. Let us take Halifax, and follow up the Intercolonial Railway to Moncton; let us go up into the Eastern Townships, take Magog, Sherbrooke, St. Hyacinthe, St. John's, Cornwall, and let us pass up to Kingston, which has become a manufacturing centre to-day; let us take Toronto, Stratford, Guelph, (Gananoque, which I passed), and which is decidedly one of the oldest manufacturing centres since the adoption of the National Policy; let us take St. Catharines, Dundas, Hamilton, London; let us look at all these cities and their manufactures and see if there are only \$26,000,000 employed in them. I said that in Montreal there were over \$50,000,000 engaged in manufactures, and I venture to say that, taking all these cities, there are not less than from \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000 invested in manufactures in this country. Do the people believe these statements of hon. gentlemen opposite? No, they will not believe them. In all this debate, there is evidently a point that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House forget, and they will stick at nothing to gain their points. They have a desire to drive this grand old man, the right hon. leader of the Government, out of power. Will they do it? No. The people of this country have pronounced that his policy and that of those who sustain him in the Ministry is correct, and they are not going to be misled by those hon. gentlemen or the people who support them at the polls. While I am on my feet, I would like to refer to something else. I have been twitted, and the members on this side of the House have been twitted about our servile following of that right hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). We have consciences as well as they have. We believe that they follow their leader for just and good reasons; why will they not give us the same credit? We believe that of them; why do they not believe it of us?

Mr. RYKERT. They have no leader.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). I would not be so unkind as to say they have no leader. We have been twitted by the hon. member for Northumberland down by the sea (Mr. Mitchell) about our servility to the right hon. gentleman. It comes very ill for that hon. gentleman to refer to our servile

following, because there was not a more servile follower than that hon. gentleman when he was a member of the Government. If it suited him at that time to support the Government, it suits us now—

Mr. MITCHELL. I should ask forgiveness for it if I ever was or ever will be a servile follower of the leader of the Government.

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil). I thank the House for the patient hearing they have given me. When those hon. gentlemen go to the country, the people will be satisfied that they have no case, and will pronounce accordingly.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. In rising to address the House, I feel that it is a difficult matter at this stage of the debate, after hearing the speeches of hon. gentlemen for fourteen or fifteen days, to offer anything new on the subject which is under discussion, but I cannot refrain from making a few remarks with regard to this important question. I have the honor to represent one of the most important agricultural constituencies in the Province of Ontario, and I may say here that the gentlemen who sent me here to represent them have had this question under discussion for a considerable period of time. They have discussed it in their Farmers' Institutes during the last year and a half, and I believe that the vast majority of the electors in that riding, both Conservatives and Reformers, are in favor of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. Sir, this is not a new question, as has been said by some hon. gentlemen. This question was promulgated to the people by the First Minister when he moved his celebrated National Policy resolution, as leader of the Opposition in this House, in 1878. He then declared that he was in favor of a National Policy, because it would lead up to reciprocity with the United States. I am not going to quote that resolution; I do not wish to go over any ground which has already been taken by previous speakers, but it is necessary to refer to some things in order that I may be able to form a basis for my argument. This question was not only promulgated by the First Minister in that resolution, but in his speeches all through Canada at that time, he declared that it was in the interests of the farmers of this country that he was propounding this National Policy doctrine. I will just give you one or two quotations, which have not already been given to the House. In his speech delivered at Hamilton, which was reported in the *Toronto Mail* of 22nd October, 1877, after stating that he had endeavored to get a renewal of the reciprocity treaty in 1871, he declared:

"There was no use trying to induce the American Government to have reciprocity with us, either as regards our agricultural products or our manufactures, or the products of our mines."

I want the members of this House to bear in mind these words, "either as regards our agricultural products or our manufactures, or the products of our mines." He further said:

"I want Canadians to say to the Americans: We will have free trade, fair trade, or reciprocal trade, if you like; but if you will not have any of these, we will have reciprocity of tariffs."

This shows that the hon. leader of the Government was then not only in favor of reciprocity in natural products, but he was in favor of reciprocity in manufactured articles, and this is a point to which I wish particularly to call the attention of the House. Then we have the utterances of the present Finance Minister, who, at a public meeting at North Sydney, as reported in the *Halifax Evening Reporter* of 29th July, 1878, said:

"Well, gentlemen, we have other interests in addition to the agricultural, but we will take the agricultural interest of Nova Scotia alone, and see the advantage it must derive from the carrying out of our National Policy. What was the consequence when we had a free market in the United States for the potatoes and coarse grains of Nova Scotia? The consequence was that that section of our country was made rich by exporting potatoes to the United States, while the result of the 15 cent duty on every bushel of potatoes was that the profit that used to

Mr. WILSON (Argenteuil).

go to the men who exported them was absorbed by the duty, and our farmers were cut off from the market. I say, therefore, that the agricultural industries of Nova Scotia, if they are ever to get reciprocity, must get it and can only get it through the adoption of the National Policy of the Liberal Conservative Party."

And farther on in the same speech, the Finance Minister said:

"We must adopt the policy of fostering and encouraging Canadian industries—of giving employment to our own people. Then, at no distant day, I believe within three years, the United States would receive any proposal from us, for reciprocal trade, with open arms."

These, Sir, are the declarations which were made by the First Minister and by the Finance Minister in addressing the electors of Canada, after they had propounded their National Policy resolution and went to the country. The promises that were made in those declarations were to the effect that the farmers of this country were to be benefited by the introduction of this National Policy. It was to the interests of the farmers that they were looking, and they promised the farmers that within three years after the introduction of their National Policy, we would have reciprocal trade relations with the United States. Now, I do not intend to refer to the change that has taken place in the views of members of the Government within the last few days. It was shown clearly here the other day that the Ministry have changed their opinions very suddenly, that they have yielded to the views of members on this side of the House, that it is desirable in the interests of the farmers of this country that the markets of the United States should be open to them, and they have issued an Order in Council making free a large number of the natural products of the farm and the nursery, in response to the action of the United States Government. Now, to show that the First Minister was not consistent, I will quote a short extract from the *Montreal Gazette*, the official organ of the Government, to show in what light this matter was viewed at the time the statements were made in answer to the question put by my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) in regard to this matter. Here is what the *Gazette* said:

"Has the spirit of manhood deserted the Canadian people? Are we such cravens, so lost to every instinct of national honor and self-dependence, that we must lick the dust before the United States and tamely submit to every indignity that they put upon us? Is every roaring demagogue in public position in the neighboring Republic, to interpret the laws of Canada to the detriment of this country, and is our Parliament cringing and fawningly to acquiesce? Truly it would seem so, in the opinion of the miserable pessimists who direct the fallen fortunes of a once great and respected party in Canada."

This was the opinion of the *Gazette* last week, but a change has come over the spirit of the dream which they then had that the Government was going to stick by the National Policy in its integrity. An hon. member near me says that they have licked the dust. They have swallowed themselves, I may say, in this matter. Well, the agriculturists of the Dominion of Canada were induced to support the National Policy in 1879, and later on by the promises which were made to them that it would procure for them reciprocal trade relations with the United States. But that promise, like many other declarations which have been made by the First Minister of the Crown in campaigns in Canada, when he sought to secure the support of the electorate, in favor of himself and his Government, was not fulfilled. I will not refer to any of those promises which were not fulfilled, because I do not desire to trespass any longer than necessary on the good nature of the House. Then, to complete the web which these gentlemen have woven around themselves, it is necessary to refer to the negotiations which took place between the Finance Minister at Washington and Mr. Bayard. I will not quote the passages which passed between them, you have all heard them quoted. You know that the Finance Minister declared that he was in favor of extended commercial relations with the United States; you know that that offer

was met by Mr. Bayard with a similar declaration that he was in favor of similar treatment towards Canada. In this matter we have two of the leading men of Canada and the United States proclaiming themselves in favor of reciprocity, not to say anything of the declaration which was made by the hon. Minister of the Interior and by the senior member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown), which was quoted by my hon. friend from South Brant, when, at a trade meeting in the city of Toronto, they declared that it was in the interest of the people of Canada that they should have extended trade relations. Now we have a marked contrast in this House to this state of affairs. We find the Government opposing the very principles which they themselves advocated in 1878, and which they declared they were in favor of by placing the clause to which I have referred in the Statute-book, which was intended to meet any advance on the part of the Americans in the direction of reciprocal trade; and we find them now opposing this resolution which has been moved by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) with a distinct declaration that they are going to stand by the National Policy in its integrity. Well, Sir, they did stand by that for about four or five days, but they have dropped some of the links out of the chain, and I hope in the interests of the general community they will see they are in error and will still further advance in promoting the interests of the people.

Mr. MITCHELL. They were led to do it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They were led to do it. It is well they do something which they are told to do. We have told them on this side of the House to do many things, but they have not done them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You forget disallowance.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It would be utterly absurd to attempt to follow the declarations made by the supporters of the Government. One hon. gentleman tells us that the adoption of the resolution would mean ruin to the farmers, another tells us he is in favor of reciprocal trade relations, another tells us that he is in favor of the coasting trade amendment moved by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), but he tells us at the same time he is not going to vote for it; and then we have the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) last night quoting prices on the other side to show that if we had extended trade relations the Americans would send in their produce here and compete with our farmers in the home market and lower the prices. And then we had the hon. member for Queen's, N.S. (Mr. Freeman) declaring in his eloquent tones that this country would refuse to adopt this policy because we would have 5,000,000 live Yankees over here in a very short time, and that at the next general election we would be swamped and the country would be eaten up by the United States and become a portion of the great republic. Why, the arguments which have been advanced by those hon. gentlemen do not hold together. The last speaker, the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson) said we were not united on this side of the House. I say that we are united; that we stand to-day a united party, seeking to advance the best interests of the great mass of the people of Canada. If there is any disunion or disorganisation on this question, it is to be found on that side of the House, and not on this, because no two hon. gentlemen opposite have expressed the same opinions in dealing with this question. I might just say before I pass along that the arguments that were used by the last speaker were just about as thin as the 35 per cent. toilet paper which he manufactures. Such arguments were to be expected from a manufacturer, a man who is directly interested in sustaining this National Policy, because some of the manufacturers believe they would be

ruined if they were made to stand on their own legs and fight for their living with others like British subjects, and compete in the markets of the world—this gentleman is a fair specimen of the class that he referred to, the bloated monopolists—I quote his own words. 35 per cent. is the protection he receives. Any arguments which he has advanced are not worthy of very much attention; at all events, I have no time to pay much attention to them. Then the opponents of this resolution declare that this is an inopportune time to consider the question. I claim that no more opportune time could be found for its consideration. When the United States have an overflowing treasury, when all classes of the people across the lines are agitating for a reduction in the tariff, when the Mill's Bill is before the Senate, providing, as it does, for a reduction of \$55,000,000 in the customs revenue, when the leading men of both great political parties are declaring in favor of sweeping reductions in the tariff, when Mr. Butterworth and Mr. Hitt are loudly declaring in favor of reciprocity with Canada, when it is understood that President Cleveland's Cabinet are unanimously in favor of a measure providing for reciprocity with Canada—I say that these facts prove conclusively that no more opportune time could be had for the discussion of this great question in the Canadian Parliament than at the present time. The facts are all against the assumption of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is clearly the desire of the American people to extend their trade relations with Canada at the present time, and it ought to be the desire of the Canadian people to seek further trade relations with their neighbors across the border. I see I have a note here that I should refer to the First Minister's barley story; but it has already been referred to by previous speakers and I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything further about it. Without reading the story in full I may say that the First Minister declared that a man who had a farm on the border, a hundred acres on each side of the line, yielding a thousand bushels of barley on one side and a thousand on the other, got eighty-five cents for the Canadian barley, while he received one hundred cents for the American barley, leaving fifteen cents a bushel in favor of the product on the American side.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. If hon. gentlemen say "no" I will read the story.

An hon. MEMBER. Where is it?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is in the *Mail*, at that time a good Tory organ, and it also appeared in the *Hansard*. The story is this:

"Take the case of barley. There was a duty of fifteen cents a bushel on all barley going into the United States. The instance had been given often before, but he would take the liberty of giving it again for the purpose of illustration. In the Eastern Townships there was no lake or river to divide Canada from the United States. The country was all one, and there was but an imaginary boundary, except where it was staked out by stones to show where the line was. The consequence was that many Americans and Canadians held lands in both countries. Suppose a farmer had a hundred acres in both the United States and Canada and he raised, say a thousand bushels on each hundred acres (as everybody knew, the market for our barley was in the United States) and suppose that the farmer took his two thousand bushels to the first brewer in the first town in the United States. He would get, say, \$1 a bushel and he (Sir John) wished he could get that much now for each of his two thousand bushels, whether grown in Canada or the United States. The brewer would pay no more for the Canadian than for the American barley, but when the farmer came to count his money he would find that for the 1,000 bushels grown in the United States he had got 100 cents a bushel, while for the 1,000 grown in Canada, he had got 100 cents, less 15 cents which he had paid as duty. In fact he would only get 85 cents for his Canadian barley, while he would get \$1 for his American barley. Now, who paid the duty?"

I hope the hon. gentleman is satisfied with the authority I have given him, and I may say that the farmers themselves have been agitating in favor of this question. No less than forty farmers' institutes have already declared in favor of

reciprocity with the United States, and why should not the farmers of this country declare themselves in favor of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States? We know—every man in this House knows—that the farmers have not been prosperous for some years past, and we know that they have not been able to obtain the natural markets that they ought to have in their possession, for their products. I will simply refer to Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. Every man in this House knows that the natural market for the produce of the farm in those Provinces is in the United States and the same may be said of a large portion of the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec. In fact of the whole tract of country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, I say, that it is desirable that the producer and the consumer, as has been argued here, should be brought more closely together. I will not refer to the exodus to the United States. That has been touched upon a good deal, and I do not wish to deal any more with that question. I know that it is a sore point with gentlemen who occupy seats on the other side of the House. They cannot deny the truth of the statement, Sir, that to-day nearly one million of the people of this country have gone to find homes for themselves in the United States, and I claim, Sir—although they may hold a different view—that the National Policy has driven hundreds and thousands of our best sons from their native soil to find homes in other lands. It is the National Policy that has done this, together with the policy which has been pursued in other directions by the hon. gentlemen who have occupied the Treasury benches for the past eight years. I propose to show how the mass of the people since 1873 have been made to pay for the enrichment of the special class which was referred to by my friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson). I propose to show how the manufacturers have been built up, and combres fostered and nurtured, by this Government in order to rob the great body of the people. Take the latest statistical information that we have at hand, with respect to the Canadian people, and we find there are in Canada :

Employees of general Government.....	4,519
Employees of municipal government, including police.....	2,071
Militia officials.....	123
Clergymen and others ministering to religion.....	11,959
Lawyers, judges, court officers and students.....	7,370
Physicians, druggists, &c.....	7,757
Engaged in art and literary pursuits.....	601
Architects, surveyors and professional men.....	7,467
Teachers.....	19,232
Musicians.....	479
Merchants.....	17,349
Commercial employes.....	32,588
Auctioneers, brokers, &c.....	5,003
Bankers and money brokers.....	1,257
Railway, telegraph and express employes.....	10,715
Messengers and porters.....	1,376
Engaged in lumbering, including mill hands.....	12,567
Engaged in navigation, ship and boat-building.....	24,451
Fishermen.....	22,905
Persons engaged in books.....	6,408
do musical employments, engraving, &c.....	683
do watch and jewellery business.....	2,184
do carriage, harness and implement business.....	10,323
do houses, buildings and building materials.....	15,002
do furniture and decorating.....	5,212
do food.....	20,269
do liquor business, including hotel-keepers.....	9,623
do stone, glass, &c.....	8,957
do dress, clothing, &c.....	46,453
do livery, stage, teaming, &c.....	10,376
do mining.....	6,541
do metals other than gold and silver.....	5,895
Boot and shoemakers.....	17,423
Engaged in other industries.....	23,183
Engaged in domestic operations.....	63,431
Dealers, traders and shop-keepers.....	9,863
Contractors.....	1,317
Hunters.....	5,595
Laborers.....	165,745
Military pensioners.....	301
Of independent means.....	11,140
In undefined occupations.....	12,056
Occupations not stated.....	205,228

MR. SOMERVILLE.

Artisans and mechanics.....	76,418
Factory operatives.....	5,649
Farmers.....	657,287
Total.....	1,593,450

But, Mr. Speaker, this does not give the employment of the whole of our population. As a set off to those engaged in the great struggle for existence in this overtaxed country of ours, we have 2,390 manufacturers. Two thousand three hundred and ninety the sum total according to the official information furnished to this House and to the people of this country by the Government of the day. Now, Sir, this Government have allowed those 2,390 manufacturers to bleed 1,593,450 of their fellow-men, and by virtue of the National Policy to promote their own aggrandisement. It may be said, it is true, there are others interested in those manufacturing pursuits. I grant it, Sir, that there are a large number of people employed in those pursuits, but I am prepared to show that the mechanics and the operatives and the general public whom I have enumerated in the list which I have given are not interested and are not benefited by the National Policy. I propose to prove by one of the blue books of the Government that this National Policy has not increased the wages of the people of this country, and that not only has it not increased the wages of the people of this country, but that it has been the means of reducing the purchasing power of the wages that the mechanics and operatives of the country derive from their employment in the factories established by those 2,390 manufacturers I have referred to. I may say, Sir, that protection does not and cannot protect the working-man, and this is an admitted fact all the world over. You can protect the manufacturers, but you cannot protect the laborer, the mechanic, or the operatives employed in those manufacturing establishments, and the experience of the world proves that the mechanics and workmen obtain the highest rate of wages in the countries where the lowest tariff is in force. Just the other day there appeared an article which gave information by the eminent statistician Mulhall, of the rise in wages in Europe and in the United States. Mulhall says :

"That the rise in wages in all Europe since 1856 has been from 40 to 50 per cent., and in the United States 44 per cent. Meanwhile prices of necessaries have fallen an average of 10 per cent. The wages of a day laborer have risen in England from 32 cents in 1835 to 56 cents in 1884; in France, in the same time, from 30 to 50 cents; in Germany, from 16 to 36 cents; in Russia, 12 to 24 cents; in Belgium and Holland (free trade countries), from 19 to 40 cents; in Italy, from 10 to 24 cents; in Austria, from 20 to 40 cents. The wages of artisans in England have risen from a little over 82 cents a day in 1840 to \$1.26 in 1884, and in France from 50 cents in 1850 to 70 cents in 1880. In the United States the average earnings of operatives have risen from 80 and 96 cents a day in 1860 to \$1.14 a day in 1880."

If further proof of this statement is required, I will quote from the last report of the Commissioner of Industrial and Labor Statistics of the State of Maine, which shows that the wages paid in free trade England are higher than the wages paid in protectionist Germany. I will give the wages per week :

	England.	Germany.
Bricklayers.....	\$7 56	\$4 21
Masons.....	7 68	4 07
Plasterers.....	7 80	4 43
Carpenters.....	7 66	4 11
Blacksmiths.....	7 37	4 00
Cabinet makers.....	7 68	4 25
Cigar makers.....	6 07	3 68
Coopers.....	7 50	3 97
Laborers.....	4 70	3 11
Saddle and harness makers.....	6 63	3 98
Tinsmiths.....	6 56	3 55

So much for general principles; now for the application to Canada. I want to show that protection has not increased wages or protected the workingmen. I will quote from a blue book published by the Dominion Government, being a report relative to the manufacturing industries in

existence in Canada. By that report I find that in the manufacturing industries of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, in 1878, there were 18,059 hands employed, who earned yearly average wages of \$366.82, while in 1884 the hands employed in those Provinces numbered 26,275, and their average yearly wages had run down to \$333.42, a reduction of \$33.40 a year on every hand employed in those industries. Now, I would like some hon. gentleman on the other side of the House to show in what way the condition of the workmen has been improved by the National Policy in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. I have proven out of their own blue book that the wages of the workmen in those Provinces have been reduced \$33.40, while the purchasing capacity of their wages has at the same time been reduced to an enormous extent in consequence of the high tariff which has been built up around this country. I am sorry to see that the same care to furnish definite information was not exhibited by the commissioners appointed by the Government to report on the industries of Ontario. I suppose they discovered that it would not pay to let the people of this country know that the workmen were not prospering under the great National Policy which hon. gentlemen opposite professed to establish for their special benefit. But I have proof to furnish of which I am personally cognisant. I reside close to the borders of one of the largest manufacturing towns in Ontario, and I know something of the state of affairs which has existed there since the introduction of the National Policy. I will take one industry to show you that the statement I have made with regard to the Maritime Provinces will equally apply to the Province of Ontario. In 1878 we had in the town of Dundas one of the most prosperous and flourishing cotton mills in the Dominion. At that time, prior to the introduction of the National Policy, that mill had orders ahead for six months. Its employees were working full time, and making large wages. But what a change has come over that mill, and the fortunes of those employees since the introduction of the National Policy. Why, Sir, I almost fear to tell this House and this country of the way in which those men have been treated. Since the introduction of the National Policy their wages have been reduced from 25 to 35 per cent. in every department of that mill and they have been idle for weeks and months—nearly one whole summer. They had no other means of living and dared not go away from the town for fear they could not get employment, and they were obliged to remain there idle, in one season alone for sixteen weeks. The weavers, in 1878, could make from \$7 to \$8 a week; now they have had hard scraping to make \$5 a week. The spinners used to make from \$9 to \$12 a week; now, the average is about a dollar a day. And that is not all; for I had a letter from home this week, which states that the hands in that mill were notified on Monday last that if they did not submit to a further reduction of 10 per cent. in their wages all round, the mill would be closed up. This is proof that the National Policy has not been in the interest of the people of this country. It may have been in the interest of a few favored manufacturers, but I declare that the great mass of the people of this country have been taxed for the sustenance and support of those men who now claim that they are unable to compete in the fair markets of the world after having been nursed and spoon-fed by this Government for the last ten years. I say it is not creditable to the manufacturers of this country that they should set up any such plea on their own behalf. While on this point I may be pardoned if I refer to the speech that was delivered in this House by the senior member for Hamilton (Mr. Brown). I am sorry he is not in his place, but I suppose he will have an opportunity of reading what I say. It was stated by an hon. member in this House while I was absent that that hon. gentleman was at one time a Reform-

er, and I understand that he indignantly protested that he had always been a blue-blooded Tory. I am sorry to have to inform this House that I am in possession of information which does not accord with the hon. gentleman's statement. I happened to be one of a deputation from North Wentworth which, in 1865, waited upon that gentleman, who was then a good Reformer, to ask him to run in the interests of the Reform party in that riding. I do not think his wisdom has increased with his years, for now, instead of being an honest, live Reformer, we find him supporting a Government which is the most corrupt—they will excuse me for using this expression—I do not wish to transgress the parliamentary rules this time—but I say he is supporting the most corrupt Government we have ever had in the Dominion of Canada; a Government that has debauched the people from one end of this Dominion to the other; a Government which has purchased them with their own money; a Government which has bribed them with subsidies and railway bonuses and post offices; a Government whose mismanagement and neglect brought on a rebellion in the North-West and caused the loss of from \$7,000,000 to \$8,000,000 to the people of this country, and a sacrifice of the blood of some of the best sons of this Dominion; a Government which is afraid to face the people fairly and squarely; a Government which has never gone to the country on its merit; a Government which, in order to retain power and office, placed upon the Statute-book the most infamous measure that ever disgraced the statutes of this country—the Gerrymander Act; a Government which, during the last election, was afraid to go to the people without passing a Franchise Bill, by which they hoped to obtain a majority that would enable them to rule longer in this country. I can remember, as I said before, when this same senior member for Hamilton belonged to the great Liberal party, and I only regret that he has gone over to the enemies of his country. I regret he is not the true man he was some years ago; but still I will be candid enough to admit that the senior member for Hamilton is probably the most popular man in the city of Hamilton—that is, with the senior member for Hamilton. And I will just say to the hon. gentleman that he should be more modest in his demeanor when he addresses this House. He must not imagine that he can overawe an assembly like this with his stately presence and his classic brow; he must remember that when he approaches a subject with his majestic step and impels his giant intellect into the arena of debate, he cannot expect to destroy his opponents and their arguments with the breath of his nostrils and a wave of his great right arm. I say he should be a little more modest in his demeanor, and not imagine he can influence a deliberative assembly like this, as he can a meeting on the Bay front in the city of Hamilton. Where the hon. gentleman is best known, his weight and intellectual power are least valued, and I will give you evidence of this by quoting from the *Hamilton Times* a short article which appeared after the hon. gentleman had delivered his famous speech some days ago. The *Hamilton Times* says:

“Mr. Adam Brown made a speech —”

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think that is hardly in order.

MR. SOMERVILLE. I bow, Sir, to your decision. I thought I was in order in quoting this article, because it shows that the arguments I have been making are true with regard to the industries of the city of Hamilton. It is not an attack on the senior member for Hamilton.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman to propose to read an attack on the senior member for Hamilton.

MR. SOMERVILLE. No, it is with regard to the industries of Hamilton.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is complimentary.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Well, it is partly complimentary. The *Hamilton Times* said:

"Mr. Adam Brown made a speech in Parliament yesterday, in which he took strong ground against unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. What do we want with reciprocity, was the burden of his discourse, when we have Sir John Macdonald and the National Policy? Then he told his old, old story, so familiar to Hamilton audiences, about the hard times and closed factories under Mackenzie and the amazing prosperity under Macdonald. To this he added a statement that the changes in the iron duties had been specially beneficial to that branch of industry. How could you, Adam? Would you kindly name any years during Mr. Mackenzie's term of office, when the foundries of Hamilton were idle for half as many weeks as they have been idle during the last twelve months? Dare you state that the moulders make higher wages now than they made in Mackenzie's time? Are you not aware that a deputation of foundry owners went to Ottawa last session to protest against Tupper's increase of the iron duties? Looking from the particular to the general, can you name, Mr. Brown, any factory failures in Mackenzie's time at all comparable in importance to those of Garrett's boot manufactory, Silver's boot manufactory, the Wilson and the Gardner sewing machine factories, the Canada Clock factory, the Olmstead foundry and the Burn-Robinson manufactory, all of which have taken place under the much-vaunted National Policy and the beneficent régime of Sir John Macdonald whom you worship? Dare you deny, Mr. Brown, that the mercantile failures, both in the wholesale and retail lines, in your own city, have been more numerous and disastrous under the Tilley tariff than under the Cartwright tariff? Are there not more bankrupt stocks now upon the market than at any time when Mr. Mackenzie was in office? Are not many of your fellow-citizens, Mr. Brown, who were rich and independent in Mackenzie's time, now chronically hard up, owing to unremunerative investments in National Policy factories and North-West land speculations fostered by the policy of your dear John A.?"

"Knowing as much as you know, Mr. Brown, about the woes and calamities which the protective tariff and Tory misrule in general have brought upon your constituents, it requires a deal of assurance for you to stand up in Parliament and repeat that old speech."

I fancy that you will agree with me, Sir, that that quotation is perfectly in order, because it substantiates the line of argument which I have been pursuing all through, namely, that the National Policy has not operated to the benefit of the workingmen of this country or of the merchants of this country, or of any class of the community, except a few manufacturers who still believe that they are unable to compete in the foreign markets of the world with those who are opposed to them in the same lines of business. Should the claims of 657,287 farmers for fairplay be ignored for the benefit of 2,390 manufacturers. It is admitted on all hands that reciprocity would benefit the farmers; it is admitted by the First Minister and Finance Minister, and by the Secretary of State, who declared yesterday that it was almost a sin on the part of the Liberals to have taken up this policy. The policy, he said, would be popular all over the Dominion. Yes, the policy is one which the people are going to adopt, and the Government know right well that should this policy be taken up by the Reform party, it will carry them to victory at the next elections. It must be evident to every reasonable mind that where the interests of the great mass of the people are concerned, the great mass of the people would be guilty of great folly if they did not adopt a system with regard to their trade relations with the United States which would be of practical benefit to them. I would like to dwell longer on the case of the farmers, because I represent the farmers almost exclusively, but I will just say this, that it is admitted on all hands unrestricted reciprocity would be a great boon. We know that when we had reciprocity from 1854 to 1866, our trade increased from \$33,000,000 to \$84,000,000 in those years. Take the case of barley alone. Last year we exported 9,447,717 bushels, valued at \$5,245,000; and the farmers of Canada, according to the contention of the First Minister, lost no less than \$943,000 of hard earned money which was extracted out of their pockets by virtue of the tariff imposed on our barley by the United States. This duty we have reason to believe will be removed, if we will approach the United States Government in the spirit which ought to actuate us in dealing with this great question. Then we exported to the States last year 18,225 horses,

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

which were valued at \$2,214,338, and we paid duty on those horses amounting to \$442,000. I will not quote any further items, but in those two items the farmers of Canada lost \$1,385,000 and we have the word of the First Minister of the Crown that this statement is true. With regard to the manufacturers, I will not admit that all the manufacturers are in favor of the continuance of the National Policy. I believe that the National Policy has not been conducive to the best interests of many of the manufacturers of this country, because it must be remembered that the raw material of one manufacturer is not the raw material of another manufacturer, and the manufacturers have been weighted down to an enormous extent by the protective tariff on the raw material. I might give you one instance to substantiate this statement. Last year the Finance Minister brought down his Budget and increased the iron duties to an enormous extent, and we have the evidence which was given before the Combines Committee of this House by Mr. Massey, one of the largest agricultural implement manufacturers in Canada, that the increased iron duties imposed by this Government on his business last year alone amounted to \$30,000. That is to say, he had to pay \$30,000 more on the iron which entered into the manufacture of his reaping and mowing machines than he had in previous years. Who pays for this? There can be no doubt at all that the consumer, that the farmer pays this addition to the burdens which are borne by Mr. Massey.

Mr. GUILLET. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that Mr. Massey stated before the committee that he paid \$30,000 more duty?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. So I understand. I was not present at the Committee, but I was informed by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), who is a member of that Committee, that that was the statement made by Mr. Massey before the Committee. I give my authority, and I think it is a good authority. I do not like to trespass on the time of the House, but I desire to make a statement in regard to the assertion which has been made that, in former times, under a revenue tariff, this country was made a slaughter market for the manufactures of the United States. The facts do not bear that statement out. The results which have been developed under the benign influence of this great panacea that was offered to the country in 1878, which was to cure all the ills of Canada and was to make every man rich within its bounds, show that the Americans still continue to slaughter their goods in the Canadian market, and that they have increased the slaughtering process. Canada has not been kept for the Canadians, as was promised by the First Minister and his supporters in 1878. Canada has, to a large extent, been kept for the people of the United States. I have here a statement of the value of the imports and the duty paid upon them, coming from the United States in 1877 and in 1887, which proves my assertion, and it is as follows:—

Articles.	1877.		1887.	
	Value.	Duty.	Value.	Duty.
Cigars and cigarettes.....	\$126,595	\$ 39,056	\$ 54,859	\$ 48,416
Carriages	91,770	16,060	166,953	57,285
Brooms and brushes.....	22,706	3,973	43,401	10,603
Baking powder and biscuit.....	35,841	6,272	121,551	25,642
Blacking	30,581	5,352	41,928	10,771
China ware and furniture...	276,383	48,373	185,854	65,093
Candles of all kinds	14,474	2,445	14,565	3,820
China and earthenware	49,594	8,749	57,894	17,442
Clocks and parts.....	49,708	8,699	112,880	39,110
Carpets	47,212	8,262	13,222	6,731
Cordage, rope and twine...	94,478	10,759	103,805	22,991
Combs, &c.	19,215	3,359	24,483	6,155
Glass and glassware.....	322,314	56,442	486,758	164,670

Articles.	1877.		1887.	
	Value.	Duty.	Value.	Duty.
Brass and manufactures of.	99,347	16,176	301,488	81,472
Metals and manufactures of	67,449	8,954	238,232	61,431
Agricultural implements...	177,526	30,975	115,826	41,826
Jewellery	129,183	26,610	368,394	73,689
Gold, silver and plated ware	162,324	28,410	139,738	42,150
Pianos, organs, melodeons, &c.	438,113	76,675	308,429	102,499
Paper and manufactures of.	266,073	43,333	713,389	190,535
Rubber and manufactures of	165,392	28,947	563,323	156,923
Ink of all kinds.....	26,040	919	49,090	10,464
Leather and manufactures of.....	720,466	119,409	886,647	174,540
Oil, coal, kerosine, naphtha, petroleum and products of petroleum	205,448	94,784	651,903	381,661

I may remark, by-the bye, that, in the city of Hamilton, which is represented by the hon. gentleman to whom I referred before, after the National Policy was started, they got up a joint stock company to build clocks. They thought, by the extraordinary protection afforded them against the United States, they would be able to build up a first-class paying establishment. What was the history of that establishment? From the day it was commenced, although the parties to it put in all the capital which was necessary to carry it to a successful issue, notwithstanding that they had engaged the best skilled artisans that could be obtained on the American continent, that factory went from bad to worse year after year, until about a year ago it became entirely bankrupt, and I believe the men who invested their money in that enterprise lost every cent that went to make up the capital stock. That is an evidence of the way in which the National Policy has fostered our industries. In regard to this last item of oil, I would advise the First Minister to make a bargain with the manufacturers of petroleum to furnish enough lubricating oil to lubricate up his National Policy, and make it more useful to the people of this country than it has been during the last ten years. Now, it is claimed that our infant manufacturers are not able to stand alone, that they ought to be spoon-fed at the expense of the great mass of the people of this country. I do not think that it is a creditable position, as has already been remarked, for any of these manufacturers to take, and I am glad to say that there are scores and hundreds of manufacturers, possessed of sufficient enterprise, and capital, and energy, and perseverance, and ability to compete in the fair markets of the world with their opponents, men of business, who are not afraid to enter into competition with their opponents. The National Policy is not conducive to the carrying on of trade with foreign countries, because we know that the United States, under their protective tariff, have ruined the shipping of that country, and have destroyed their intercourse with other nations. But even against that assumption that high protective duties are not conducive to trade with other countries, we find that there is one Canadian manufacturer who is opening a market for himself in foreign countries. I will read an extract from the Brantford *Expositor* of 17th March, in regard to a cotton mill that has been established there for some years :

"For over four years the Craven cotton mill, like every other cotton mill in Canada, has not run near its full capacity—"

There is the same old story again ;

— "on account of the producing having got so far ahead of the consuming power of the country. This has been a great loss to stockholders and work people. We are glad to say that the future prospects of the cotton industry are much brighter, owing to the opening out of new markets

which will take all the surplus production of the mills in Canada. Mr. Slater having sold through a New York house 500 bales of cotton sheetings to be shipped direct from Brantford to Shanghai, China, the Craven Mill will start full blast on Monday next, as they have to commence delivery of these goods in April. The Hochelaga mills, Montreal, and Kingston cotton mills have also taken large orders for the same market."

Now, this shows that the Canadian manufacturer can compete, dares to compete, with his opponents in the markets of the world. This shows that even in New York, the commercial metropolis of the United States, a business man was found who was desirous of purchasing Canadian cottons in preference to Yankee made goods. He gave the preference to Canadian cotton, because, I suppose, it was a better quality of goods, and because it could be manufactured at less cost than he could get it at home; and this is a fair sample of what the manufacturers of this country could do if they would stand up like men, like British men, who are prepared to say that they will face the world in fair competition, and ask no favor in a fair field. Now, Sir, I contend that protection has not even benefited the manufacturers. It has created a desire to become rich, as the leader of the Government said he was going to make the people rich in 1878; he was going to make every man in the country rich. I tell you, Sir, that if there is one man in the Dominion of Canada who is an adept at humbugging the people it is the talented leader of the Government at the present time. He knows how to do it. He has set a brilliant example to the politicians of this country; he has shown them how to manipulate the voters of this country for his own interest. He told them that he was going to make them all rich, and a desire to make themselves rich caused the people of this country to make over-investments in every line of manufactures, and it brought about the natural result of combinations, and we find that almost every manufacturing industry in this country is a party to a combine of one kind or another, to keep up the prices and restrict production; and if they restrict production, then to reduce the value of the labor of the employes in their manufactories, to make the workman poor at the expense of the rich. I contend, Sir, that I have proven beyond a doubt that the National Policy has not been a benefit to the people of this country. Then, as to the general principle of protection. There was an admirable exposition given of the principles of protection by Mr. Everett P. Wheeler, at Tremont Temple, Boston, the other day. I shall trespass on the good nature of the House so far as to read a short extract from it, as in it is embodied the true character of protection, and it shows to the people the absurdity of any action attempting to build up the prosperity of a nation by means of a protective tariff. Mr. Wheeler said :

"The monstrous absurdity of the protective system is simply this: That it really asserts that scarcity is better than abundance; that it is an injury to you to trade with other countries; that the benefits which flow from the free exchange of merchandise with Pennsylvania and Illinois would not flow from the exchange of commodities with England and with France. Who can tell me why it is not as good for a man who earns his living in Massachusetts to be able to buy English goods or French goods, if he likes, and to be able in return to sell American goods to the people of France or England if he likes? If we trade with them it is because they have goods that we want and we have goods that they want, and thus the trade is a benefit to us both. The protectionists themselves admit that trade with foreign countries is a benefit to America. For they deplore the decay of American shipping, and are proposing to give a bounty to American ships for carrying the products of other countries to this country, and for taking ours back in return. What monstrous inconsistency! They enact a high tariff, far in excess of the needs of revenue, not for the purpose of taxation, but for the purpose of excluding the goods of other countries; and then, having crippled commerce with one hand, they propose to nurse it with the other."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a good exemplification of the result of the operation of protection. I might just say here, in passing, that if it is not good for us to trade with the Americans and to deal with our neighbors, what sense is there in the Government appointing a commissioner, with a view to establish-

ing trade with the West Indies and the Argentine Republic? I think it may not be out of place to say that the gentleman entrusted with this mission is a hanger-on of the Government; he wanted something, and he has got it. I understand he has gone down to the Argentine Republic on a pleasure trip. I fancy his labors there will be just as productive to the people of this country as the results of similar missions in former times. And the loyalty cry comes in here. I am afraid to touch it, for I generally get out of order when I speak of loyalty. They say it is not loyal to trade with the United States and have a tariff against Great Britain. Yet these same men have had a higher tariff against Great Britain, at least they have levied a larger amount of duties on the goods coming in from Great Britain than on the goods coming in from the United States under the present tariff. Here are the figures:

Total imports from Great Britain in 1887...	\$14,962,233
Duty collected on same.....	9,318,920
Average rate of duty.....	20.7
Total imports from the United States in 1887	\$45,107,036
Duty collected on same.....	7,299,591
Average rate of duty.....	16.3

They do not wish to discriminate against English manufactures—it would be disloyal for the people of this country to favor our neighbors across the line; and yet, while they have the hardihood to make such a statement, they have been discriminating against Great Britain all the time by this tariff which they have built up to protect the manufacturers of this country. It is claimed that a high protective tariff is in favor of the workingman, and that he does not pay the taxes. I desire to show by facts taken from the blue-books that the large proportion of taxes levied in this country is paid by the workingman. I find that on baking powder imported last year there was a duty paid of \$20,628. A poor man has to use baking powder, he cannot have salt-raised bread all the time, and he must have something to puff up his pastry just as much as the bloated bondholders to whom the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson) referred, or even a manufacturer. On blacking and shoemakers' ink, \$13,822. A workingman must have his shoes blacked as well as the aristocrat. Then there are Bibles and prayer books, \$132,403. Hon. gentlemen opposite have even to tax Bibles and prayer books, which are intended to make the people of this country religious. Then there is laundry blue, \$8,683. A poor man cannot even have a starched shirt without paying an amount into the treasury. Boot and stay laces, &c., \$40,524. Why, the ladies cannot even have their stays laced without paying duty. Breadstuffs, \$4,450. Carpets, \$322,681. I suppose a workingman is allowed to have a carpet in his best room, but he has to contribute to the revenue for that article. Clocks and springs, \$46,814. I call the attention of the House to this fact, that workingmen have more need of clocks than rich people. A workingman has to rise at a certain hour in the morning, and where I live when the hands go down to the cotton factory—when it is at work and when it is running full time—they go down early in the morning and they are obliged to have alarm clocks. Cottons, \$1,389,349. Coal and coke, \$1,178,964. Collars, cuffs and shirt fronts, \$37,574. I suppose the shirt fronts are used by workingmen—gentlemen have full shirts. Coffee, \$13,163. Drags, dyes and medicines, \$330,365. Why, a workingman cannot even get sick without having to pay duty. Earthenware and china, \$226,685. Fish, \$86,038. Fruit and nuts, \$156,679. Gloves and mits of all kinds, \$124,326. Hat boxes and bonnets, \$322,908. Leather and manufactures of, exclusive of gloves and mits, \$345,849. Coal oil and kerosene products, \$343,944. Paper and manufactures, \$315,019. Plants and trees, \$18,882. By the way the Government have taken the duties off trees, under pressure. Butter, cheese, lard and meats, \$267,852. I thought they were going to keep

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

our markets for the Canadian farmer. Salt, \$12,655. Seeds and roots, \$60,052. That is taken off too. Soap, \$36,414. Why, a workingman cannot even wash his face and keep himself clean without paying an enormous duty to keep up the extravagance of the Government. Spices, \$37,000. Sugar, \$3,167,528. That is to keep up those bloated monopolists—I make this as a quotation, and I do not think I am out of order—who in a few years can make sufficient fortune to go to the old country and buy a castle and palatial residence and immense grounds, and live there at the expense of the people of this country, live there out of the riches they have heaped up for themselves here and which they have dragged out of the pockets of the hard-working tax-payers of Canada. Molasses, \$92,516. Workingmen cannot even have molasses without paying an enormous duty. I find also that the workingman cannot smoke the pipe of peace with those manufacturers for whom he slaves day in and day out, in order to enrich them, without paying an enormous duty. No less than \$305,515 duty was paid on tobacco. And then we have vegetables, \$46,178. We have wood and its manufactures, \$314,098; watches, \$99,439; and woollen manufactures, \$2,373,240. These and many other items, which I will not quote, show who pays the taxes. It is all nonsense for hon. gentlemen on the other side to get up and tell the workmen, the farmers, the mechanics and the operatives of this country that they do not pay the taxes. They do pay the taxes, and they are bled every day of their lives, in order to uphold this Government and in order to uphold the manufacturers in this country. Now, I do not wish to talk on the loyalty question, as I said before. You know that Artemus Ward once said "that a man must be a mighty limited cuss if he couldn't build himself up without pulling his neighbor down." Now I do not apply that to the gentlemen on the other side, but I say there are gentlemen on that side who are mighty limited, and I think that is enough for me to say. I would just conclude by saying, Sir, that I purpose voting for this resolution, and it affords me great pleasure to say that I am in favor of the adoption by this House and by the people of the country of the resolution which has been introduced by my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am also in favor of the amendment which is proposed to be added thereto in favor of the encouragement of the coasting trade of the Canadian people. I think, Sir, it would be a grand thing for this Canada of ours, a country which every Canadian has a right to be proud of, a country which we cannot boast too much of with regard to its extent, its resources, its capacity and its wealth. I say, Sir, as Canadians we have a right to be proud of our country. I am proud of my country, but I am not proud of the gentlemen who govern the country, and I hope to live to see the day when we shall have, directing the affairs of this country, men who will conserve the interest of the people more closely than the gentlemen who occupy the Treasury benches have conserved their interests since they introduced the National Policy. I have great pleasure in saying that I vote for this resolution, because I think that it is in the interests of the great mass of the people of this country. I wish to oppose every legislation that is in favor of a special class. Class legislation ought to be a thing of the past, and it ought to be the duty of this Government as well as of the Government of every free and enlightened country on the face of the globe, to legislate in the interests of the great mass of the people—and not to legislate for 2,390 manufacturers at the expense of the millions of people in this country who are taxed for their benefit. I therefore say, Sir, that I have great pleasure in voting for the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright).

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Mr. Speaker, I am sure, Sir, you will be glad to know, and the House will be pleased to

learn, that I do not intend to occupy your time at any considerable length. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down must, I think, have imagined that he was addressing a meeting in his own constituency from some public platform where he desired to make an impression against the Government of the day, and in support of the party with which he is connected. That hon. gentleman, upon the present occasion, has endeavored to show, as hon. gentlemen upon that side of the House have, during the nine years since the present Administration came into power, endeavored to show the reasons for the support given by the people of this country to the hon. gentleman who leads the Government on this side of the House. He has endeavored, as they have endeavored, both in this House and out of it, to account for the support given to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and against those on the other side of the House. They have tried to explain this by every reason except the true one. They endeavored to account for it as this hon. gentleman did to-night, upon the ground that the leader of the Government had corrupted the people, upon the ground that the Government of the country was corrupt, and upon every possible ground except the true one, which is that the people are in favor of the Conservative party and against the Liberal party in Canada. Why, Sir, are they in favor of the Conservative party and opposed to the Liberal party? Is it because that the Liberal party during the time they were in office from 1874 to 1878 governed the country in the interests of the people of Canada? Is it not rather to be conceived that it is because the people of Canada have judged the two parties by their records? Judging the party upon the opposite side of the House by their record during the time they were in office, from 1874 to 1878, and judging the Conservative party by their record during the long series of years which they have governed this country, the people have come to the conclusion that, in the interests of the people of Canada, the Conservative party should be retained in power and that those hon. gentlemen should be kept in the place they at present occupy. The gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, since the present Administration returned to office in 1879, have been endeavoring to discover some policy that would make them acceptable to the people of Canada. They have devoted themselves during those years to a very great extent to decrying their opponents, and finding after the two elections, in 1882 and 1887, that the mere detraction of their opponents did not succeed in bringing them the support of the people, they are endeavoring now to bring forward some policy that, from their point of view, will be instrumental in relegating them to the Treasury benches. Sir, I do not think that I would have addressed the House upon this occasion, even the few words I propose to offer for your consideration, but for the fact that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) who introduced this resolution based it upon the ground that certain classes of the people in this country were suffering under the present and existing state of things. He laid great stress upon the fact that the farmers of this country and the lumbermen, and the miners, and the artisans were suffering, and that it was necessary to provide some remedy for the great evil under which the country was groaning at the present time. I, Sir, represent a constituency in which the people are interested in the successful prosecution of two of those industries, farming and lumbering, and I think I shall give good reasons why I shall vote against the resolution proposed by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I do not propose to offer for the consideration of this House any long array of figures. We have had since the commencement of this discussion long arrays of figures presented to this House, and we have had those figures brought up in battalions, and in squadrons, and in companies. They have been hurled from one side of the House to the other

against an innocent and unoffending House of Commons. I shall therefore, to-night, not use any more figures than I consider necessary (and that will be very few indeed) for the purpose of illustrating the few arguments which I propose to present for your consideration. Let me say also, Mr. Speaker, that, in my opinion, there is not the greatest possible reliance to be placed upon the statistics that are quoted in Parliament and out of it. Especially let me say that from my observation I am convinced that the statistics which are furnished by Mr. Blue, the statistician of the Province of Ontario, are not wholly and entirely reliable. I say that, Sir, because I believe that the conditions which prevail in my own constituency must prevail to a very great extent throughout at least the whole Province of Ontario; and when I find it stated, as it has been stated during the progress of this discussion, that the value of farm lands in the Province of Ontario, according to Mr. Blue, rose from \$10.02 an acre in 1873 to \$18.14 in 1878, an advance of \$8.12 during those five years, and that the same farm lands only increased from \$18.14 in 1878 to \$19.71 in 1885, I am convinced from facts which have come under my own observation that those statements cannot be correct. I know, as a matter of fact, that farm lands in my own county from 1873 to 1878 materially decreased in value, and that it was almost impossible in 1878 to dispose of a farm at all, or if any were sold they could only be sold at a ruinous price, while to-day they are worth three or four times what they could be purchased for in 1878. I know, in addition to that, that large sums of money, amounting to tens, and I might say hundreds of thousands of dollars, which were borrowed on mortgages on the lands in my county, have been paid off since this dreaded and detested National Policy has come into force. I know also, for I have the records in my hand, that the assessed value of property in my county rose from \$2,200,000 in 1875 to \$4,515,000 in 1887. Having all these facts before me, as well as those that come under my daily observation, I cannot believe it possible that the farmers of this country are in the dire state of distress which hon. gentlemen declare them to be in. It is because I do not believe they are suffering any such distress that I do not consider it necessary to apply what these gentlemen call this heroic remedy at the present time. I believe the farmers of Canada are capable of holding their own in the race for subsistence which is going on throughout the world. Although I am quite free to admit that the lumbermen of Canada would be benefited to some extent by the entire removal of the duties on lumber, yet, when I look at the records of the prices obtained for timber lands, especially in the Province of Ontario, I am forced to the conclusion that the lumbermen are not suffering to the extent which hon. gentlemen opposite say they are suffering at the present time. I presume that the best test of the condition of our lumber trade during the past fifteen years is the increase or decrease in the value of timber lands. Let me tell you that the lumbermen are not fools; they know pretty well what they are doing, and they are not likely to pay an increased price for timber lands unless they expect to secure a return for what they pay. Let me, then, give you the prices of timber lands, as ascertained by the auction sales that have taken place in the Province of Ontario. During the last fourteen years there have been three large sales of timber lands in that Province. The first took place in 1872, when the average price obtained was \$200 per square mile. Another sale took place in 1881, shortly after the present Government came into power, when the price obtained was \$600 per square mile. In 1886, after this improvident and corrupt Government had been in office for a number of years, the third sale took place, when, notwithstanding the fact that a short time previous the stampage dues were

increased 33½ per cent., and the ground rents were increased 50 per cent., you would hardly believe it, but the price obtained was \$2,957.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very much to Mr. Mowat's credit.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am not aware, Sir, that the fact that lumbermen were able to pay a larger price in 1886 than they were in 1872 is any evidence of great ability on the part of Mr. Mowat. It may be a fact that Mr. Mowat secured those high prices by submitting the lands to public auction; it may be that he is entitled to some credit for that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He got the cash—that is better than the credit.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). He got the cash, that is quite true; but I am sure my hon. friend from South Oxford will agree with me that in the figures I have submitted to the House, and which he will not deny, there is no evidence that the lumbermen are suffering to any great extent. I listened to-day to the hon. member for Bothwell making a statement in regard to the importation of raw material and manufactured goods, and I dare say he thought he was making a great impression on the House when he told us that while he thought it was quite proper from our point of view that a horse should be imported free of duty, we thought it would endanger the constitution if the harness to be used on that horse should be imported free. I am sure my hon. friend must have forgotten the discussions that have taken place with regard to the National Policy in this House during the last ten years, or he would have known that what we contended on this side of the House was that by the adoption of the National Policy we would keep in Canada the manufacture of those articles that were consumed in Canada, and that the wages that would otherwise go to employees in the United States would be paid in Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to say that my point was this: Hon gentlemen on that side of the House say that unrestricted reciprocity would lead to the annexation of Canada to the United States, but they say that reciprocity in natural products would not have that effect; and I was pointing out that while the free admission of a horse from the United States would not injure the constitution, the free admission of harness from the United States would overturn the constitution and put an end to our autonomy.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I would just say, in regard to that, that I am actuated to some considerable extent, I confess quite freely, in regard to the vote I shall give on the question before the House, by what those gentlemen are pleased to call sentiment. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has said that we contend it would endanger the constitution and would make annexation imminent if we were to allow manufactured goods to come to Canada, while the constitution would be in danger if natural products were allowed to come in Canada to free. Let me point out what I conceive to be the distinction between those two things. These hon. gentlemen have told us time and again, during the course of this discussion, that we have already discriminated against Great Britain in our tariff. I say that proposition cannot be sustained. I say that our tariff is the same against Great Britain as against all the other countries in the world. But what do these hon. gentlemen propose now to do? They propose to admit free into Canada from the United States the same class of articles as those on which we charge a duty coming from the mother country. Do we import any horses from the mother country, or any hides? Do we import any natural products from Great Britain? No, it is the manufactured goods of Great Britain that come

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

into this country subject to a duty, which, under this resolution, would not be imposed upon the same goods coming into Canada from a foreign country. It is that which renders it, to my mind, dangerous that we should adopt any such proposition, and which leads me to the conclusion that any policy which would discriminate against the mother country in favor of a foreign country would inevitably lead us to annexation. It is because I believe the inevitable result of the policy the hon. gentleman proposes would be annexation that I am opposed to the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford. Hon. gentlemen opposite have told us, time and again, during this discussion, of their loyalty and attachment to the crown of Great Britain, and we have heard them, at the same time, excuse themselves for supporting the resolution now before the House, on the ground that they love Canada more than Great Britain. I have yet to learn that any subject of Great Britain finds it detrimental to him to be connected with that country or to trade with that country. If I were to believe the statements made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to-day, that England was neither able nor willing to help us in any emergency that might arise, I would at once say that it would be our bounden duty either to become independent or to connect ourselves with the United States; and if I believed it impossible for us to live on this continent without adopting a policy which would place a foreign country in a better position towards Canada in regard to our trade than the mother country occupies, I would at once say: Let us not only have commercial intercourse with that foreign country, but let us adopt a policy that will give us some influence in its political affairs, and not become a mere dependency of it, as we would if the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford were adopted. I hope that the time is far distant, I hope that I shall never live to see the time when it will become necessary for us to adopt any such policy. I believe it is possible for us to maintain our autonomy, and that we need not become a dependency of the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite have pointed out that from the adoption of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1854 down to its abrogation in 1866, our trade with the United States increased very materially. Well, taking the articles that were included in that treaty and looking at the Trade and Navigation Returns of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, of which Provinces I am now speaking more particularly, I find that whilst our aggregate trade with the United States increased very materially during these years, there were in different years very great variations in the trade between the two countries. For instance, you will find that exports of the forest and the farm to the United States in the first full year under reciprocity amounted to \$20,000,000, and those exports fell three years afterwards to \$11,000,000, and so we will find, going through the whole of the list, which I will not trouble the House with reading, that both during the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty, from 1854 to 1866, and since its abrogation, the export trade from Canada to the United States has very greatly varied. One year it would be very considerable and the next year drop \$5,000,000, \$6,000,000 or \$10,000,000. As I have already stated, I believe it is possible for us to maintain our autonomy; I believe it is possible for us to exist, and that we ought not to adopt a policy which would make us a dependency of a foreign country, and which would give us no influence in the political affairs of that country while losing control over our own; and it is because of that belief that I propose to vote against the proposition of the hon. member for South Oxford.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not propose, considering the length to which this debate has been protracted, to prolong it to any considerable extent. At the same time, considering the importance of the question, I am not prepared to give

a silent vote. The subject is one which, I believe, demands from the First Minister of the Crown an expression of opinion on the floor of Parliament. Had the circumstances permitted, I think we should have had an expression of opinion from the hon. the Finance Minister, but when he was unable, through circumstances beyond his control, to give the House and the country the benefit of his views upon this question, it was more than ever incumbent on his seniors in the Cabinet to have placed their views upon record. They have not seen fit to do so. But three members of the Cabinet, at different stages of the debate, ventured to commit themselves. The last Minister of the Cabinet who spoke, the Secretary of State, made a most extraordinary statement, one that does not commend itself, at all events, to my mind. He took the position that, no matter what the facts were, no matter what the statistics established, no matter what the arguments proved, no matter what interests were involved, they all counted for nothing if the sentiment of the country was with him. What he had in view was the votes of the people and not the interests of the people, and he delivered what he considered an infallible judgment at once, when he said: the people are not with you on this occasion. Where, he asked, are the petitioners? Where are the expressions of opinion for or against the proposition? He got one of his answers to-day, when Prince Edward county spoke. Could there be a better evidence of the will of the people than the verdict rendered at the polls, and should this debate continue a few days longer, another would be given in the person of the representative of Missisquoi, who was recently elected on this very issue in a constituency that a few months ago gave at the polls a Conservative majority, and which to-day rendered a verdict in favor of this proposition by some hundreds of a majority.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MULOCK. What was the majority?

Mr. MITCHELL. Two hundred and six.

Mr. MULOCK. I saw it stated in the press that the majority was something over 200. I have not seen the official returns. We had another election the other day in L'Assomption, which had been carried by a Liberal, at the general election, by a majority of twenty-one. I am told that this trade question was the leading issue in that contest, and that it turned entirely upon it, and the result was that the people of that county, by 400 or 500 per cent. over the previous majority, returned a member in favor of the proposition which is now before the House. Surely, in face of these facts, the Secretary of State need not assert that there is no evidence before the House of the feeling of the country on this question. We had the benefit of the opinion of the Minister of the Interior, who is always ready to fill a gap; who is always ready to take charge of any question; who has a certain number of good stock speeches on hand that can be brought out on all occasions, whether they fill the bill or not, and I think he drew on some of his old supplies on this occasion. I think I have often read that speech which he delivered, though he had burnished it up a little, but it was not new to us. I believe he only delivered it forty times in the Province during the last electoral contest, and he delivered it well, seeing how few opportunities he had had to practice it. What argument did he advance against this proposition? He admitted the right of Canada to do what it is proposed to do. He admitted that it might be to the interest of Canada to do what this resolution proposes shall be done, but he took the ground that we should not be mean enough to legislate in a way that might not conserve the interests of England. Then we had the benefit of the opinion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and what was his argument against this proposition? His argument was that

there was no such thing as a natural market, that markets could be made by the expenditure of money and of energy, and that no natural markets were to be found on the earth, that markets were artificial creations, and he pointed to the United States, and said that, even if we did get free trade with the United States, they were producers of the very things that we would produce, and therefore we would find no market there. It is too late for one to indulge in mere opinion, but I will trouble the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with some brief statistics, which I think will convince him, or which ought to convince him, that trade does find a natural level, in spite of many obstructions, artificial and natural. He referred to the trade of Europe, and I have turned up the trade returns of the leading countries in Europe, those on the west and those in the centre. I did not get the trade of Russia simply because there are no trade returns from that country to be found. If you take the trade of Spain for the year 1886, you will find that one-third of the whole volume of the trade of that country was with one of its neighbors, France, although France, as my hon. friend knows, produces many of the very same articles that Spain exported to France. If you turn to Germany, you find that last year Germany did 48 per cent. of the whole volume of her trade with her actual neighbors, with those countries which are in actual contiguity with her, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Austria and Denmark. If you turn to Norway, the same story is told. Norway did 48 per cent. of her whole trade with her three neighbors, Sweden, Denmark and Great Britain. I claim that Great Britain may be treated as a neighbor of Norway, although there is a narrow strip of water between the countries. Italy transacted 56 per cent. of her whole trade with France, Algeria, Austria and Switzerland. France transacted 56 per cent. of her trade with England, Belgium, Switzerland and Italy. Portugal transacted 58 per cent. of her trade last year with three countries, Spain, France and Great Britain. Belgium did 66 per cent. of her trade with France, the Netherlands, Germany and Great Britain. The Netherlands did 72 per cent. of their whole trade with Prussia, Belgium and Great Britain. Austria transacted over 80 per cent. of her whole trade last year with her neighbors, Germany, Russia, Italy, Roumania, Switzerland and Great Britain. When you come to this continent, if you take the Republic of Mexico, you find that over 60 per cent. of its whole trade was with one neighbor, the United States of America. If you take the trade of Canada for 1887, you find that over 40 per cent. of our whole trade was with our neighbor, the United States. We sold last year to the United States over \$37,000,000 worth of the products of Canada, notwithstanding the obstructions in the way of that trade by reason of the high tariff existing in the United States. Had that tariff not prevailed, I think we may fairly assume that our trade with the United States would have been vastly more during the past year than it was. These illustrations, which I have furnished from the trade of Europe, it is to be borne in mind, are in regard to countries which are separated from each other by many differences—differences of language, in some cases tariffs, prejudices and other obstructions to the free flow and interchange of trade. I think, therefore, that, with these illustrations from Europe and from this continent as well, I have clearly established the proposition that there is such a thing on the earth as a natural market, and that that natural market is the nearest market geographically to the country that is seeking to trade. If you look at the trade which Canada has done with the whole world during the past year, you find that, with all the efforts we have been putting out, having established connections with all parts of the civilized world, we have only been able to sell \$7,000,000 worth of the products of Canada to all the nations of the earth with the

exception of the United States and Great Britain. We sold last year to the United States five times as much in value of our products as we sold to all other countries in the world, Great Britain alone excepted. Does not that teach us a lesson? Can we not draw inferences from those facts? Will any philosophy enable us to say in a sensible, truthful way, that trade does not assert itself on geographical lines, and follow as nearly as possible the natural directions indicated? If not, how comes it that all these nations I have referred to confine so much of their trade to their near neighbors? I think there can be but one deduction drawn from it, and that is, that if we do not interpose obstacles, trade does naturally seek the nearest market. In Canada what is the nearest market? We sell, first of all, to ourselves,—we have our domestic trade. The vast bulk of the trade of this country is at home amongst the people, and the surplus, following the principle of selling in the nearest market, if it is the best, finds the nearest market, which is always the best, and that, in our own case, in the market of the United States. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says there is no natural market in the United States for anything that we have. He says that the United States are producers of the very articles that Canada produces, and therefore it is idle to seek to obtain access to the United States market; it is bringing coals to Newcastle, that is the burden of his argument. I have looked through the list of imports in the United States in the past year and what do they disclose? I may not have made out a complete list of all products of Canada which have been imported into the United States; if not my argument is so much the weaker; but I find that the United States last year received from foreign countries \$61,711,024 worth of products, every one of which could have been produced in the Dominion of Canada. On those products the United States customs houses collected \$19,316,181. These articles are as follows: Animals, barley, bituminous coal, copper ore, fish, hemp, furs, hay, hops, iron ore, pig iron, lead, leather of various kinds, spirits, cheese, salt, potatoes, lumber, wooden ware and wool. All of these articles are producible by the people of Canada, and all of them were purchased by the United States last year to the extent of over \$60,000,000, in spite of the tariff imposed. Can any hon. gentleman say now that there is no possible market in the United States for what the people of Canada can produce? Sir, to say so is to trifle with the facts. The volume of trade under these circumstances would, I think, be vastly increased were we to have free access to the markets of the United States. My hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White) touched very lightly upon the effect of the Reciprocity Treaty. If we examine the imports and exports of the old Provinces of Canada during the continuance of the Reciprocity Treaty, they will tell us whether a high tariff is a hindrance to trade or not. In the year 1854, we sold to the people of the United States \$2,162,200 worth of products; in the succeeding year, our products entered the United States free, and the amount of exports immediately jumped up to the sum of \$4,184,319, or very nearly double the amount of the preceding year. I may say in this connection that as our exports to the United States in succeeding years went up, those of England went down. What did that prove? That proved that for our surplus products, in the year 1854, when there was a duty upon them going into the United States, we had to seek a comparatively unprofitable market in Great Britain, but in the succeeding years, when they went into the United States duty free, we sold in the best market, the United States. During the continuance of that treaty the volume of our exports to the United States increased by leaps and bounds, so that in the year 1866, when the treaty was repealed, we exported to the United States the enormous sum of \$34,770,261 of the products of the old Provinces of Canada. Now, I would call the attention of the Minister

Mr. MULOCK.

of Marine and Fisheries to this point. In the year 1866, the last year of reciprocity, the Provinces of Upper Canada, Lower Canada, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, exported to the United States products to the value of \$40,127,266. That year the American people imposed a high duty upon our products and the effect since then has been that in the year 1887, the last year for which we have complete returns, we only exported to the United States 37 million odd; in other words, whereas 22 years ago these four Provinces, under free trade with the United States, sent to them over 40 million dollars worth of Canadian products, to-day, although we have become more powerful, although our population has considerably increased, our trade has fallen off with the United States to the extent of nearly three millions of dollars. So I think that so far as natural products are concerned, there is no possible argument against the proposition, that if we remove the barriers imposed by the custom houses, our trade with the United States in natural products would vastly increase. But it is said by the friends of the manufacturers that this policy would destroy our own manufacturers. I would deplore such a result with any man. I do not desire to see any industry in Canada sacrificed, I desire to see what is best for the whole of Canada adopted by Parliament and by the country, and being of that wish, and believing, as I do, that evidence is producible to show that our manufactures would not suffer, I am firmly of the opinion that we will not endanger our manufactures by enabling them to obtain access to the United States markets, even by giving access in Canada to the manufactures of the United States. Perhaps I might just refer, by way of example, to what has happened in the case of the southern States. Hon. gentlemen all know that at the close of the great American war the southern States were essentially an agricultural country. They had a few manufacturing industries, but agriculture was their leading industry. They emerged from that war in a condition scarcely fitting them, I think, to compete with old established industries, they came out of that war with ruin all around; public credit was gone, private credit was gone, private fortune, were swept away, the labor market was demoralised, everything was in chaos. What was the condition of the Americans in the north at that time? The old established manufactures in New England, though disturbed a little by the troubles of the war, were still in existence. They had grown up under the fostering care of the tariff, they had been supplying the great western States with clothing, while the western States supplied food to the east. You would think it would be absolutely impossible for manufacturing interests, I will not say to thrive, but obtain a foothold in the southern States under such unfavorable conditions. But what has been the result? If you turn to an authority upon the subject, I refer to Mr. Hillyard in the *New South*, you will find he tells of the progress made in manufacturing in the southern States within the last few years. Moreover, I would say that the manufactures that have sprung up in the Southern States during this period are not manufactures having any special advantage from their being in the southern States. I do not refer merely to cotton or tobacco factories, but to the ordinary industries such as exist in Canada to-day, to the small factories. Mr. Hillyard, on page 29, says:

"In building up the lumber mills of all kinds."—

And this I commend to the attention of the hon. member for North Renfrew,—

"In the building of lumber mills of all kinds, from the small portable saw mill to the mill costing \$50,000 to \$100,000, the erection of ice factories, flour mills, &c., there is great activity. In fact, while the iron interests have attracted the greatest attention, the growth of manufactures covers a wide range of industries, including foundries, machine shops, steel works, cotton and woollen mills, cotton-seed oil mills, cotton compresses, fruit-canning factories, carriage and waggon factories,

agricultural implement factories, flour mills, grist mills, saw mills, planing mills, sash, door and blind factories, shuttle factories, handle and spoke factories, barrel factories, shingle mills, furniture factories, &c. It is a healthy growth. Instead of all interest being centred in the establishment of a few enterprises, the south has realised the importance of the small factory and workshop, and so we see springing up everywhere small factories, requiring but few hands, and but little capital, for producing the many articles of manufacture needed everywhere. Finding at first a local market for their goods, these factories will gradually extend their facilities and widen the scope of their trade, until they develop by a natural process into an extensive enterprise."

Not only have factories in the southern States developed, but there has been development in what is the best of evidence as to what is the growth of a country, railway building. He goes on to say :

"Although the mineral resources of the south and her vast forests have attracted much consideration and large investment, in no regard has she so much enlisted the attention of the nation and of Europe as in building railroads. This is the most commanding theatre of capital, and strikes the eye of the world, not only for its colossal combinations of money, but the prestige of its participants."

He goes on further to say :

"It were a vain task to attempt to keep pace with the southern railroad projects. It seems as though almost every day brings a revelation of some new railroad scheme. It is quite certain that railroads are projected, surveys being made, 'ground' being 'broke,' under the auspices of such wealthy corporations as to confirm public confidence in the seriousness and good faith of their operations and intentions. But to assume nothing as the amount of capital to be invested in roads not actually built, the south can make an exhibit which is 'both a pledge and prophecy' of her progress."

Then follows a statement showing the enormous extent of railway construction within the last few years. In the summary Mr. Hillyard states that within the last six and a half years the southern States have constructed over 14,000 miles of railway—far more than there is in the whole Dominion of Canada to-day. Further on he speaks of the saw mills. Those hon. gentlemen who are interested in lumbering need fear nothing from comparison with the United States in this regard, because we know that the northern States will absorb all the lumber we can spare. At this hour I will not read further from this work, but I will simply ask hon. gentlemen to apply the lesson that is furnished by the growth of the southern States, and ask whether Canada, if admitted to the markets of the United States, would not be able to have such a record as that after a reasonable period of time. Is there anything in Canada, is there anything in the Canadian people to warrant us in saying that they cannot accomplish what the people of the southern States have accomplished, given the same conditions? Are our people less energetic, are they less capable? Those hon. gentlemen who say so declare want of confidence in the people of Canada. They do not mean it. They are afraid of the competition. They are afraid of making an honest trial. They are afraid to give up what they call a certainty for what may, to their minds, prove an uncertainty; but in the light of facts and in the light of history, which should teach us and from which we should learn, I cannot see how Canada can fail in any arena in which the American people have succeeded. Why, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) the other night furnished us with a little argument upon this point. He said in his glowing language that he knew something of the southern States, that he came from them, or had something to do with them. He stated that within the last eight months there had been invested in industries there over \$100,000,000. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the conditions of the southern States are such that, having the whole of the market of the United States, they put their capital of \$100,000,000 in eight months to build up industries, why would he not apply the same reasoning to what would follow in Canada if we had access to that great market?

Mr. COCKBURN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to make a short explanation? I did say \$100,000,000 were invested in the southern States within eight months, but I

was careful to draw attention to the fact that the northern States were at the end of the war, and remain still, one Confederation or one Government.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, we are talking business. I refer the hon. gentleman to the *Spectator* of the other day, which in speaking of the "fad," as it called it, of Imperial Federation, said: "We don't want any Imperial Federation, we don't want any sentiment, business is business." We mean business and the people of Canada want business, and the people of the United States wanted business, and when they invested \$100,000,000 during the last eight months it was for business. It was because they saw there was a market in the United States for what they would produce, and because they expected a return, that they invested that capital. Whether we are under one flag or a dozen flags it does not make any difference in the amount of money we are making, if we can get the customers under the same conditions. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Interior argued in favor of the loyalty cry. That is a favorite trick in order to take the attention of the public away from the issue involved. If this proposition is sound on business principles it is sound in its entirety. If this proposition can be defended as one likely to produce comfort, to supply wants, to make the value of labor more than it is, that is loyal, and that is a proposition which ought to be commended to the people. But I am willing to take the hon. gentleman at his own words. I am willing to test him by the record of his friends to see whether they really are sincere when they try to cause this loyalty cry to be raised in order to prevent the people from debating this proposition, or whether the cry is merely raised as a device in order to humbug the country. Now, in 1854, hon. gentlemen, or some at least in this House, will remember that in the old Legislative Assembly of the Provinces of Canada this very question came up, and although no final decision was arrived at, yet on the 26th May, 1854, a resolution was adopted by the Committee of the House at that time in the following words:—

"That the principle of reciprocity with the United States be extended to the production of manufactures, and to the registration of Canadian and United States built ships, and to the shipping and coasting trade in the same manner as to the production of agriculture."

That resolution, so far as I have been able to discover, and I speak subject to correction, was not opposed by any member of the Conservative party. It was reported to the House, but I do not find that it made any further progress. But looking at the members who constituted the committee that reported upon it, I find that they represent pretty fairly the Conservative element of that day. The chairman of the committee was a gentleman who I believe had no very decisive political views—the Hon. Hamilton Merritt—at the time. I do not know that he had any particular political views. At all events that resolution was then offered to the House and no protest was raised against the principle involved in it. It was not then declared to the country that it was disloyal. The Conservative party did not then declare it was disloyal. They were not nearly so loyal then as they are now, and it was not very long before that they were taking a very different view of the whole political relations of Canada. It was only about five years before that a number of their leading lights declared that the only salvation for Canada was political annexation to the United States. I do not know that the Conservative party ever treated with any great cruelty some of the prominent men that took part in that movement. I believe that one of them has recently been promoted to a high position in the Cabinet of the hon. gentleman opposite. In fact they have all at times come in for favors, sometimes from the Government, and in many cases from Her Majesty, by being decorated in testimony of their extreme loyalty and worthy citizenship. At the particular time this resolution was brought in some members of

the Conservative party then in the country were not as they are to-day, so sensitive upon this question. They were prepared at all events to discuss any question involving the best interests of the country. Mr. Speaker, in 1878 the Conservative party proposed what they called their National Policy and we have several times had the resolution proposed at that time brought before the attention of the House. That resolution told the people of Canada that this National Policy that they were proposing was simply the means to an end, and that end was to be what we are seeking to-day, reciprocity. Not only did they tell us that, but they emphasised it in their resolution, in order that there should be no possible difference of opinion on the question. That policy the resolution says, after referring to some other things:

"Would encourage and develop an active inter-provincial trade and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of reciprocity of tariff with our neighbors so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade."

What does "eventually" mean? Does it mean a time so remote as is indicated by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) when he proposes eventually to benefit the farmers of Canada by his Imperial Federation scheme, and when he succeeds in inducing English statesmen to tax breadstuffs so as to raise the price of wheat from seventy-five cents to one dollar for the Canadian farmer. That is the relief proposed by the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Is that "eventually"? Did the First Minister mean when he put the word in the resolution that it was to be at a remote period or did he mean that that word was to be accepted in the ordinary sense of plain language in which it was expressed, that "eventually" meant just as soon as such a treaty could be obtained. That was the view presented to the people on the hustings, that is the proper reading of this article and that is the right view to take of the aim of the hon. gentleman at that time. I am reminded by my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Bain) that the present Finance Minister asserted that this National Policy would produce this highly desirable result of reciprocity within three years, so that "eventually" has really expired now. Well, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister was not nearly so loyal then as he is now. He was then trying to get into office and he is now there and trying to hang on. He was very much concerned at that time about putting money into the pockets of the people, and British connection had not much to do with it. Whatever enriched the people of Canada was the first law unto him at that time; and so, when he came to move his resolution in 1878 he was prepared to throw overboard Great Britain. In the course of his speech in support of his National Policy, after depicting all the benefits that would flow from it, he said (*Hansard*, page 861):

"We shall then grow up rapidly a good, steady and mature trade between the Provinces, rendering us independent of foreign trade, and not, as New Brunswick and Nova Scotia formerly did, look to the United States or to England for trade, but look to Ontario and Quebec." He was prepared then, for the sake of the Canadian people, if necessary, to shut out the whole trade of England, and I presume he felt that he was doing his duty. The doctrine he laid down then bore fruit, because he was followed shortly after in the debate by a supporter of his, the Hon. Mr. Masson, who gave his view of what the duty of Canadians was under such circumstances. He said (page 893 of *Hansard*):

"He might tell the hon. gentleman that the Conservatives of Lower Canada were as loyal to England as they always had been, but he would add the words of Lafontaine: 'Mais avant tout soyons Canadiens'—['But before all let us be Canadians']. This was Lafontaine's doctrine, and they followed it. The Imperial Government in its relations and connections with the colonies had never been exempt from those rather selfish motives, if such motives could be so called, by which the mother country wished to aggrandise herself at the expense of the colonies; the whole colonial system was based upon this principle that the mother

Mr. MULLOCK.

country took these colonies so as to have from them raw material for her own manufactures. That was the object of every central government in every country in the world with respect to their colonies, and, if England claimed a right at times to be selfish in its desires with regard to this colony, they would not go so far in that course, but defend the rights of Canada. The Imperial Government having given us the right of self-government, had also conferred upon us the right to regulate our fiscal duties as we wished. The Conservatives of Lower Canada did not wish to act against the interests of England, but they had the right, if they wished, to regulate the duties, irrespective of England if it were Canada's interest to do so."

I am not aware that the hon. gentleman who used these words lost standing with the Conservative party by reason of them. On the contrary, I believe he was duly rewarded at a later period with high honors at the hands of the Administration. I am not aware that the First Minister either has suffered by reason of his assertion that he believed in Canada for the Canadians against England, even if it injured British connection. I do not believe Her Majesty entertained any ill will towards him on that account, because a few months afterwards he was decorated. Therefore utterances of that kind do not appear to be regarded as disloyal by Her Majesty herself. Again, the doctrine that Canada's interest must be considered first was echoed by another hon. gentleman supporting the Government, the present member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who, in the course of his speech, on 26th March, 1879, said:

"There was nothing we could do which would be more likely to bring about a renewal of reciprocity, than taking a stand upon a tariff which might be carried out in the interests of the Canadian people."

Another supporter of the Government, Mr. Houde, laid down this proposition:

"Let every Government legislate the best in the interest of its own people and for the welfare of its own people. That was the surest way of promoting human progress or general prosperity."

The then member for Centre Wellington (Dr. Orton), expressed himself as follows:—

"He had always thought, the inauguration of a National Policy in Canada should be merely a means to an end, and that end the obtaining of favorable commercial relations with other countries. He hoped in a short time we would be in a position to compete favorably even with our more formidable neighbor across the border, and they would see it to their interests to give us fair trade relations and open up their ports to us in return for our admitting their products on favorable terms."

This National Policy he regarded as a means to an end, the goal aimed at being what we are seeking for to-day. Another supporter of the Administration, Mr. J. S. Ross, of Dundas, expressed himself as follows:—

"If England chose to open her markets to all peoples and treat us no better than others we had to do the best we could for ourselves, consequently Canada must adopt such a fiscal policy as commended itself to their own judgment and which was in the interests of their own people. Unless they did this they must fail to accomplish what was expected of them as a free and progressing people."

I understand that that hon. gentleman, after expressing this view, received a position of emolument from the Conservative Administration. Then, I am obliged to refer to the utterances on that occasion of the present Speaker who was prepared to advance the interests of Canada even against those of England. He is reported in *Hansard* as having used these words:

"It had been stated in a threatening way that England would not approve of a tariff that seemed contrary to her interests, but where was the Englishman that could seriously refuse to Canada the right of legislating in her own interests?"

Further on he says:

"When responsible government had been granted to Canada by the British North America Act, had she not been conceded the right to frame her tariff as she saw fit? Canada had the right of governing herself, and if this right was now refused to her, she would be well able to demand it."

Then, speaking of the vote he was about to cast in favor of the National Policy, which was to lead to reciprocity, he said:

"It would be a vote given in favor of the constitutional and commercial liberty of Canada. It would be a vote that would assert the existence of Canada as a nation distinct not only from England, but the United States."

Hon. gentlemen, I have no doubt, are quite familiar with the memorandum directed by Sir Alexander Galt, then Mr. Galt, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, setting forth what ought to be the true attitude of Canada in regard to its fiscal affairs. I could, if time permitted, give numerous extracts from speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, all taking the ground that in matters of trade the Parliament of Canada had first to consider the interests of the people of Canada. I say that not only do the people of Canada demand that position from us, but the sentiment of England is in harmony with the sentiments I have quoted. The hon. gentleman who formerly represented the constituency which I have the honor to represent, a keen observer—I refer to Dr. Strange—spoke in this House on this question. He is an Englishman, and an able and talented gentleman. He expressed himself on this question in a way, I think, that did not meet with the disapproval of his constituents in North York. On the contrary, I believe that many of his old supporters again desire him to represent their riding. They bore no malice to him for having uttered on the floor of Parliament the words which I am about to quote, taken from *Hansard* 21st March, 1879. He addresses this House as an Englishman. He was a Canadian by adoption, but an Englishman in spirit. As far as he was able to ascertain the spirit of the English people, they were anxious and willing that Canadian interests should be first considered by the Canadian people. He spoke as follows:—

"He addressed this House as an Englishman. He was a Canadian by adoption, but an Englishman in spirit. As far as he was able to ascertain the spirit of the English people they were anxious and willing to see this vast colony of which they were justly proud succeed even if we had in our own interests to put a stop to purchasing our goods from England. No English Government would venture to prevent the adoption of this tariff on the ground of its injuring England. The English people, without exception, took great interest in our success and with the exception of a few manufacturers would bid us God-speed on the royal road to wealth."

That is the sentiment of an Englishman expressing what he conceived to be the opinion of England with regard to the affairs of Canada. What did the Right Hon. John Bright, recently tell us at a banquet given to Mr. Chamberlain? I do not endorse all that Mr. Bright said that night, but I wish to show that he took strong grounds in favor of Canada being entitled to arrange her own tariff as she pleased and to conduct her own affairs in her own interest without regard to the commerce of the mother country. He went on to express a sentiment I do not endorse, but hon. gentlemen opposite can hardly repudiate John Bright as a true friend of the Empire at present, in view of the attitude which he has taken on certain political questions in England, which attitude, no doubt, commends itself to the favor of the Conservative party both in England and Canada. We have a very distinguished Englishman in Canada, Mr. Goldwin Smith, whose name has been referred to in this assembly during this debate, and not in the most courteous manner. The time was when what he said was accepted with favor by the Conservative party. He is a loyal citizen to England. I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite cannot controvert that. We all know his record, we all know the part he thought it was his duty to take to preserve the Empire, some few months ago, and we know that he to-day is a loyal British subject, anxious to see the welfare of England promoted. Do they denounce him as a traitor to England?

An hon. MEMBER. They do.

Mr. MULOCK. Since when? I think he is a truer man to England than the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), who has just interrupted me, was to the people of Ireland, when he allowed some of his compatriots to be

turned out of office because they would not be coerced into voting for him.

Mr. CURRAN. I beg leave to state that the assertion made by the hon. gentleman is entirely devoid of truth, and the newspapers which published that statement against me, apologised in the most humble manner for having done so.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sure the hon. member for Montreal Centre will not admit that his influence with this Cabinet is so small that he could not secure their retention in office.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. MULOCK. I will not take it back.

Mr. CURRAN. I contradict that statement most flatly.

Mr. MULOCK. I say that the hon. gentleman will not admit on the floor of this House, and if he does I doubt whether any one is so credulous as to accept his admission, that his influence with the Cabinet is so weak that he could not prevent the removal from office of three poor Irishmen who had been for years in the employ of the Government, and who were removed simply because they would not come down and vote for him when he had voted against the best interests of Ireland.

Mr. CURRAN. What the hon. gentleman states is positively untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member would do better to abandon that part of his remarks.

Mr. RYKERT. Make an apology.

Mr. MULOCK. I give as another reason why we are not obliged, in making trade relations with the United States, to consider first the interests of England, the fact that England does not act in this way with regard to the colonies. There are trade treaties between England and other great nations, giving benefits to England from which the colonies are excluded. There are now treaties on foot between England and China, and Japan, and Siam, and France, and Spain, and the Netherlands, and the United States, which are not applicable to the colonies. If England, in the exercise of her constitutional rights, considering the highest interests of her people, arranges, as I conceive she has the right to do, her own customs treaties for her own benefit and not for that of the people of Canada, a corresponding right exists with us. Does not the Confederation Act, under which we are here to-night, say that the constitution of the people of Canada shall be the same in principle as the constitution of the people of England? Our constitution is based on the principles of the English constitution, and unless the loyal gentlemen opposite can prove that England is not loyal to us in her conduct with regard to commercial treaties, they cannot say that Canada would be acting disloyally if, first of all, we consider our own interests in any particular trade relations we may enter into. We have further evidence to prove this contention. There is uncontrovertible evidence, having the sanction of the British Parliament, that the duty of Canada is to arrange her trade treaties in her own interest and without considering the interests of England. How will I prove that proposition? When the right hon. the First Minister, who is smiling now, caused the Customs Act of 1879 to be introduced, it was, before it became law, communicated to the Imperial Government. It was a tariff considered highly detrimental to the interests of the English manufacturers, who rose up in arms against it, protesting that Canada was raising a tariff to exclude English goods, and was not, therefore, loyal to England. They asked, therefore, that the Act be disallowed by the Imperial authorities. John Bright brought the matter before Parliament on the 20th of March, 1879, and put this question to the Colonial Secretary on the floor of the House:

"In case of any proposal to enact differential duties on the part of Canada, would the Bill be submitted to the Government before it was adopted?"

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, then Secretary for the Colonies, replies :

"The best answer I can give to it is to read the telegram I sent to Canada, which received the sanction of the Government. It was in these terms :

"They deemed the fiscal policy of Canada rested, subject to treaty obligations, with the Dominion Parliament."

The Dominion Parliament was recognised on the floor of the Imperial Parliament as being entitled to impose differential duties if necessary, without it being considered right or proper or constitutional for the Government of England to disallow that Act. What further evidence is there? Hon. gentlemen all know that every colonial governor, when entering upon the duties of his office, receives certain instructions. The time was when all the instructions to colonial governors of all English colonies contained the instruction forbidding the governor to sanction the imposition of differential duties, and that instruction is still to be found in the instructions to every colonial governor with the exception of the Governor General of Canada. In 1878, for the first time, that instruction was eliminated from the instructions given to the Governor General of Canada. Thus you see that the Crown recognised the fact that Canada, occupying a peculiar geographical position on the earth, cannot have her trade affairs regulated in the same way as other colonies of Great Britain, which are more or less insular or peculiarly situated; so the Government of England recognised fully that Canada, by reason of her importance, by reason of her position, and by reason of her constitution, cannot be trammelled and ought not to be trammelled in the interests of the people of Canada, or for that matter in the interests of the Empire, even if, for her own sake, she should impose differential duties. On that point, I cannot offer to the House, I think, any better evidence of the feeling of the people of Great Britain at the present time than an extract from the work of the late Mr. Todd, who was a keen observer of current events, on Parliamentary Government in the British colonies. At page 181, he summarises the position of Canada in regard to her trade rights, in these words :

"But, on account of the growing importance of Canada, as well before as since Confederation, exceptional privileges have been conceded to her, from time to time, in respect to fiscal and commercial matters wherein the interests of Canada were concerned, with freedom to adopt whatever policy might be approved by the Local Legislature, irrespective of the opinions or policy of the Imperial Parliament."

Such is the inference drawn by Mr. Todd from the current opinion and the authorities in Great Britain. I think I have established that the hon. gentlemen opposite at one time took a different view of this question; I think I have established that England does not wish Canada to injure herself even in the interests of the mother country, and though hon. gentlemen opposite have been practically asserting that English regard for Canada simply depends upon the extent of Canadian accounts in British ledgers, I do not think that our people will be so childish as to consider the business interests of people across the Atlantic to the prejudice of their own domestic interests. There is a good reason why England desires us to be on friendly terms with the United States. The United States are the largest customers of Great Britain. More than one-third, nearly a half, of the volume of trade of Great Britain is with the United States. Last year, the volume of trade between Great Britain and the United States amounted to between \$500,000,000 and \$600,000,000, and England desires that we should be on good terms with the United States, so that there may be no disturbance of her interests in that connection. If it is placed upon that ground, we are promoting the best interests of the people of Great Britain by maintaining friendly

Mr. MULLOCK.

intercourse with the United States, so that there may be no interference with the flow of trade between those countries. I shall not delay the House longer on this subject. We are loyal to the people of Canada if we vote on this question with a view to their benefit, on a proposition which is calculated to find a natural market for our products, to stimulate the manufactures of this country, to encourage labor and to make Canada attractive to the population and to the wealth of older lands, that will be a trade policy that will operate equitably throughout the whole length and breadth of the Dominion, that will enable us to solidify this Dominion, and to extend and carry out the very principle which established this Dominion, the extension of our trade markets. As inter-provincial trade was held but as an inducement to the Provinces to come together and form a confederacy and thereby to have the domestic trade of four millions of people, that principle must be equally good if you give them the trade of sixty millions of people. Therefore, if it was right to bind us together by the scheme of Confederation for the purpose of establishing inter-provincial trade—and I believe it was—it is still better to extend this principle and to obtain ultimately entire free trade throughout this great American continent. Therefore, I have great pleasure in recording my vote and giving my voice in favor of this principle, believing as I do that it will be to the advantage of Canada and will place our relations with England on a sure and firm foundation, and that we will be bound to England by a feeling of love and regard, not by a feeling that we have to pay for, not one wrung from the people by a system of indirect taxation, but by a harmonious union between colony and empire free from all disturbing causes.

Mr. PERLEY (Ottawa). I have listened very earnestly to the arguments which have been submitted to the House on this important question. I have paid particular attention to the grounds taken by the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House in arguing for the resolution introduced by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). I have felt especially gratified at the regard which has been expressed for the lumber trade, although it comes from the wrong side of the House, but from all these arguments, even from the hon. gentleman for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who, I understand, is a practical lumberman, I have not heard any account of the lumber interest that I am able to verify by any reports either from the United States or from Canada. Those statements are all, in my view—and facts go to substantiate it—made for a particular purpose, to endeavor to obtain the support of the lumber trade, but I think they are made on an extravagant, unjustifiable and unwarrantable basis. I have gone to the trouble of making an accurate statement of the lumber export interest of this country for the last year. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), stated that practically one-half of the exports of the forest—\$9,253,000—went to the United States, leading us to believe that to be the amount upon which the producers of this country had to pay duties, in order to reach the United States markets. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) took similar ground upon the matter of exports, and he claimed that the producers of this country had to pay a duty upon the products of the forests exported, with no exception whatever—all of which was misleading, as will be shown by the following statement, viz.: the whole exports of the forest product for the year ending June, 1887, were \$20,484,746; the amount sent to Great Britain and other countries was \$11,131,240. The amount that entered the United States free of duty, according to returns, was \$1,873,412; the balance which went to the United States, subject to duty, was \$7,480,094. That was a proportion of 36 per cent. of the whole products of the forest which were subject to duty, and 64 per cent. free of

duty. Now, as a matter of fact, all the products from the forest that have been heretofore subject to duty since the abrogation of the Treaty of 1854, as every hon. gentleman in this House knows, it is proposed to admit into the United States, under a Bill introduced into Congress, providing for the removal of the duty upon the products of the forests. Now, in view of this fact I am unable to see upon what ground the hon. members who have been arguing on this resolution for the last two or three weeks, could take up the interest of the lumber trade at all. It was expected that the Bill I have mentioned would pass through Congress, if not at this session at an early period afterwards; consequently I, as a practical lumberman, must take the ground that I am unable to see any reason or propriety why hon. gentlemen opposite should have taken up the question at the present time. I must say I consider it an interference and an intrusion upon the negotiations which were pending between the United States and Canada, and which, I have no doubt, have been seriously interfered with by it. Now I speak upon business principles in this matter. As every one here knows I am not a politician, but I am a lumberman of long standing in this country. Now, if I were in negotiation for my firm or for myself in relation to important transactions, and some of my neighbors or some of my family interfered, and tried to show to the parties with whom I was negotiating that I was going to gain enormous advantages, I should conclude that it was an unjustifiable and unwarrantable interference, subject to the most severe censure of every reasonable fair minded man. I am particularly surprised at the hon. member for North Norfolk taking the ground that he did. Himself, a practical lumberman, he takes the ground that the duties must be paid by the producer on this side of the line. Now, if that is followed out, I see no propriety in the hon. gentlemen opposite complaining of a rise in the duties upon material imported into this country. They leave it for the producer to pay, from whom we get these goods, upon the principle that they have to pay the duties and not us. Now, if that principle is correct, it is certainly not reasonable to contend that we also have to pay duties upon what we import. It is a rule that cannot work both ways, and if we pay the duties upon what we export, it is fair to conclude that those who export to us also have to pay the duties. I am sorry the hon. member for North Norfolk is not in his place, but I have no hesitation in stating to him that he could not find any experienced lumberman upon the Ottawa or its tributaries who would agree with him. Now that hon. gentleman went further, and contended that unrestricted reciprocity would increase the value of the timber limits of this Dominion by at least 50 per cent. I cannot understand upon what grounds he made that assertion. In my opinion it is simply absurd to say so. It is well known that the Governments of Quebec and Ontario have increase the Crown dues very largely during the last year. We contended that they were unwarranted in making such a large increase, and I think I can show that so far as trade is concerned in the Ottawa valley, there was no reason for increasing the Crown charges as they have done, except in anticipation of the removal of the duties upon the products of the forests going into the United States. I have taken that ground in my own party. That must have been the ground upon which they made that increase, and they were perfectly justified in their views that the United States would at an early day do that which was to their interest, and remove the duties from the forest products of this country. Now, as a practical lumberman, I may state here that, as a matter of fact, according to the condition of the lumber trade in the Ottawa valley, those charges cannot be paid by the lumbermen at the present time unless the duties are removed upon lumber going into the United States. It is a well

known fact to all lumbermen and sawmill men, that the low grade of lumber as produced now cannot be exported to the United States under that system of duties, without a loss to the sawmill men who saw the logs. That is a positive fact, and the principal advantage, I contend, which we can obtain from the removal of those duties, is to enable us to cut and saw an inferior quality of logs, and perhaps, in many cases, trees that have been burnt and killed a long time ago might be cut and used for building timber, boxes, &c., which might be worked here and exported to the United States, if there were no duties to pay. I make that statement as a matter of fact from my experience of lumbering, and I challenge any man who is accustomed to the manufacturing and sawing of lumber, to contradict or controvert it. There is another matter in connection with the lumber business that has not been stated here, or referred to in any way, and that is the enormous increase of home consumption which has taken place since 1880. Hon. gentlemen opposite have either purposely or carelessly avoided mentioning anything of that kind as being a benefit to our producers here. That, I contend, is one of the essential points that should be considered in any transaction or measure of this nature. It has been strongly argued from the United States point of view in this House that the enormous internal interstate trade of the United States has increased to a wonderful degree year after year, which we all know is the fact upon which the prosperity and advancement of that country have very largely depended, and to which the success of the United States may be attributed, especially since the abolition of American slavery. The interstate trade of that nation has been enormous and unequalled in the world. I contend that we can cultivate and develop an inter-provincial trade in Canada, and in order to show the reason why I hold this to be the fact, I will cite the statistics of the increase of the sales of lumber in Montreal for local consumption since the adoption of this protective policy. The estimated consumption for 1880 was from 45,000,000 to 50,000,000 feet, while in 1887 it ran up to 120,500,000 feet, an increase of nearly 200 per cent. in seven years. I look upon this as one of the important elements of the prosperity and success which this National Policy so-called has given to this country. And if we were able to obtain the statistics of other cities, I am sure we would be able to show the people and hon. gentlemen opposite, who are contending that we should throw overboard everything we have achieved, that upon that basis we have developed our trade and given our own people employment in the manufacturing interest. That is not all, but it furnishes a home market for much of the products of the forest within our own country. That home market, I contend, is the best market in any country. In order to show the benefit of that trade, and in order to make it more clear to the comprehension of hon. members who are not accustomed to the lumber trade, I would say that the amount consumed in the city of Montreal in 1887 was equal to 20 per cent. of the cut of all the mills in Ottawa and its immediate neighborhood. That this progress has been accomplished from 1880 to 1887 furnishes remarkable evidence of the effects of the National Policy, and it cannot be questioned that it has benefited this section of the country. I contend that this same principle will apply all through Ontario and Quebec, not only in regard to the products of the forest, but to the products of the farm, and everything we can raise and consume or of which we have a surplus to export to another country. Upon that basis I claim that there can be no question of the success of the National Policy so far as we have gone, and I contend that the advancement has been far more than perhaps might have been expected under the circumstances. When we consider the sparseness of our population from ocean to ocean, that when this policy was adopted we had limited

means of transport from one section of the country to the other, it is remarkable that within this period of time we have attained such results. When we consider that it is only within the last year or a little more that we have had means of communication with the extremity of the Dominion on the Pacific Ocean, when we consider that at the present time much improved means of communication are in course of construction to the other extremity of the Dominion, we may congratulate ourselves on the real success we have achieved in the provincial interchange of products. I regret to say that means do not seem to be available to arrive at a correct conclusion in regard to the inter-provincial trade, which we have already developed and which we now enjoy, and although meagre, it would be quite surprising to many people who are attacking it and endeavoring to make us believe that there is no such thing as inter-provincial trade, and that we have not arrived at that stage of development in our progress as a Dominion to have the advantage of that trade to any degree. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if we can get over this attempt to disturb the progress and development of this country, and if the hon. gentlemen who represent constituencies in this House would take some other means of criticising the action of the governing party, that we would do far better and get along more successfully in developing the resources of the country. It seems to me that this feeling of enmity against the successful party and this complaining has been going on since I have known anything about Parliament, and this raising of the cry that we are going to ruin are, I believe, calculated to retard the progress of the country and to embarrass the Government from carrying on measures for its welfare. I may be criticised for expressing my views on this point being a young member of this House, but I must say that, in view of pending legislation now before the United States Congress, I consider this resolution uncalled for in every sense of the word, so far as the lumber trade is concerned, and I can see no ground upon which they can justify themselves in introducing a resolution of that kind. So far as I am concerned I have no hesitation in saying that the lumber trade does not need any such measure. I think it is very unfair that the arrangements pending between this country and the United States and which we have every reason to believe would result in an immense benefit to the country should be embarrassed by such a proceeding. We have seen in this House, during the last 48 hours, that already measures for a further interchange of our natural products are being arranged between the United States Government and this Government. I contend that we may consider the United States people a sensible people and we claim at least to be a sensible people here, and when they see, as they apparently have seen, that it was a mistake to continue the duty on lumber, we may readily conclude that they will come to the same conclusion regarding potatoes, barley, and other things which in due time they will see it is to the detriment of their own interest to continue to hold dutiable. I consider that those Governments have achieved remarkable results in the fishery negotiations, results which we ought to all feel proud of in this country and which tend to the settlement of that long vexed question. As a native of the United States, I have had much intercourse with its people during all these years, perhaps more than any other member of this House. The great difficulty I have met with on the other side of the line is that the mass of the people believe they have the right to fish where they like, but the more sensible portion of the people with whom I have talked recognise the obligation of the Treaty of 1818. We can depend upon the sensible portion of the people of the United States, and I am happy to congratulate the members of this Government, especially the Minister of Finance upon the success which he obtained for Canada at the Washington conference. I am quite satisfied that it will lead to a better understanding between the

Mr. PERLEY (Ottawa).

authorities of both countries, and, as I said before, I have no doubt that reasonable arrangements will be made for a fair interchange of the products of the two countries in due time. In the course of the debate upon the resolution introduced by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) it has been said that we will open our market to 60,000,000 of people. I contend that we only open our markets to the 5,000,000 with whom we come in contact along the border on the other side of the line. So far as we are concerned, are not the farmers along the line producers of the same articles as we produce? We immediately come into contact with them and we open our markets to a country highly developed and to a people better prepared to produce or manufacture than we are. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to know what advantage we would have in sending our products to compete with the same products in the United States? From a business point of view I cannot see that we are going to obtain any advantage. On the contrary, I contend that we are opening our markets to the manufacturers of the United States; that those manufactories are highly developed, they make almost everything that is needed for the people, and when we open our markets to those manufacturers we become confronted with the great facilities and advantages they have gained after many years of establishment, and I contend we are not prepared in our young country to meet such a state of things. I contend that our country would be overrun with the manufactures of the United States, and we would not be able to contend against the best kind of machinery and manufacturing skill they have in that country. Upon that ground, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see that we will gain any advantage by unrestricted reciprocity, or commercial union, which is the same thing, or by annexation. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Barron) said:

"I have no accurate statistics as to the value of the lumber interests, but I find that we exported up to the 15th June, 1887, for the year prior to that, the immense value of \$3,165,987 upon which as I will explain in a moment, my constituents, at all events, pay the enormous amount of over \$500,000."

Now, the facts show as nearly as possible that from the Province of Ontario the total amount of forest products which were subject to United States duty for the year ending June, 1887, amounted to about \$6,000,000, and that it is not at all likely that the whole duty thereon could have exceeded from \$100,000 to \$700,000, showing clearly that the hon. member was not perfectly justified in stating that he had no accurate statistics, and that his statement regarding the amount of duties paid by his constituents was without foundation in fact. I submit that no member of this House is justified in placing before his constituents any statements that rest on a false basis. Now, with regard to the question, who pays the duty on the lumber we export to the United States, I do not know that there is any settled principle; but the dealers in lumber and manufacturers in the United States, without any exception, so far as I am aware, contend that they pay the duty. They come here and buy lumber free on board, and pay the duty on it. I do not intend to argue the question, but I will state my experience in the application of the Treaty of 1854, and leave the hon. members to draw their own conclusion as to which contention is right. Notice for the abrogation of the Treaty of 1854 was given in 1864, and the abrogation took place on the 1st of July, 1866, when a duty of 20 per cent. was imposed on pine lumber. At that time my firm was engaged in the sawing of lumber, and at the time this resolution was introduced my impression was that we did not experience any difference in the price of our lumber from the imposition of that duty. But to verify my impression I had an examination made of the books of my firm, and I found that from 1864 to 1867 inclusive, there was no perceptible change, upon a gold basis, in the price of our products. If anything, the

prices increased in the latter years to some extent. This instance goes to show conclusively that at that time we certainly did not pay the duty that was imposed on lumber by the United States. After all, we have valuable resources in our forests that would be much improved by the removal of the United States customs duties—not in the sense of such increased value of timber lands as my hon. friend from North Norfolk estimates, but more particularly as I contend in the sense of enabling the holders and workers of these timber lands to appropriate and market low grades of growth—possibly vast numbers of trees from burned districts which it is impossible for them to handle under the Crown charges now resting upon such products, but which might then be worked up in this country into marketable exports for the United States. It may thus be clearly seen that the mere earnings to the laboring classes and payment of Crown dues, with only a very small profit to the mill men, would be a great boon for this country to get from such timber, and I contend that this is the main advantage which this country would gain by the removal of the United States duties on lumber. At the inauguration of our present fiscal policy, it was contended, on what we considered reasonable grounds, that the lumber trade would have to suffer, under the National Policy, for the benefit of other industries. It was contended by a member of my own firm, and by some of my neighbors, that we would have to pay increased prices for the different articles we consumed. I took the opposite view, and held that we would get these articles from our own manufacturers at rates fully as low as those we would have to pay the foreign manufacturer. What was the fact? The articles of clothing and the vast amount of goods that enter into shanty supplies were never advanced in price, and to-day we can get them cheaper than ever we could get them before. That is the true principle of protection. Protection is not a new thing to me. Before I came to this country I was a protectionist, and I have always been firmly of the opinion that no new country can get on without a protective policy. I am sanguine that with our resources which, under the National Policy, are being rapidly developed, we will in time become a nation of great importance. We need only take the glowing accounts of Mr. Erastus Wiman and his supporters to realise more clearly than we otherwise might the vast resources that we possess in our unlimited wheat-producing and stock-raising lands, the richness of our mineral deposits, our forests, rivers and water powers. We need only consider these advantages to appreciate properly the heritage we now possess and to become inspired to the exercise of every effort to work out the great destiny before us. The hon. member for South Brant has alluded to evidence before a committee of this House on depression in the year 1876, in which he gives the statement of W. G. Perley, lumber merchant, whom he supposes to be the present member for Ottawa. I wish to remove all doubt from the mind of that hon. gentleman by a full declaration to this House that I am the same W. G. Perley to whom he alluded as having given evidence on that occasion. I thank the hon. member most sincerely for reporting my evidence on that occasion, viz., that we were all anxious to have the privilege of sending lumber into the United States without duty, if we could have it on fair terms. I feel able to congratulate myself upon the record that my hon. friend has brought down to this House, and further to congratulate myself on having been a uniform and steadfast supporter of the view all the time from that date to this, that reciprocity with the United States on fair terms would be a boon to us as well as to the United States. But that does not in my view offer any inducement for a sacrifice or absolute surrender on our part such as I consider the resolution introduced by the hon. member for South Oxford, and I shall therefore vote against the amendment to the amendment and against the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford, and I hope that such an

expression of opinion against both will be given by this House as to leave no room for encouragement in the minds of those who might desire to bring forward this resolution again. I thank you, Sir, for the patient hearing you have given me, and I hope the House will pardon me, if, being a new member and therefore lacking parliamentary experience, my remarks have not been as well put as they might have been, but I have done, as I always intend to do, the best I could for my adopted country and the constituency which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. GILLMOR. I have listened to all the speeches that have been made on this very important question, the most important perhaps that has ever been presented to Parliament since Confederation, and I would not now take up the time of the House were it not that my hon. friend the senior member for St John (Mr. Weldon) is not able to take part in this debate on account of physical difficulties. Only one of our delegation from the Province of New Brunswick has spoken in the discussion, and therefore I feel it is my duty to make my voice heard on this question. Anyone who knows my views on trade questions knows that I will vote for any measure which will remove the obstacles to trade, either partially or completely. I am from honest conviction a free trader. In 1854, when the treaty of partial reciprocity was introduced into New Brunswick, I was a member of the Parliament of that day and I voted to ratify the arrangement thirty-four years ago. So that you see, Sir, I am not a very young man. That was the commencement of my political life, and I have been in politics nearly ever since. If this resolution should be adopted now, at the close of my career, if I can assist in the humblest manner in bringing about this result, it will be a happy ending to my political career. I have listened to all the speeches that have been made on this subject, and, although I have always been associated with the Liberal party, I do not think I am an extreme partisan; I think I can look at questions fairly, and, according to my light, can judge fairly of arguments. I know that this question has been ably discussed, though I think there has been much said which has not helped us to come to a correct conclusion. When this question was first mooted in the country, I had hopes that it might be discussed to a large extent free from party feelings, and with a disposition to arrive at what was best for the country. I cannot suppose that the majority in this House are not anxious for the advancement and prosperity of the country. I have no doubt that they are anxious that their policy shall succeed, and that they have made the best efforts they can to that end, but, in my humble opinion, no country can succeed under a policy of protection. Surround it as much as you may with fallacies and sophistries, I am so grounded in my belief that protection cannot succeed that these sophistries and fallacies cannot affect me. I do not know how much time I may occupy in what I have to say, but I promise that I shall not endeavor to dig up dry bones and dead issues of the past. Those dead issues cannot help us to come to a proper conclusion on this question. The question is large enough to be discussed on its merits, and what this gentleman on this side or that gentleman on the other side said years ago, under different circumstances, speaking on different questions, has no relation to the question now before us, and can have no effect upon it. We are face to face now with an issue which is worthy of the best consideration and the best judgment we can bring to bear upon it. The question now is, without regard to other matters, without regard even to the question whether Canada is prosperous or not, whether it is the best for the interest of Canada to adopt the resolution now before us, and to endeavor to obtain unrestricted free trade with our neighbors to the south of us. That is the question, and I shall endeavor to give the reasons why I think that is the best

policy. This question is so plain that it does not require a very intelligent man to understand it. It is so plain that I do not think that men's minds can be blinded by sophistries and fallacies. I think it is a question that is being considered by more electors, by more people throughout the Dominion of Canada, than any question which was ever propounded before in so short a time as we have had this question before us. I believe the people of this country will give it a fair and intelligent consideration, and will come to an honest decision in the matter. Of course, I do not expect that anything that will be said here will change a vote in Parliament. This is said to be a deliberative body, but party feeling has become so strong, and I may say so rotten, that we cannot look at things here through a clear medium, or at least we do not seem to be able to do so. I do not wish to judge hon. members. I think they have presented their objections to this resolution to the best of their ability. I think they have done the best they could; but they have failed, as everybody must fail who attempts to prove that protection is a correct principle and is the best for the country. They have spoken fluently and brought their arguments to bear on the question, and, while I do not wish to underrate their speeches, for they are not responsible to me or to this House, but to their constituents, I think they have failed to make out a case. I was once at a meeting. A colored man was preaching, and before he commenced the services he gave out a hymn, and the choir commenced to sing, but they pitched too high, and then they stopped. Then they began again, but they pitched too low. They made another effort and failed again, and after several trials, they sat down, and did not succeed in singing because they could not, and my hon. friends, I think, have not succeeded simply because they could not. The preacher said: "I thank you, gentlemen, although you did not succeed, you did the best you could." So those hon. gentlemen have done the best they could, but they have failed to convince me; there has been no music in it to me. In dealing with trade questions, it is usually supposed that it is only the manufacturers and the wholesale and retail dealers, and a few others who constitute the trading public, that they are the only ones who trade, and that, therefore, we should look to them as the traders of the country. My idea is that everyone is a trader who buys or sells anything, and this question is important because it reaches every man, woman and child in the Dominion of Canada, who are able to produce and to dispose of their products, whether it is their labor or anything else which they may desire to sell or to buy. This is a question which appeals to everyone. We are a hive of traders. We are endeavoring, all of us, to get something which we may sell again in order to obtain what we wish to consume for our comfort. However desirous one might be to treat this question without regard to party, it is only necessary to reflect for a moment to see that the proposed resolution is a direct attack upon the principle of protection. Therefore, I could not expect that this question would be discussed without having the National Policy discussed from beginning to end, with its effects upon the country from its inception to the present time. I have been unable all through these years to understand exactly what the policy of the Government was upon this question. It has never been very clearly defined. They started out with the proposal that we must have reciprocity of trade or we must have reciprocity of tariffs. I did not know what they really wanted, or what they thought was best for the country; but it seems as though they had two strings to their bow, and they have continued to have two strings to their bow all the way through. They have found that the National Policy has worked well for them as a party, and I confess they have been very successful. I never expected that they would be so successful in introducing such a policy at this age of the world, but they have been successful, and, when

Mr. GILLMOR.

this discussion was opened, I made up my mind that the policy of the Government was clearly defined. When the amendment to the resolution was moved, I thought we had a clear and distinct issue, I thought that the Government were disposed to hold to the policy of protection as a principle to be fixed upon this country. But the declarations of the Government seem to have left me again in doubt as to their policy. I do not know now what they mean. From the declarations of the Prime Minister the other day, I supposed that their colors were nailed to the mast. I understood him to mean that they were decided not to have reciprocity in either natural or in manufactured products. Their amendment declared that they had proved the National Policy, that the people had approved of it on three occasions as having protected and fostered their industries, and, therefore, I supposed the Government had made up their minds to fight it out on that line. I find now that is altogether changed, that they are beginning to yield, and that this pet of theirs, the National Policy, is receiving but little attention in some respects. I find that in this first engagement with the United States in the war of tariffs, they have made a retreat, and this bantling of the hon. gentlemen opposite, this idol which they have erected and worshipped so long, is now suffering injury. Are not the fruit growers an industry in Canada? Are not those who grow shrubs, and plants, and trees, and put them into the market, men who have a right to be protected under the National Policy? It seems not just now. That is one of the interests of this country that does not seem to be taken under the fostering care of the National Policy. And so I do not know how much they are going to yield, or exactly what they contemplate. I thought this amendment was the policy of the Government. I understood by it that all these industries and interests in the Dominion of Canada, having been so fostered and having proved so successful, were to continue to receive the benefits of the National Policy; but I cannot tell now whether that is going to be done or not. I have noticed that all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this question from the Government side, have declared at the beginning or at the conclusion of their speeches, that they were willing to have reciprocity. After arguing with great ability that free trade would injure the interest of the farmer, the miner, the lumberman, and every other interest, at the conclusion of their speeches they wound up by saying: We are willing to have reciprocity of some kind or another. This proves to my mind that they have a lingering fear that the people of this country are in favor of unrestricted trade with our neighbors across the border. It all convinces me that some how or other, they believe there is a feeling abroad that the people want to have the shackles of trade removed, at least in reference to the United States, and I fancy that they are right. I believe that the people desire unrestricted trade with our neighbors, and for that reason I shall help them so far as I am able. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not unmindful of the fact that there is a hard battle to be fought before we can obtain it. We have had a good many elections, and you know the result, Mr. Speaker, and I know the result, and our party knows the result. In three elections we have been beaten. But that is no reason why we should compromise our principles, that is no reason why we should not contend for what we think is to the advantage of this country. Any hon. member who thinks it is going to be an easy matter to beat the present Government, with the influences they have at their command and know so well how to use, is greatly mistaken. Any hon. gentleman who remembers that this Government with their experience, with \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000 to spend every year, and their knowledge as to how best to apply it, how best to use it for their purposes, must know that it is a hard matter to over-

come that influence. In addition to that, we have to meet the influence of all the "combines," of all the "rings" and the monopolies that have been fostered and encouraged by the present policy, and they form a very important element in carrying an election. Then, there is the manufacturing interests, which have a very strong influence, and in the main I fear they may be against us. Then we have in this Dominion a great many office holders, many of them men of honor, many of them men of ability, and many of them doing service to their country. But beside and above all these, there is a host of hangers on, the rag-tag and bob-tail, who want to get a living without work—we are going to have that vote against us; and then, Mr. Speaker, in addition to them, there are a great many honest men, a great many men who are good citizens, but whose party feelings are so strong that we cannot approach them, and they will vote for their party. Then we have an army of contractors, who have made great wealth out of the public works of this country; we have the sub-contractors and all who depend upon them, who have made vast wealth out of the public works of this country; and all these will be against us. The Government know the power of contractors, they have had a little experience of them down in Glengarry; they know what they can do when they put themselves to work, and they have not got them all on their side. Take these altogether, all who have been in office and who are looking for office, all those who follow the Government ship in order to live on the offal that is thrown overboard, and you have got a host to contend with. But still I feel that our cause is just, and I believe that to-day there is a large majority in favor of unrestricted free trade with the United States. Feeling that, I have no fear. Now, there is a great difference of opinion in the House as to whether Canada is prosperous at the present time. I do not think the Dominion is at all that she ought to be considering her resources and her opportunities; but this idea of prosperity is a relative term, and what one might consider prosperity another might not consider prosperity, and you can prove your position by taking one locality and another locality that may be fairly and truthfully said to be prosperous at the present time. Taking Canada as a whole it cannot be said to be prosperous. The expectations held out when the National Policy was inaugurated have entirely failed to be fulfilled, and whatever prosperity there may be of a general nature, it is not the result of protection. You might as well expect to gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles, as to expect any general prosperity in any country by restricting and impeding trade.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What about the United States?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are the greatest free traders in the world.

Mr. GILLMOR. I admit the United States is a great country, but I do not admit that her prosperity is the result of her protective policy; she is not prosperous because she has protection any more than because she has got Mormonism. The United States is a rich country by nature, it is a country with vast natural resources and with an energetic people. It possesses a great variety of climate where any immigrant from Europe can find a genial climate. They have a cold climate where any person from the colder countries of Europe can come and find a climate suited to him. They have a greater variety of climate than any other country, and I contend that the condition of the United States is not at all due to her protective policy, but in spite of it. That is my honest conviction, and that opinion is shared I believe to-day by a majority of the electors in the United States.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. GILLMOR. Yes, I believe so. An evidence of this is found in the proposals for a reduction of their tariff. They have already free trade between the different States. Hon. gentlemen opposite offset that by stating that we have free trade here between the Provinces. Many of the most able men in the United States now believe that the present protective policy is not in the interests of the country, and they are fighting that battle out there, and this is an opportune time for Canada to raise her voice in support of this measure. Men there believe that for trade purposes this country is intended to be united with the United States, and that it is for our joint interest that we should be united. A very good evidence that a country is not prosperous is when its real estate is declining in value. I know there may be differences of opinion on that point, but in my opinion one of the best evidences that a country is not prosperous is when real estate is at a low price. With regard to my own county I could not consistently with my convictions say that we are in a depressed condition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GILLMOR. I cannot say so fairly, although I could go to some parts of my county and pick out small communities and small localities where property is very low. Just now I understand there is quite a "boom" in the price of real estate in the shire town of my county. I am exceedingly pleased with the fact, and I take this opportunity to state the fact that real estate, which has been much depressed for thirty years, is now quite in demand, and that much property has changed hands at a very marked increase over the price of the last quarter of a century. I am glad of it, and I give the Government the benefit of the fact. What has caused it I do not know. I do not believe it is the National Policy—I do not know exactly what it is. It may be that this town is expected to become the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that this may be the cause of the advance in real estate. It may be owing to the circumstance that this is a very pleasant summer resort, and perhaps on that account Americans have come in and invested there. Whether it is due to the expectation of its being the terminus of a great railway system on the Atlantic coast, or of a popular summer resort, it is equally the same to us; it is a benefit to those who have property to sell and a benefit to the county where the transactions are going on. But I could go to another part of the county, where I live myself, and point out real estate that is not worth half as much as it was thirty years ago; I could point out large districts where real estate is really of little or no value, where there are no purchasers for it. That, of course, is another view of the case. The present condition of things is due to the exodus from the country. No country like Canada can lose in a few years nearly 1,000,000 of men and women who were its pride and strength without suffering very materially in all its best interests. I am not disposed to blame any one for what I could not do better myself. I know how anxious hon. gentlemen on the Government benches and those who support them were to prevent this exodus. I am aware they have made every effort in their power to stop this out-going from the Dominion; I am also aware they have made every effort to bring immigrants to this country, and I am glad they have concluded that the plan has not been successful and has not been worth the expenditure. Hon. gentlemen promised, and I have sat and listened to all their speeches on the subject, that the National Policy would prevent this exodus; the First Minister stated both in the House and the country that he could do it and would do it. They have most signally failed, their National Policy has entirely failed; there can be no doubt the exodus has been as large and larger than it was before the National Policy was introduced.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. GILLMOR. The First Minister dissents from that proposition, but in my honest opinion they have failed entirely. Unrestricted free trade would check the exodus I believe, if it would not stop it. If you allow the young men and women to put their labor upon the soil and produce what this country can produce and have a free market with the United States, our young men will stop here more than they do under the National Policy. With regard to the state of trade in other parts of New Brunswick, I have no doubt that New Brunswick is upon the whole in a distressed condition. I know something about St. John as it is convenient to my residence, and therefore I believe that not only has the National Policy not helped St. John, but that it has interfered with its progress and has been a great injury to the trade of that city—not alone to its general trade, but a great injury to its manufactures which this National Policy was especially adopted in order to advance. Mr. Speaker, in regard to that city, before the National Policy was introduced we had about seven manufacturers of boots and shoes. To-day we have only one manufacturer of boots and shoes left in the city of St. John, and I have been informed, truthfully I believe, that that institution upon which some \$17,000 was expended, those holding the mortgages upon it are willing to dispose of their claim for \$4,000. The truth is the "slaughter" process we heard so much about before has been going on since the National Policy was introduced to a larger extent than when it came from the United States. The "slaughtering" process is coming from Montreal and Canada, and they have "slaughtered" six of those manufacturing out of existence, and left the remaining one on its last legs. I do not know whether it is running at all or not. That is the effect of the "slaughtering" process there. We heard a good deal of boasting about cotton manufactories in St. John. Before Confederation we had one cotton mill there, small it was, but it was prosperous before we had any connection with Canada under Confederation. I do not know what was invested originally in that mill, but under the stimulus of the National Policy it was increased to a capital of \$384,000, and that factory which cost \$334,000 is now in the hands of its creditors at a price of \$284,000. Here was a clear \$100,000 lost in that undertaking stimulated by the National Policy. Therefore the National Policy cannot be said to have worked very well in St. John. There was another cotton mill started under the fostering care of the National Policy, in which \$230,000 was invested, and that was bought not very long since for \$75,000. Here was another loss of \$150,000 capital sunk in this concern, and lost for ever to Canada. There is a total of \$250,000 lost to the cotton manufacturers of St. John. It is true the mills are working, and I hope they may succeed, but that cotton mill is now owned by those who work it, at a much less cost than it ever could be built for. One of the mills is owned by one of the most enterprising men in the Lower Provinces, perhaps I may say one of the most enterprising men in the Dominion of Canada—Mr. Gibson. He on his own account undertook to build a great cotton mill, and he has succeeded in erecting one of the finest institutions of the kind in the country. He has built the finest mill that has ever been built in Canada and for the least money, but in consequence of the stimulus under the National Policy he comes in competition with the "slaughter" cotton mills of Canada. The fact that these mills have come into the hands of their present owners at a very low cost, places Mr. Gibson at a disadvantage, he being subjected to unfair competition. I have no doubt of his success; I know the man, I know his energy and I know his independence. I am informed that he is not a member of the "combine," although the other institutions in St. John are members of the "combine," and endeavor to make their institutions pay by keeping up the price of cotton. Mr. Gibson is not a member of that "combine," he wants a fair field and no favor, that

Mr. GILLMOR.

is what I understand his principles to be. He is not afraid of competition, and a man like him need not be afraid of competition, but all he wants is a fair field, and a large field, and a fair chance for business. Mr. Gibson is not afraid of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. We have in my own county perhaps one of the finest mills in the Dominion of Canada, and a large amount of capital has been sunk in it. I believe it is now working successfully, but the first stockholders have lost quite a considerable sum. I was glad to find in the stores here that their cotton was considered of the very best class, as also is Mr. Gibson's cotton, both of which successfully compete with their rivals in the Ontario market. I am informed, not personally, but through conversation with my friends, that those mills have no fear of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. They feel that if they had opened up to them the markets of the United States with sixty millions of consumers they could hold their own, and they are not afraid of not meeting with success. I have heard a great deal said about the resources of Canada. I am a Canadian by birth, and my sympathies are with Canada, and her institutions, and her welfare. Canada, no doubt, has vast resources. We hear our friends on the other side speaking of Canada as starting on the race of nationality 20 years ago. What we see in Canada now is the result of 100 years' effort. It was Canada as much before Confederation as it is now. We are not a nation now, but I hope in time we will be. We have been on the march and making efforts to progress almost as long as many of the United States at all events, and the result is now that we have less than five millions people in Canada. I think we ought to have made greater progress than this, and I think we would have made greater progress if we had adopted free trade with the United States. Our experience of the ten years of the National Policy shows that it has been ten years lost to the country. I think there has been no progress of any extent since that time, and I think the National Policy is not at all performing what its promoters promised it would achieve. Mr. Speaker, our National Policy was introduced especially to encourage our infant industries, and that was the principal argument used at its introduction. I do not think that our industries have been promoted by it. Ten years have passed and I am honestly of the opinion that the manufacturing industries of Canada would have been in a healthier state to-day if the National Policy had never been introduced into this country. The argument used is that other industries must contribute in order to sustain and increase our infant manufacturing industries. I read the following incident a short time ago, which I thought might serve to illustrate how long they were to be considered infants:

"When Senator Broderick was shot by David Terry in San Francisco, a Dublin man wrote to an editor of a paper there claiming to be next of kin. He gave the date of his birth, which showed him to be 47 years of age, and he wound up by asking him to help a poor orphan who had lost both father and mother."

These industries remind me of that poor orphan who was 47 years old, and who wanted this man to help him in his infantile state. The best protectionist writers have come to the conclusion that it takes about three generations to bring these infant industries to maturity so that they can stand alone. If we have to maintain these institutions by the National Policy for three generations, I think it is rather more than we can afford to do in justice to other interests in the country. Now, notwithstanding all the efforts that have been made to prevent our people trading with our neighbors across the border, and notwithstanding a protective tariff in Canada that is very high, and a still more objectionable one on the other side of the line, our necessities have been so great that we have climbed over these barriers and have traded with our neighbors to the extent of \$35,000,000 or \$36,000,000 a year.

You cannot prevent our people trading with the United States; you may put on high tariffs, and protect this trade or that one, as you like, but the daily and hourly wants of the people of these two countries will overwhelm these obstacles. You do not diminish the trade between them, but you make it perplexing, annoying and discouraging by the obstructions you place upon it. You have a frontier of three or four thousand miles extending from the Pacific Ocean to the Bay of Fundy, and you are attempting to guard that frontier with custom house officers; yet you cannot prevent the people trading with each other. You are hunting up markets in other parts of the world, and you are passing by 65,000,000 of the best customers the world can give you. You are sending your commissioners to the South American republics, to Spain, and even to China and Japan, but the trade will not come. My hon. friend told you that all your trade in the world outside of the United States and England amounted to only \$7,000,000, and you are spending your money and time in vain to obtain customers in those countries. The best customers we have are our neighbors who are of the same kith and kin as ourselves; they are the only customers we have for a large surplus of our natural products. There are many of our products which we cannot send to England or consume at home, and we must find a market for them in the United States. I feel that I am speaking for the majority of the people in my country, and in the interest of the whole country, when I say that we must have that trade with them there. I do not justify smuggling; but I know the case of a man who went across the border to Eastport and bought two barrels of flour, took them home and ate them, and two years afterwards the Government fined him \$60, and the vessel that brought the flour \$100, because he did not go nine miles to a custom house and pay the duty on it. I repeat that I do not justify smuggling, but these people feel such a necessity for free trade that they do not consider they are violating a moral law, but only a law that is against their interests. You have detectives all along the frontier, at salaries of \$600 or \$700 a year, who are pocketing \$6,000 or \$7,000 a year, taken by a species of blackmail out of the pockets of our people who trade across the border. Our trade with the United States, in spite of all you have endeavored to do to prevent it, amounts to upwards of \$75,000,000 a year, and if we had had unrestricted trade with the United States during the operation of the National Policy, our trade would have been to-day twice that amount, and many of our young men would have remained at home to till the soil instead of laboring in a foreign country. If you will give us free trade with the United States, you will open up ten thousand channels of trade, you will open up those streams of commerce that you are retarding by your policy, and you will see Canada take a start onward. I do not exactly understand leaps and bounds to wealth; the natural way to become wealthy is to be industrious and economical, and I have no idea that we shall become immensely wealthy in a few years; but under free trade we would be in the way of getting wealth, our people would be growing richer, and the difficulties that are continually in our way would be removed. Talk about a growing trade with all these restrictions put on it! You might as well undertake to grow a strong and vigorous man by putting ligaments around his limbs and stopping the circulation of the blood, as to expect trade to prosper with all these restrictions and impediments in the way, no country ever did or ever will progress or prosper unless it enjoys free and unrestricted trade. It is the same with nations as with individuals. They depend on one another. Suppose the United States were to act upon the principle on which hon. gentlemen opposite desire that we should act, and suppose they would refuse to sell us their raw material, what would become of our industrial establishments, such as our cotton mills? Hon. gentlemen now

oppose unrestricted trade with the United States in order to build up our manufactures. Protection has produced here its legitimate and natural fruit. You undertake to tax the people in order to make them buy your goods at higher prices, so as to enrich the few who are engaged in manufacturing, and you have failed even in that. You do not take the money out of the pockets of foreigners, but out of the pockets of Canadians, and thus inflict great injustice on the majority of the people. Nations cannot afford to be independent of each other any more than individuals. This resolution opens up a grand prospect for Canada, and I believe that if the people were appealed to, they would endorse the policy which it embodies. With regard to the legitimate fruits of the National Policy, what do we see now in Canada after a few years of its working? It has produced its natural fruit. We have now "combines" and monopolies in all branches for the purpose of keeping up prices. We have been taught to pray to our heavenly Father for our daily bread, but we have now to pray to a combination of millers on oatmeal who keep up the prices and serve the people in any way they choose. Instead of having to pray to our heavenly Father, we have to pray to Mr. Drummond for our daily supply of sugar, and we have to pray to another "combine" for the cotton with which to clothe ourselves. And if we should get sick of this system of extortion and oppression, and wish to shuffle off this mortal coil, we have to get on our knees and beg Mr. Conners, or some other man in the rope business, to give us a few yards with which to hang ourselves. If hon. gentlemen will look to England for an example in trade matters instead of the United States, they would find an example worthy of imitation. If you want to ascertain the effects of protection go to England and see what protection did for her. She suffered all the horrors and degradation protection could produce; her ships lay idle at anchor in their harbors, her manufactures were closed, her looms were still and her spindles were resting. But she had men for the occasion who fought the battle of free trade nobly, and England to-day is the brightest example we can follow. England has laid the foundation in everything great and good. England has fought out the battle of personal freedom nobly, so that every Englishman is a freeman. I am loyal to the institutions of England. England has fought the battle of constitutional liberty, and every Englishman has a right to his opinion and the liberty of his person consistent with the laws and the good of society. England has fought out another great battle, and that is freedom of trade. She is an example to the wide world, and the result of her free trade policy is that she has the trade of all nations. I am proud of England. I am not loyal to that which is wrong. England has had upon the throne tyrants and imbeciles, and to those she has always had toadies. They had protection in Queen Elizabeth's time; there were guilds then one hundred years ago which are copied here to-day. Queen Elizabeth was proud of these "combines," and said they were the finest flowers in her garden. The Prime Minister here has the same system. He has imitated their policy of one hundred years ago, and the favored flowers in his garden are the monopolists and the "combines." Those are the flowers in his garden. Those are the sycophants. Yes, the rich have always had such men, and the poor have been neglected. They have got the ear of the Crown under such circumstances, but the poor have had no one to speak for them. These men have the ear of the Crown now. They had when they introduced the National Policy; but when the struggle for free trade arose in England, the people rose equal to the situation. There are men in England who are true to principle, and they fought out this battle, and a hard battle it was. Forty-three years ago I was there, and I became a free trader, and I contributed my mite to the bazaars that were held in every town

in England to raise funds to carry on that cause, and they succeeded because they were men of intelligence, men of integrity, men of honesty and of character. There have always been men in England to battle for the right and to battle for principles. I am loyal to England, I am loyal to the principles that influence England, and I am loyal to the men who have brought about those grand results; but above all I am loyal to the people. The poor have few friends. I am not a demagogue. I do not appeal to the people on that account, but I know that the toiling masses are those who suffer. When I was in England as a lad, in my leisure hours I used to walk about and talk to the men who were using the pickaxe and the shovel and the spade, and I learned from talking to them what their condition was, what their wages were, and that their food was meal and the cheapest kind of food. They told me over and over again that it was a rare thing for them to be able to afford meat once a week for themselves and their families.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Free trade.

Mr. GILLMOR. That was the condition of England under protection. After the battle of free trade was fought England soon began to improve. Her ships found something to do, her looms started again, her spindles resumed working, and she went on progressing from that time until this, not of course without occasional depression—it is the lot of mankind to have reverses—but her progress has been onward and upward ever since. That is only 43 or 44 years ago, only twice as long as we have been confederated. Up to that time the whole volume of English trade was something over eight hundred millions, while her annual trade is now three and a half billions of dollars, including exports and imports, and she is the admiration of the world. She is carrying her products to every country under the influence of free trade.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question. Go on.

Mr. GILLMOR. My friends need not be alarmed about me. Members of Parliament are supposed to be gentlemen, and I have always so endeavored to conduct myself in Parliament. In addition to that, I find by my notes that since that time the increase of England's wealth has been marvellous. I see that she has invested in foreign countries one billion five hundred million pounds sterling, and of that we have some five hundred million dollars in Canada. England has made that out of her free trade policy. Her investments all over the world, in consequence of the wealth she has gained under free trade, are bringing her in some sixty or seventy millions of pounds sterling annually. The wealth of England is the result of free trade, and any people who want to get wealthy must follow her example and must not expect to get wealthy under a system of protection. Of course, we cannot expect such great results, because our population is sparse, but we have homes here for many millions more. I do not expect to live to see the great increase in our population which I am satisfied would result from the adoption of free trade, the increase in our population and in our wealth which would result from making our trade as free as possible, consistently with the raising of our revenue.

Mr. MADILL. May I ask the hon. gentleman if the English manufactures were not built up under the highest protection in the world, before England adopted free trade?

Mr. GILLMOR. That shows very little knowledge of English history. England held to protection until her manufactures were ruined, until her factories were shut down, until her people were out of employment, and there were two millions of paupers in the kingdom without food. Although they are not entirely rid of the poor, the country took a start from the moment she adopted free trade and

Mr. GILLMOR.

has gone on until she is the pride of all nations, with a commerce greater than any other nation ever had. There is no doubt that there are some difficulties to be encountered if we succeed in getting this policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States adopted. There is the question of revenue, which is all important. We collect on our imports from the United States a little more than seven millions of dollars. That has got to be met. There is some difficulty and there may be some friction in regard to these matters, but, if the people import forty million dollars worth from the United States, and pay \$7,000,000 in duty, they pay \$47,000,000. Will the people be any poorer? Will they not have the \$7,000,000, and will they not be in just as good a position as they were before? There may be some difficulty in regard to the mode of obtaining it, but you will not deny that the whole \$47,000,000 are here, and if you have to get the \$7,000,000 out of the people, they will be just as able to pay it as if they paid it in customs revenue. The only difficulty is how to get it. I do not know how that is to be done; I am not going to trouble myself as to that. I want to know what the difficulties are; but, if our contention is right, we will get over the difficulties. I think, myself, that the plan suggested by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) is the best plan. If a part of that sum or the whole of it can be saved by economy, you will all agree with me that would be the better way. I think we can safely trust him in that respect, because, without making any invidious comparisons, I think he is about the ablest financier that I have seen in Canada since I have been in Parliament. I have no doubt about it. I do not wish to compliment men to their faces, but that is my impression. I have no trouble on that score. The people need have no fear of the bugbear of direct taxation. Taxation is always an unpleasant subject, and I suppose a Tory is just about as reluctant to pay as a Liberal. There are a good many ways of taxing the people, and of getting a revenue, but the usual way is a revenue tariff. In my humble opinion, of all things in the world that should be free, it is trade. I think it is a most impolitic and unfair way to get revenue by taxing trade, and trade should be as free as the wind that blows, or as the flow of the ocean; and then people will get the money and be able to contribute it for the support of the institutions that civilised life requires. That is the best mode, I think, of raising a revenue. The next best mode is that of a revenue tariff, levied in such a way and on such articles that the money should go into the Treasury. But the worst tariff that evil-minded men, the worst tariff that Satan ever suggested, is a protective tariff. It takes millions out of the people and puts little into the Treasury, but it puts a large amount into the pockets of those who are protected, and instead of paying \$30,000,000 of revenue tax in this country, I do not hesitate to say that the people are paying twice that amount. Now, how long do you suppose the consumers of Canada would put up with a protective tariff, if they really understood it? Suppose that instead of collecting your customs duty on the goods before they go into the store, you changed your policy and collected on the goods when they came out of the store. Suppose a customs officer, instead of collecting the dues on the imports, would stand in a retail store and collect it there. Well, a customer would come in and he would make a purchase, and when he came to leave the custom officer would step up and say: What have you purchased? The customer would reply: Twenty pounds of sugar, for which I paid \$1. The officer would say: Then you must pay me 80 cents before I can allow you to take it home. Then the people would realise how much they pay, then they will begin to enquire what this all means. But your system now is to pluck the goose, to take all the feathers off; she don't squeal, she don't make a noise at all, but she stands shivering from cold and does not know who in the deuce

took the feathers off her. Let them know how they are being taxed in this country, and your National Policy would vanish like thin air. Now, Mr. Speaker, the question of loyalty has been discussed. I think it is a great mistake to have introduced it into the discussion of this question at all. Now, I have not felt offended at anything hon. gentlemen may have said. I thought it was silly—I thought it was wishy-washy nonsense. Yes, and I am satisfied that your sensible men on that side of the House thought the same. I think it is not an indication of your loyalty to begin here mouthing it as though it was oozing out from your fingers ends. It is all nonsense to talk about it. I suppose one party in this House is just about as loyal as the other, and you are no more loyal by talking about it than if you were to hold your tongues. I should advise you to hold your tongues about loyalty. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this tariff I had made up my mind not to refer to any speeches on the other side, but there is one gentleman from the county of Annapolis (Mr. Mills), who took a very singular view of this tariff of ours. He had discovered that it was just the tariff for a poor man who need not pay any duties if he did not buy anything. It was a wonderful discovery. But it was equally good to the rich, and if he did not choose to buy anything, he would not have to pay any duty either. I think if any one tried to live in this country on what he could get without paying taxes on it, he would either freeze to death or starve to death in a very short time. I do not know anything that is worth having that is not taxed. When this National Policy was being discussed, I had a daughter at home, and she was reading over the things that were taxed, and she wrote up to me and said: she could not find anything that was not taxed. She said: "Father, our Jersey cow has got a little calf—is that taxed?" I wrote back to quiet her fears, and told her that there was no tax upon a Jersey calf. Yet the hon. member for Annapolis says this is a very good tariff for the poor. He says they need not buy jewellery, and they need not buy optical instruments, nor perfumery, nor silks, nor jams, nor jellies, nor fancy soaps. He says that the poor man does not want any perfumed soap. They can make their soap out of lye and soap grease, and soft soap is good enough for them. I wonder if he would say that to one of his constituents down in Annapolis if he went to solicit their votes. He would have to use some little soft soap himself before he could convince them they had no right to use perfumed soap if they could get it. He says they do not want any jam or jellies. O, no! He wants a tariff under which they cannot have any jams or jellies. He thinks that molasses and dried apples are good enough for them. The next item is musical instruments. The poor do not want musical instruments; such is the opinion of the hon. gentleman. Are they to be forever toiling from generation to generation, their children being debarred from learning to sing and play. Is that a good tariff for the poor, one which debars them from the pleasures and gratifications of life? Are they to toil on like cattle to be used by hon. gentlemen and work for them? They are not to have musical instruments. Why? Have not the poor man's children a right, laboring and toiling as they do, to become educated and accomplished if they can do it? It affords me much pleasure in travelling through my county to find a poor family who by industry and prudence have saved from their earnings sufficient to buy a musical instrument. Yet according to the hon. gentleman's theory this is a good tariff for them because they do not need those things and need not buy them? I hope the hon. gentleman's heart is better than his head. If those are his sentiments he is as cruel as the man who would make his ass bear his burdens, and because he could exist on thistles he would turn him out to eat thistles by the wayside. If he would treat the poor in that way, who perform the labor and produce the wealth of the Dominion,

51

it is not worthy of any man in Canada. There is another set of asses called jackasses, who perform no labor. They live on clover, hay and oats, but the ass that toils can live on thistles. Next we come to watches. The poor need not buy watches for they do not need them, and yet the toiling masses are the foundation and source of wealth in Canada. What are our exports from the Dominion? They are the products of hard labor, of the toil of the fisherman, the farmer and the laborer; they produce all that goes out of the country to bring back wealth to support the Government and the lazy fellows who will not work. The working classes all over the world are tethered, they can go just so far, they can eat the length of their rope and see green pastures before them which they cannot reach—and accordingly they are dissatisfied.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. MITCHELL. I think this is very unfair to the hon. member who does not very often trouble the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a question of order; and I think when I see so many white chokers, there has been too much Rideau Hall business to-night. The hon. member for Charlotte has a right to a hearing.

Mr. SPEAKER. The members will please keep order. What is the question of order?

Mr. MITCHELL. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are disturbing the representative from Charlotte, and he has a right to a fair hearing. There has been too much white choker business about it, too much Rideau Hall about it. Go on, you will get a fair hearing.

Mr. GILLMOR. I do not complain very much. It is evident hon. gentlemen opposite do not like what I say; I can sit quietly and listen to what they say and they might return the compliment, I will not speak longer, as I have spoken too long already.

Mr. MITCHELL. Talk as long as you like and you will get a hearing.

Mr. GILLMOR. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said there are fair traders in England, that the country was built up under a protective system and all such nonsense. I admit there is some such movement there, but it will be of short duration.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would ask hon. members to stop throwing papers. It is not a very nice or a very dignified practice, and it is one that should be stopped.

Mr. GILLMOR. I will stop, and then hon. gentlemen will be satisfied.

Mr. MITCHELL. Stop when you are done and not before.

Mr. GILLMOR. I was going to make a remark in regard to the speech delivered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, which, without wishing to make invidious comparisons, I must say was the best delivered on the other side of the House. That hon. gentleman said:

"It is the triumph of man to overcome the disabilities which nature throws in his way. It is the triumph of modern science, than which nothing has been more wonderful in the history of the world to overcome geographical difficulties, to overcome the disabilities of distance, to overcome the obstruction of physical difficulties, and to overcome them in the interest of the unity of countries and in the interest of the spread of commerce."

Those are fine sentiments, and with his eloquence he made them appear very fine. It was an excellent argument for a free trader to use, but it was perfectly nonsensical for a protectionist. When you go to work to tunnel the Alps in order to facilitate trade and commerce and overcome natural obstacles between nations it is absurd to place German

and Italian artificial obstructions on each side. Such has been the result of all that you have expended to overcome distances and to overcome time, because those natural obstacles on which you spent so much money to remove were no more obstacles than the artificial obstacles which you have now. The Germans and Italians, who spent millions to tunnel the Alps to facilitate trade, were fools to place taxes upon the trade, which were just as much obstacles as the Alps were before they were tunnelled. I will not trouble you any longer. I have given this question my best consideration, and I think it will be to the interest of Canada to have unrestricted reciprocity in the natural products, and also in our manufactures, with the United States. There are difficulties connected with it but they will be overcome and it will not affect our loyalty in the slightest degree. No man cares about loyalty when he is buying or selling, he cares not for his nationality, he cares not for his creed or color, the simple barter or exchange of one thing for another has nothing to do with those questions. England is just as loyal as she was before she opened her ports to the world. We shall be just as loyal to our religion and our country when we have free trade as we are now. I am satisfied we will not suffer in our patriotism or in our loyalty to Canada or in our loyalty to England. England has fought out many a battle and there is only one blot on her escutcheon. Let her give the right of self-government to Ireland and when that is done, England will be the brightest nation on the face of the earth. With these few remarks I beg to state that I intend to vote for the motion of my hon. friend for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the amendment moved by my hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones).

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. (Translation.) At this late hour of the morning, I have no intention of long detaining the House. But on so important a question as this which is before us, occupying not only the attention of the House, but also that of the whole country, and which, according to the hon. the Secretary of State, is destined to form an epoch in the parliamentary history of Canada, I feel that it is my duty, as representative of the most important counties of the Province of Quebec, to state the reasons which are going to actuate my vote on this question. I do not purpose entering far into the merits of the question, which has been under discussion for nearly three weeks, and even if I were to repeat the figures and statistics which have been set forth, they would add no new interest to the debate. I listened attentively to the remarks of the hon. the Secretary of State. His style of argument chiefly consisted in the attempt to place the Opposition in contradiction with itself on this important subject. I fancy it will not be difficult for me to show that, if there were contradiction in the premises, it is assuredly not on this side of the House. I could prove this from the arguments employed even in this very debate, but I prefer to go a little further back and take up certain assertions made by the hon. the Secretary of State on the position held by the hon. leader of the Opposition and his friends in the Province of Quebec, on reciprocity, protection and free trade; whenever these topics became public questions of interest to the future destinies of the Dominion of Canada. The hon. the Secretary of State would have us believe that he was the first to promote the cause of protection to our manufactures in the Province of Quebec; that, later, the hon. leader of the Opposition followed in his wake, and finally that, in 1878, the hon. leader of the Opposition and his friends forsook that policy to take up that of free trade. I believe it is easy to demonstrate that this assertion rests on the facts such as took place at that period. To show this, I have only to read to the House the report of the meetings of the Dominion Board of Trade, and the meetings of the representatives of that Board of Trade with the

Mr. GILLMOR.

Boards of Trade of the United States in 1871, 1872 and 1873, when these questions arose for the first time. I read in the *Negociant Canadien*, of the 21st December, 1871, the following observations made at the meeting of the National Board of Trade of the United States:

"Between the United States and the British Colonies, adjacent in the North, commercial relations should naturally be as close and extensive as those existing, within the limits of the Union, between the several States or any individual group beyond the sea. Indeed, the natural relations between Canada and our own States of the North, the North-West and the East are such that they are more intimate in few States of our Union. More than one-half of the line of demarcation of the two territories is formed by a grand natural outlet of business communication by the finest and most useful channel of traffic in the American Continent. The lakes, which mark our boundaries, bind us rather than they sever us from the foreign country lying on the other side; while, in fact, the great river by which their waters flow into the ocean only adds to the closeness of the relations between the two countries. The Canadian peninsula between the lakes is set as an angle in American territory. It is through them that lies the shortest route between our North-West and Eastern States. Geographically, in the natural structure of that energetic zone of the continent, lying between the 40th and 46th parallels, the Province of Ontario holds the position of a key to the trade between the East and the West."

This speaker proceeds in his remarks to explain in fuller detail the advantageous positions held by the channel of communication of the St. Lawrence for the products of the western United States. The words were uttered by Mr. Leonard, special agent appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury, in pursuance of a resolution of Congress, to enquire into the condition and extent of the commerce of the United States, with the several British colonies of British North America. The following is the resolution definitely adopted, a little later, at the Boston meeting:—

"The following propositions were submitted verbally by the chairman to the representatives of the Dominion. They are given for the information of the Board and its members:—

"1. The introduction free of all manufactured articles and products of Canada into the United States, and *vice versa*.

"2. The adoption of uniform laws of the two countries for the imposition of unjust duties, and for interior taxation, the amount collected to be placed in a common treasury and divided between the two Governments in an equitable manner.

"3. The admission of Canadian vessels on American registers and to all the commercial privileges of the American coasts and abroad.

"4. The widening by the Dominion of its canals, and the improvement of the navigation of the St. Lawrence, besides the assistance which she shall bestow on the building of a fast international railway; the Americans to enjoy the same rights as the Canadians, and the latter the same rights as the Americans to similar public works in the United States."

It follows that even at the above period, not only was the renewal of a reciprocity treaty under consideration, but commercial union itself was discussed. The proposition before the House does not at all aim at or include commercial union, but it is simply an expression of opinion in favor of an unlimited reciprocity treaty. This is precisely the position taken by the Canadian delegates at the several meetings where this subject came up for debate, either at the meetings of the Dominion Board of Trade, or those of the representatives of both countries. Before giving the deliberations of the Dominion Board of Trade, and citing the resolutions adopted therein, I must state the results of the meeting and the names of those who represented the divers interests of commerce at that meeting. They are Messrs. Fairweather, of St. John, N. B.; J. Watson, of Hamilton; W. H. Howland, of Toronto; John Carruthers, of Kingston; John McLennan, Thomas Rimmer, John Young and W. J. Patterson, of Montreal. I find in the *Negociant Canadien*, of the 25th January, 1882, the following report of the meeting held by the Dominion Board of Trade on the 17th January, 1882:—

"The result of the meeting of the National Board of Trade of the United States was the resolution to address a memorial to Congress with prayer to appoint a commission charged to meet Canadian Commissioners and negotiate the fundamental principles of a new treaty of commercial reciprocity. It was suggested that this treaty should be founded on free trade in national and manufactured products; the admission of Canadian vessels to American registration, freedom of coasting, and the

widening of the Canadian canals, which would be very profitable to both countries.

"Our delegates, however, although desirous of reviewing the former Reciprocity Treaty, could not admit the possibility of free trade of manufactured goods, with our present high American tariff. The following are the resolutions adopted at the St. Louis Convention:—

"Resolved.—That the Executive Council receive instruction to demand of Congress to provide for the nomination of a commission charged to meet a number of Canadian Commissioners, if the Government of that country decide to appoint any, with the view of negotiating a treaty between Great Britain and the United States for the encouragement of commerce between Canada and the American Union, founded on the following principles or several others equally broad and well defined:

1st. The free entry of all manufactured articles and products of Canada to the United States, and *vice versa*.

2nd. The adoption of both countries of uniform laws for the imposition of import duties and internal taxation, the amount collected to be placed in a common treasury and divided between the two Governments in an equitable manner."

On the 18th January, 1872, the best business men of Montreal—and it will be enough to name Mr. Hugh McLennan—made the same objection as is made to day, that if we insisted on a reciprocity treaty we should be led to annexation. The same cry is used at present, and the charge of disloyalty is superadded. The following is what Mr. McLennan said, according to the *Negociant Canadien*:

"Mr Hugh McLennan thinks that the objection is worthless, and that Canada is quite able to maintain itself alongside of the United States without a Customs union. The cry of disloyalty sounds very much like whistling to keep up one's courage. The difficulty about the Customs union is simply that it is not understood."

It was understood that if commercial relations with the United States were established on the broadest, most equitable and most advantageous foundation, the question of annexation would have nothing to do with it, and could not constitute a serious objection. I think I have clearly shown, Mr. Speaker, that, so far back as 1871 and 1872, this question of reciprocity was discussed by the business representatives of the Dominion, and that they tried to come to an understanding on the subject with the business representatives of the United States. Since then, what has been the policy—if I may call it such—or the behaviour of the business representatives of the Dominion of Canada? Listen to what the editor of the *Negociant Canadien* said, on the 1st February, 1872. At the close of a long article on reciprocity he writes:

"A complete reciprocity treaty founded on the uniformity of tariffs.

"This solution furnishes every advantage without any of the inconveniences of a Customs union and of annexation."

"For our part, we are heartily in favor of it."

Following the progress of facts and incidents, we find, on the 21th June, 1872, that at the end of a long debate on this same question, this conclusion was arrived at, as stated again in the *Negociant Canadien*:

"It follows, therefore, that in the interest of manufactures and agriculture, two points are requisite:

"Protection on the one hand.

"A free and more extensive market on the other.

"Now, all these conditions would be combined together, and all interests conciliated by the negotiation of a reciprocity treaty formed on a uniform tariff. We have on several occasions treated this question, but we do not tire of it, so plain and conclusive does the matter appear to our minds. We are convinced that a reciprocity treaty is absolutely necessary to revive our agricultural resources, and set them in the way of profitable returns. Manufacturers tell us that a higher tariff would tend to multiply our manufactures, give employment to a large number of people who would otherwise emigrate to the United States, and place our production on a par with our consumption. Finally, our trade has everything to gain by multiplying its relations with our neighbors, dropping the navigation laws banishing our vessels from American waters, and obtaining the free navigation of the American lakes and canals.

All these advantages would be found grouped together in a complete reciprocal treaty with the United States, and as the latter can clearly not grant us that boon unless we adopt fiscal laws identical with theirs, it is plain that we should stand ready to accept that political solution which would settle all difficulties.

"What we here demand would give:—

"1st. The vast American market to our agriculture.

"2nd. To our industries their requisite protection.

"3rd. To our trade an immense new field, which it would be sure to further develop.

"American trade is held in such esteem that Canada does not grudge spending millions for the widening of her canals. If, embarrassed as she is, she finds it so important, what would it be if she were free?"

"Let therefore, the friends of Canada take up this watchword:—

"Conclusion of a reciprocity treaty with the United States founded on a uniform tariff."

"If that will not do, it is plain that Parliament will have to accept the suggestions of the Manufacturers' Committee, inasmuch as so important an interest cannot be let suffer much longer."

The consequence to be drawn is that, at this epoch, the object of the business men of the Dominion, in view of the stagnation of trade, was to obtain a full reciprocal treaty with the United States. The adjective "unlimited" is used in the motion at present before the House, but that makes no difference and the meaning remains the same. Let us continue to follow the course of events, although I am aware that, at this advanced hour of the night, the subject is less attractive than it would be in the initial stages of the debate. Reference has been made to the position occupied on this question by certain public men, in 1872, and the hon. the Secretary of State showed practically his own position at that time, throwing out the insinuation that he was the first to speak of the renewal of the treaty of reciprocity or of a policy favorable to our manufacturers. Well, Mr. Speaker, the facts are these. In 1871, the National party was established at Montreal, and one of the first articles of its programme was the renewal of reciprocal trade with the United States. This was incidental protection granted to our manufactures. What portion was taken by the hon. the Secretary of State and his friends, in the elections which took place in the district of Montreal? Sir George Cartier was a candidate for Montreal East, and the Hon. John Young, candidate for Montreal West, the latter being backed by the National party, and by the Opposition of that period. Mr. L. A. Jetté was Sir George Cartier's opponent in Montreal East. The following is the circular addressed to the Hon. John Young by Mr. John J. McLaren, Secretary of the Manufacturers' Association of Montreal.

"MONTREAL, 30th July, 1872.

"SIR,—At a meeting of the Council of the Manufacturers' Association, held on the 27th instant, the following resolution was adopted:

"That Messrs. Henry Lyman, E. K. Green, W. Rodden, A. W. Ogilvie, and H. R. Ives, with the secretary, form a committee, instructed to correspond with the parliamentary candidates of this city, in order to ascertain how far each of them, if elected, is disposed to co-operate toward realising the aims of this association—the encouragement of the industrial interests of the country. This association comprises nearly all the great manufacturers and contractors of the city, united for the object set down in the constitution, a copy of which is herewith transmitted to you. In the belief that the progress and greatness of the land essentially require the accomplishment of this object, its members are desirous of ascertaining the views of those who claim their vote, namely, whether, in the event of their election, they would be prepared to promote such legislation as would encourage our manufactures, and thus furnish more constant and lucrative work to the workingmen, insure a national market to national production and increase the population and wealth of the Dominion. Wherefore it is that I have received instructions from the aforesaid committee to request you to tell us in the plainest possible language, and for the information of the association, your views on the three following points:—

"1. How far do you approve the principles of protection as applied to the country and opposed to those of free trade?"

"2. How would you be prepared to go in furtherance of the aims of this association for the development of the industrial interests of Canada? and

"3. What legislative measures would you recommend in relation to these principles?"

"An early reply would much oblige,

"Yours, &c,

"JOHN J. McLAREN,

"Asst. Secy. Manuf. Assoc., Montreal."

Here is the chief part of the Honorable John Young's reply:

"What is wanted in Canada for the development of its manufacturing industries is a wider market, which we can obtain by a reciprocity treaty with the United States. The union of several Provinces under the control of a single central Government, guaranteeing the free entry of each other's products, has given and will give rise to excellent results, but it is indubitable that they will be only following the progress of our population. Wherefore it is that, without neglecting anything that might

promote our manufacturing industries, I trust that my past efforts may prove a warrant for the future, and that I will secure the support and confidence of the members of your association, as candidate for the representation of the western division of Montreal, inasmuch as it will be for me a pleasure and satisfaction to do all in my power in the interests of your manufactories."

The position taken by Mr. George A. Drummond, the Hon. John Young's adversary, was not so clearly defined on this question, and the result of the election, in spite of all the efforts of the hon. Secretary of State's eloquence, was his defeat by a majority of over 800 in the Tory division of Montreal city. As to the position of Mr. L. A. Jetté, candidate against Sir George Cartier, his replies to the Manufacturers' Association were so satisfactory and perspicuous, that he was returned by an overwhelming majority in the eastern division of Montreal against Sir George Cartier, who was supported by the oratorical talent of the hon. the Secretary of State, but had not given satisfactory answers to the Manufacturers' Association. If our adversaries attempt to make the world believe that there was contradiction among the members of the party to which I belong, I reply, backed by demonstrable facts, that there was no such contradiction, but that, on the other hand, the contradiction lies with the members on the other side of the House who, on this question, followed a policy of expedients and nothing else. These gentlemen would never enter upon any formal engagements; they would never define their position in unequivocal terms, but they adopted a policy of opportunism and shaped their conduct according to events. We now come to 1878. In consequence of a serious crisis not only in Canada—inasmuch as Canadian trade, at that period, was not considerable to affect the entire world—but in the United States and the other nations of North and South America, our natural market was closed upon us and we found ourselves in the most grievous financial straits. The people naturally listened to those who professed to have a remedy for all their ills, a method to favor agriculture, promote manufactures, procure work for the laboring man and furnish a panacea which would give satisfaction to everybody. It is not at all surprising that owing to the excitement of the times and the prejudices that were played upon, the Mackenzie Government should have been wrecked. Well, Mr. Speaker, this remedy was applied, and, from year to year, Parliament has been asked to increase the duty on this or that article for the benefit of this or that party. And this evening we heard the hon. representative of Argenteuil (Mr. Wilson) depict the system of protection in most gorgeous colors, thus favoring the imposition of duties for the benefit of industrial manufactures. Up to the election of the hon. gentleman from Argenteuil, in 1887, the Government had neglected the protection of a certain industry which was in a nascent state—I refer to the tissue and paper bag manufactures. Immediately after the return of the hon. member, during the Session of last year, the duties on these articles were brought up to 35 per cent. I quite understand that the hon. gentleman wants us to get up to the top of a high mountain to contemplate the blessings of an unlimited protection. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not all in the hon. gentleman's position; we are not interested in a paper factory, as is the case with him; we have not the benefit of 35 cents duty for our particular behalf, and hence cannot see things in the same light. All that we see is that unmitigated protection has been granted to certain manufacturers, who are few in number, to the detriment of the great number. Sir, the general mind of the Dominion of Canada has been specially interested in the debate that is going on in this House. The manufacturers have got interested in it, and I make bold to say that there is not a solitary manufacturer of standing who can be pointed to us as opposed to reciprocity with the National Policy. On the contrary, Sir, manufacturers like Mr. Boas, of St. Hyacinthe, Mr. Thomas Willet, of Chambly,

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.

one of the greatest woollen and flannel manufacturers in the Dominion of Canada, have faith sufficient in their labor, industry and ability to be able to say: "Give us the American market, give us a market of 60,000,000 of people, and we shall rest content. We are as enlightened as the Americans; our manual labor is as favorable as theirs; we can turn out goods as cheaply as they can in the United States, and we stand prepared to encounter their competition in the different manufactures which we work." But, as I understand perfectly well, certain manufacturers wish to take advantage of a high tariff in order to make money as rapidly as possible, at the expense of the large majority I repeat that there has been no contradiction, in this regard, on the part of the Opposition. We have always shared the same course, but have not cared to imitate our hon. friends on the other side of the House, in the extremes to which they would have dragged us, and then they pretended that we were out-and-out free traders. It behoves us, Mr. Speaker, to understand the meaning of free trade. A person may be a free trader on principle, which I regard as the soundest and most equitable, which ought to be generally accepted. But to have free trade in Canada, the country with which we trade should be free-trading as well. We are thus debarred from unlimited free trade. We require revenue to meet our expenses. We should have what is called incidental protection, that is protection sufficient to promote our manufactures to a reasonable extent so as to secure a reasonable income to those who invest their money in those ventures. It certainly does not prove, however, that there should be unlimited protection to manufacturers, nor that the latter should be enabled to combine together to reduce production or sell at prices settled beforehand, and saddle heavy fines on those among them who break any of the rules which these associations have drawn up. Protection, as understood by the hon. members of the right, has been tried and not found able to remedy the evils under which the country suffered. This leads me to the conclusion that we should go further, withdraw the duties, and conclude a reciprocity treaty with a neighboring country containing a population of 60,000,000, and opening to us a natural market. This is the logical stand taken by the Opposition on this question, and it is based on principles and ideas formerly expressed by the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Chapleau) and the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. White). To prove this and to show further that if there has been contradiction, it lies with our adversaries, I will quote from an article of the *Montreal Gazette*, of the 12th October, 1885, a paper under the directions and inspired by the hon. the Minister of the Interior:

"It is an historical fact that the policy of protection was supported by the Conservative party, in the election of 1878, only as a means to push forward the relations of commercial reciprocity with the United States. In 1878, when both parties were in favor of commercial reciprocity, the Conservative party alone adopted a policy calculated to achieve this result. On the first opportunity, after the general elections, the Conservative Government, desirous of manifesting their view of sympathy in favor of reciprocity, laid down in our statutes an invitation to the American Congress to admit free our natural products in exchange for theirs."

And on the 26th October, 1885, the following appeared in the same paper:—

"Meantime, we have to put to exercise the virtue of patience, in the hope that a feeling favorable to reciprocity may yet predominate in Congress, and if we fail in this, Canada will have to set to work and find other means of developing her trade."

Where is the proof, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of which the hon. the member of the Interior (Mr. White) is a member, ever attempted to govern a reciprocity treaty or even more extended commercial relations with the United States. It was not done; it was not even attempted. And yet, when the question is taken up by the

Opposition in this Parliament, its members are accused of being disloyal and annexationists. If it were allowed to be merry in so serious a discussion, I should be inclined to say that the replies made by the adversaries are very much like that which a certain party made to a question as to whether his brother could sing. "No," was the answer, "but he can run fast." As if that was any response to the query asked. The Opposition speak of reciprocity, and they are answered with taunts about annexation and disloyalty. I judge, Sir, that the people will understand perfectly the bearings of this question after discussion here. They will understand that the Government have not returned the answer expected of them, neither from the lips of the hon. Secretary of State, nor from the hon. the Minister of the Interior. They perceive, on the other hand, that the hon. the Finance Minister (Sir Charles Tupper) took upon himself to make an answer that is equivalent to approval of the stand which we are now taking. He undertook to refute the arguments of some of his own partisans, and it will suffice for me to mention the speech of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), who went to the trouble of enumerating certain articles which should not be entered free, because that would ruin a considerable branch of trade with which he is well acquainted. Two days later the hon. the Finance Minister declared to the House that these same articles were going to be admitted free, and that negotiations were going to be opened with the United States for the admission of other products, in consideration of certain advantages which the United States were prepared to give the Canadian Government. As this debate does not take place only for the interest of the members, but also in the interest of the people, it is important that all the facts be made known, in order that arguments may be supplied to those who favor reciprocity, and to enlighten the whole people which is likewise partial to the scheme. For this question is going to be raised in all the electoral contests that will take place from the present time till the general elections. It was brought up in two counties of the Province of Quebec within the past few days, and no one can pretend that the Province of Quebec, as far as circumstances allowed, rendered a verdict in behalf of a reciprocity treaty. I was not specially engaged in the contest of Missisquoi, but the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) was so engaged, and he was bitterly attacked by the ministerial papers for the speech he delivered at Farnham in favor of the Reciprocity Treaty. The result of this election was that, in the most Conservative portions of the county, where the Liberal candidate had no hope of a majority, but expected to be beaten by quite a vote, the number of his adherents had so increased that he was raised to the head of the poll in a county that has always been Tory, and which had carried at the last general elections by our late lamented friend, Mr. Clayes, on account of divisions in the Tory party. Another election took place last Tuesday, in an essentially French-Canadian county, that of L'Assomption. There the question had been squarely laid down by the leader of the Opposition, between the adversaries of a reciprocity treaty and its champions. The hon. leader of the Opposition asked the Conservatives of L'Assomption to support the claims of our friend, Mr. Gauthier, as the members of the Opposition favored a reciprocity treaty with the United States. The subject was fairly laid before the electors and the contest hinged upon it.

Mr. GIROUARD. (Translation.) Will my hon. friend allow me to interrupt him. On nomination day, I was at L'Assomption, and asked Mr. Gauthier whether he would support Sir Richard Cartwright's resolution, and he replied that he had not examined the question and was not prepared to express an opinion.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. (Translation.) You were not on polling day.

Mr. GIROUARD. (Translation.) I was there on nomination day, and heard Mr. Gauthier's answer with my own ears.

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE. (Translation.) The electors who voted for Mr. Gauthier did so on that issue. What if Mr. Gauthier was not prepared to decide on the question on nomination day? Has the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) always expressed the same opinion on the same question? I repeat that, on the day of the first meeting, when the leader of the Opposition spoke, the question of reciprocity was openly set before the people, as favored by the Opposition, and the most advantageous to farmers. The discussion was taken up on that issue by the friends of the Government, such as Mr. Bisailon, Mr. Joseph Tassé, editor and proprietor of the leading Government paper in Montreal, Mr. Desjardins, local member for Montmorency, the representative of Provencher (Mr. Royal). All these gentlemen took up that issue, and the arguments addressed before the intelligent electors of the L'Assomption county were and the same as those employed in this House, namely, that it was disloyal to favor reciprocal trade with the United States, and that to ask it was tantamount to a plea for annexation. One speaker went so far as to repeat the absurdity, which has been stated even here, that if there was a duty of 20 per cent. on horses exported to the United States, of 10 cents a pound on butter, of \$2 a ton on hay, it was not the Canadian exporter who paid cost on that amount, but the purchaser. We thereupon asked those gentlemen if it was in virtue of that principle that a certain number of Canadian hay merchants are at present negotiating with the American Government to get reimbursed for the surplus of duties which they paid the American Customs, during five years, on the export of certain farming products. Of course there was no reply to this query, and the listeners quite understood on what side common sense leaned, and where their own interest lay. In this county where, in February, 1887, Mr. Gauthier was returned by a majority of only 21, on the 3rd April, 1888, in the same conditions, under the same circumstances, but with a policy strongly defined by the Opposition, he carried the day with a majority of nearly 100. The proof is here patent that, in the Province of Quebec at least, the question of reciprocity is well understood. It was always understood and will always be understood. The electors understand that if we can manage to have a reciprocity treaty with the United States; if we can obtain wider commercial resolutions than we have now, there is no sensible, independent man who will pretend that such an event would not turn to the good of Canadian trade. We are told that the majority of the House will not concur in these views, and that the proposition will be defeated by a strong majority. That does not signify, Mr. Speaker. The Opposition set their opinion before the public, that the public may discuss it and pronounce judgment thereon. An effort is being made to have the electors understand in order that, when the day of suffrage comes around, they may decide for themselves whether it is worth while to favor a reciprocity treaty which has been demanded in a special manner, and advocated not only by the members of the Liberal party, but by the members of the Conservative party, for over twenty years. I might continue, Mr. Speaker, to point out the effect which this policy of the Opposition may have, from the standpoint of the Dominion of Canada, but at this hour of the night I shall no longer abuse the patience of the House. I cannot resume my seat, however, without drawing the attention of the House to the fact that, in combatting this policy, the attempt is made to turn into ridicule the attitude of the Liberal party therein. Our adversaries are displeased to find that the Opposition

will henceforth have a programme perfectly well defined, and that this question will be squarely placed before the electors of the Dominion of Canada, between the party that does not want reciprocal trade with the United States, and the party that is favorable thereto—favorable to a policy which will give to the trade of the Dominion the resources of which it stands in need, to rise from the state of stagnation in which it is at present, and which will cause to progress and enter upon a brilliant career of prosperity.

Mr. McCULLA. I understand that an arrangement had been come to that the debate should have been brought to a close after the speech of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor). If that arrangement is to be carried out now, I shall reserve my remarks for another occasion.

Mr. TROW. Our friend who has just taken his seat was not aware of the arrangement made, otherwise he would have been the last man to attempt to violate the rule of the party.

House divided on amendment to the amendment of Mr. Jones:

That in any arrangement between Canada and the United States providing for the free importation into each country of the natural and manufactured productions of the other, it is highly desirable that it should be provided that during the continuance of any such arrangement the coasting trade of Canada and of the United States should be thrown open to vessels of both countries on a footing of complete reciprocal equality, and that vessels of all kinds built in the United States or Canada may be owned and sailed by the citizens of the other and be entitled to registry in either country and to all the benefits thereto appertaining.

YEAS:
Messieurs

Amyot,	Fiset,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Fisher,	Mills (Bothwell),
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Mitchell,
Barron,	Gillmor,	Mulock,
Bécharde,	Godbout,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Guay,	Perry,
Borden,	Hale,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Préfontaine,
Bowman,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Brien,	Jones (Halifax),	Robertson,
Burdett,	Kirk,	Rowand,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Landerkin,	Ste. Marie,
Casey,	Lang,	Scrifer,
Casgrain,	Langelier (Montm'cy),	Semple,
Charlton,	Langelier (Quebec),	Somerville,
Chouinard,	Laurier,	Sutherland,
Davies,	Lister,	Trow,
De St. Georges,	Livinston,	Turoot,
Dessaint,	Lovitt,	Watson,
Doyon,	Macdonald (Huron),	Weldon (St. John),
Edgar,	McIntyre,	Welsh,
Eisenhauer,	McMillan (Huron),	Wilson (Elgin).—67.
Ellis,		

NAVS:
Messieurs

Audet,	Gigault,	Montague,
Bain (Soulanges),	Girouard,	Montplaisir,
Baker,	Gordon,	O'Brien,
Bell,	Grandbois,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Bowell,	Guillet,	Perley (Ottawa),
Boyle,	Haggart,	Porter,
Brown,	Hall,	Prior,
Burns,	Henderson,	Putnam,
Cameron,	Hesson,	Reid,
Cargill,	Hickey,	Riopel,
Carling,	Hudspeth,	Robillard,
Carpenter,	Ives,	Roome,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Jamieson,	Ross,
Chapleau,	Jonas,	Royal,
Chisholm,	Jones (Digby),	Rykert,
Cimon,	Kirkpatrick,	Scarth,
Cochrane,	Labelle,	Shanly,
Cockburn,	Labrosse,	Small,
Colby,	Landry,	Smith (Ontario),
Corby,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Sproule,
Coatigan,	Laurie,	Stevenson,
Coughlin,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Taylor,
Coulombe,	Macdowall,	Temple,
Couture,	McCarthy,	Thérien,
Curran,	McOulla,	Thompson,

Mr. PRÉFONTAINE.

Daly,	McDonald (Victoria),	Tisdale,
Daoust,	McDougald (Pictou),	Tupper (Pictou),
Davin,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Tyrwhitt,
Davis,	McGreevy,	Vanasse,
Dawson,	McKay,	Wallace,
Denison,	McKeen,	Ward,
Desaulniers,	McLellan,	Weldon (Albert),
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Cardwell),
Dickinson,	McNeill,	White (Renfrew),
Dupont,	Madill,	Wilmot,
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Mara,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Marshall,	Wilson (Lennox),
Ferguson (Welland),	Masson,	Wood (Brockville),
Foster,	Mills (Annapolis),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Freeman,	Moffat,	Wright.—124.
Gaudet,		

Amendment to amendment negatived.

Amendment of Mr. Foster:

That Canada in the future as in the past is desirous of cultivating and extending trade relations with the United States in so far as they may not conflict with the policy of fostering the various industries and interests of the Dominion which was adopted in 1879 and which has since received in so marked a manner the sanction and approval of the people.

Agreed to, on same division reversed.

Main motion of Sir Richard Cartwright, as amended, agreed to, on same division.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 4.40 a. m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 9th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received a certificate from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery of the election and return of David Bishop Meigs, Esq., for the Electoral District of Missisquoi.

REPORT OF RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. MILLS. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works when we may expect copies of the report of the Railway Commission? Several weeks have gone by since the blue-book was laid upon the Table, and none of us have received copies yet. I have enquired at the Distribution Office and I found it has not been received there yet.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I shall enquire and inform the hon. gentleman later.

THE FISHERY COMMISSION.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Railways, in the absence of the Minister of Finance. It was announced by the Premier on Friday, before the adjournment, that the hon. the Minister of Finance would probably proceed with the discussion on the Washington Treaty tomorrow. I intended to suggest to the Minister of Finance, if he had been here, the advisability of submitting a chart of the coast, showing the delimitations of the coast, which would render the discussion much more intelligent to those of us who may not very well be able to follow the debate otherwise. I understand the matter very well myself, but I think the House, generally, would understand it much better if a chart were exhibited, showing the delimitation of the coast as proposed under the treaty. I believe that

if the Government thinks it advisable there is plenty of time to procure a chart, and it would render the discussion much easier and much more intelligible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I shall mention this matter to my colleague as soon as he comes in.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest that not only the line of delimitation as marked under the treaty should be laid down, but also the line claimed by the Government of Canada prior to the meeting of the commissioners.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 26) to confirm a certain agreement made between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Canada Southern Railway Company, and the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 77) to confirm a certain agreement made between the London and South Eastern Railway Company and the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 16) to incorporate the Chinook Belt and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Perley, Assiniboia.)

Bill (No. 52) to amend the Act to incorporate the Maskinongé and Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. Coulombe.)

INDIAN RESERVE—BRANT AND HALDIMAND.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Whether any person has been appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Dr. McKinnon, late physician in the Indian Reserve of Brant and Haldimand?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No appointment has been made. Dr. Dee is doing the duty in the meantime.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, MONTREAL DISTRICT.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. PRÉFONTAINE) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to increase the number of Judges of the Superior Court for the District of Montreal?

Mr. THOMPSON. That matter is now being considered.

COURT OF APPEAL, QUEBEC.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. PRÉFONTAINE) asked, Whether it is to the knowledge of the Minister of Justice, that for the two last terms of the Court of Queen's Bench for the Province of Quebec, sitting in Appeal, only four of the Honorable Judges of the said Court have been present? If the answer is in the affirmative, whether it is the intention of the Government to rectify this state of affairs?

Mr. THOMPSON. I have been informed that the Court has been regularly constituted, under the legislation of the Province of Quebec, for the last two terms.

ENGAGEMENT OF HENRY SMYTH.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, 1st. The date of Henry Smyth's engagement? 2nd. The date at which his services were dispensed with? 3rd. The amount per diem or month paid him for travelling expenses? 4th. The entire sum paid him for travelling or other expenses? 5th. The entire sum paid for services of any kind, and travelling and other expenses from the 1st of January, 1887, to 1st of March, 1888?

Mr. CARLING. Only a few days ago, I think, I answered the same questions as those now made by the

hon. member. If the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to put a motion on the paper, I will endeavor to bring down the necessary papers.

THE THOROLD CANAL.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to let the water-power on the new canal in the vicinity of Thorold; and if so, when?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are not in a position to give an answer now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not as to whether you will let the water-power at all or not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. We are not in a position to answer that question now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman expect to be able to answer it in a short time?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will renew his question, and then I will be in a position to answer. He knows that the Minister of Railways and Canals is unwell, and I have not been able to discuss the matter with him.

PUBLIC WORKS IN PENETANGUISENE, MIDLAND AND ORILLIA.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. Cook) asked, Whether the Government intend to place in the Supplementary Estimates this year a certain sum of money to assist the town of Penetanguishene to build an esplanade in that harbor? Whether the Government intend to place in the Supplementary Estimates this year a sum sufficient to complete the harbor improvements at Midland? Whether the Government intend to place a sum of money in the Supplementary Estimates this year to build a post office in the town of Orillia?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the Supplementary Estimates come down, they will have to speak for themselves. I cannot give any other answer just now.

FREE LIST BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to lay upon the Table of the House, the report of the Minister of Customs, made some time since, on the application of the American Government made through their Consul at Ottawa, asking that certain articles of farm produce be placed on the free list in conformity with the statute of agreement entered into with the United States?

Mr. BOWELL. The Minister of Customs never having made any such report it cannot be laid upon the Table.

RICHARD MERRICK, OF CHATHAM.

Mr. TROW asked, Whether Richard Merrick, of Chatham, was in the employ of the Government during the year 1887, or any part thereof? If so, in what capacity; for what period and at what salary, and how much was he paid? Is he still in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity and at what salary?

Mr. CARLING. He was in the employ of the Government a year ago; and if the hon. gentleman would place a motion upon the notice paper I will be glad to bring down the papers.

HALDIMAND DEPUTY RETURNING OFFICER.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether Government are aware that one Charles Young, one of the deputy returning officers at the two elections held in the county of Haldimand, in February and November, 1887, and one of the parties at whose polls certain irregularities are alleged to have occurred, has served a term of imprisonment for theft in the gaol of the county of Brant, prior to being appointed deputy returning officer as aforesaid?

Mr. THOMPSON. The Government are not aware that Chas. Young served a term of imprisonment for theft in the gaol of the county of Brant prior to being appointed deputy returning officer. They are informed that he has not. Mr. Charles Young, as deputy returning officer, was not in any sense an officer of the Government; but we are informed that he is a respectable man, who has held several offices of trust and honor in the county of Haldimand, and that he was recommended for this office by several persons of credit, including a prominent Grit politician. The only charge with regard to irregularities at his polling place was investigated and dismissed.

THE FREE LIST—ORDER IN COUNCIL.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire to call the attention of the Government to the Order in Council published in Saturday's *Gazette*, which purports to place upon the free list the articles mentioned therein, but only does so in favor of the United States. The concluding operative words of the Order in Council are these:

"That the articles in question may hereafter, until otherwise provided, be imported into Canada from the United States free of duty."

That Order in Council recites the Customs Act of 1879, section 6, and when I look at section 6, the impression on my mind is that if that section is to be acted upon, the goods in question must be placed on the free list entirely. The clause, after enumerating the articles that may be so treated, says:

"Any or all of the articles so enumerated may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act."

You will observe that it does not say free of duty merely when they come from the United States, but free of duty when imported into Canada. Then it goes on to say:

"Upon the proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same, under such proclamation, when imported in Canada."

My view of the Act is that the Government must place these goods on the free list entirely in order to comply with the clause of the Act in question. By the interpretation that the Government have placed upon this clause under the Order in Council of Saturday, they appear to hold that they may place these articles on the free list in relation to the United States alone, and may still maintain a tariff upon them as against Great Britain or any other nation in the world. I commend the Government for their desire to consider the interest of Canada first, and, if is not to the interest of Canada that these articles, or any other goods, should be admitted free from any part of the world, or that they should only be admitted under certain restrictions, I am in favor of the Government considering the interests of Canada first; but I would like to know whether the Government hold—I presume they thought so when they passed this Order in Council—that the Act of 1879 gives them power to pass an Order in Council of this kind, discriminating in favor of the United States, and against Great Britain. It is true that, in regard to the particular articles mentioned in this Order in Council, the

Mr. CARLING.

bulk of them do not come from Great Britain, but some of them do. The Trade and Navigation Returns of 1887 show that quite a number of the articles enumerated in that Order in Council have been imported during the past year from Great Britain, but that does not at all affect the matter, because, if, under an Order in Council, you can admit any one article named in section 6 of the Act of 1879 into Canada duty free, and at the same time maintain a duty upon it as against Great Britain, you can do the same in respect to them all. Therefore, in that case, it amounts to this, that in 1879 the House, upon the advice of the present Administration, passed an Act enabling Canada to discriminate against Great Britain, and that has been the construction placed upon the Act of 1879 by the recent Order in Council. I think it is important, therefore, to know if that is the view the Government intend to take of it in the future, and if they have abandoned the attitude they adopted in the recent discussion, when they declared emphatically that in no case would they discriminate against Great Britain. For three weeks, gentlemen opposite advanced that proposition as the great reason why they would not entertain the proposal for reciprocity with the United States, lest it would discriminate against Great Britain. If they have abandoned that position, and are going to stand up for Canada first, as this Order in Council seems to suggest, I am glad to see their rapid conversion to a wiser and sounder doctrine. For that purpose, I have taken the earliest opportunity to call the attention of the Government to the Order in Council. Of course, if they have inadvertently framed it in that manner, they will take an early opportunity to correct it, but if they have deliberately come to the conclusion that they can discriminate against the flag, and that is what they have done, let us know whether they propose to adhere to that policy in regard to everything that concerns the welfare of Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid, and I think my hon. friend who has just moved this resolution will admit, that we are getting somewhat into an unparliamentary practice of moving the adjournment on every possible occasion when any hon. gentleman wishes to bring any subject which it would be otherwise unparliamentary to do. We all understand the limits which old parliamentary practice would allow in such a case, but I think we are trespassing a good deal on the rule, and it would be very inconvenient if this course should be carried out to any extent. In reference to the question the hon. gentleman has referred to, the Government did not alter their position at all, but this proclamation was issued in consequence of a special application made to this Government by the United States, and it referred to that alone, but the consequence will of necessity be that the Government must open the market to all the world.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman has not at all met my hon. friend's point. He pointed out that, under the terms of this Order in Council, these goods coming from the United States alone are freed from duty. If they come from other quarters they will remain still subject to duty. That is the contention of the First Minister.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then you discriminate in the clearest manner in favor of the United States and against all other countries, the mother country included.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought the hon. gentleman would understand that we desired, especially in consequence of this being the first application on the subject which we received from the United States, to issue the proclamation which we were bound to issue to meet this case, but of course the consequence will be that there must

be a proclamation issued for the purpose of giving the same to all the world.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You did not say so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I did.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the Act authorise the hon. gentleman to do this by proclamation in relation to any other country? Does he propose to legislate, or depend on the issue of a proclamation? Does he consider that the Act authorises the Government by proclamation to abolish the duties in regard to any other country than the United States?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so.

Mr. EDGAR. It seems to me that the clause under which that proclamation has been issued, authorised only the proclamation that these goods would be imported into Canada free of duty from all the world; it did not say from the United States alone. I think there is no authority in that section 9 of the present Customs Act, in the Revised Statutes, authorising the Government to make a limited proclamation of that kind. It seems to me that, if any English is plain, the Government have acted *ultra vires* when they issued that proclamation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it must be *infra vires*.

Mr. EDGAR. It seems that now they have found that out, and as the First Minister says, they are going to correct that mistake at the first possible opportunity, but, as has occurred before this Session, not until after it was pointed out from this side of the House. I would be glad to think that the Government had taken upon themselves to adopt the policy they seemed to have adopted by that proclamation. I am free to admit that, if the Government adopt that policy of discriminating only in favor of the United States, they have got to face the "favored nation" clause in British treaties, they have to say that Canada will not be bound by the "favored nation" clause in British treaties, so that our hands will not be tied in making commercial arrangements to suit ourselves. I had hoped that that was the case, and I regret that the Government are proposing to back down upon so important a subject as this.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is evident that there will have to be another proclamation issued unless there is to be discrimination. My friend the Minister of Customs will understand that, when an Order in Council is as explicit as this, these articles would certainly not be allowed in free from any other country than the United States. I do not think the Minister is guilty of admitting or directing the admission of anything free into Canada that he is not compelled to, and the language of the Order in Council is very explicit:

"And whereas in the opinion of our Governor in Council, it is expedient that the said articles should be admitted into Canada from the United States free of duty,"—

And it closes, after enumerating the different articles, that they

"may hereafter, until otherwise provided, be imported into Canada from the United States free of duty."

It was evidently the intention of the Government that they should be made free coming from the United States and the United States alone, for there was no necessity to insert the words "from the United States" at all if the intention was to admit them free from all countries. I understand the First Minister to say that the Government will now amend the proclamation, and that these articles will be placed on the free list, come from what country they may.

Mr. MULOCK. With regard to the remarks made by the First Minister, that he regretted it was necessary to make

this motion, I must refer him to the Minister of Public Works as my excuse. I only intended to call the attention of the Government to the matter, in the first place, for the reason that it appears to me that the present Order in Council is *ultra vires* of the power of the Government, and absolutely void, and therefore would not accomplish what was apparently in the minds of the Government at the time. My object was to induce the Government to put the matter in a legal shape as respects the validity of the Order in Council.

Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

PRINTING OF DOMINION NOTES.

Mr. EDGAR moved for

Copy of the contract which now exists between the Government and the contractors for the printing of Dominion notes, and copies of all correspondence relating to the awarding thereof.

He said: I find there is a great discrepancy between the amount voted for the purpose of printing the notes, and the amount actually expended for doing so. The amount voted last year was \$25,000 and the amount expended was \$37,556.58, showing an increase over the grant of \$12,556. Now when a matter, in which the Government have had so much experience as in the printing of Dominion notes, is so difficult to estimate, I think we should have before the House the contract under which the work is done, so that we may see its terms, and whether it cannot be improved, and whether it has been closely followed. I would like to add to the motion, with the permission of the House, the words "and further, for all copies of correspondence relating to the awarding thereof."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

PRIVATE THOMAS NEELY.

Mr. MULOCK moved for:

Copies of all letters, despatches, communications and other papers, in the possession of the Department of Militia and Defence, touching the case of Private Thomas Neely, late of "C" Company, School of Infantry, or of his widow and children, for compensation by reason of his disability and death.

He said: The facts of the case are simply these, as I am informed by the widow of Private Neely. He enlisted in "C" Company of Infantry on the 1st February, 1884; he went to the North-West with his company in March, 1885, for the purpose of aiding in the suppression of the rebellion. His company returned to Toronto on the 28th October, 1885. Shortly after his return home he became ill, and his illness finally developed into insanity. He was placed for a time in the jail in Toronto, and then placed in the Lunatic Asylum, and the military authorities, on the 17th May, 1886, discharged him from the service of Her Majesty on the ground of his insanity. He continued insane until the time of his death on the 21st January, 1887, on which day he died in the Provincial Lunatic Asylum in Toronto, and was buried that day as a pauper, being followed to the grave by his widow and the undertaker only. This is a case for which I bespeak the favorable consideration of the Government. If the House will permit me, I will read an extract from a letter from his widow, who says:

"When he returned he complained of feeling great pain at times in his head. He had 10 days leave of absence from the regiment after his return. I do not remember the date, but he had his holidays in November. After his return he complained frequently of his head. When at home, and on Christmas after coming home, he frequently said that he knew it would be his last Christmas with me, stating that he knew his head would never get better, and at times he got quite delirious and imagined strange things which I would have to convince him was not so; and at other times he would sit and look at us, that is, the children and me, and would say he knew his time with us was not long, as he had strange feelings when in the North-West."

He told her he had these pains in his head and strange feelings while in the North-West:

"Sometimes he thought the sun affected his head, and sometimes he thought it was nervousness."

Then she goes on to state :

"There was never any insanity in his family, all being healthy, strong people. When he became insane he was 10 months in the Insane Asylum, and on the 21st of January, 1887, he was buried from the Asylum as a pauper, having no one to follow his remains but myself and the undertaker; since which time I never received a cent from any one."

Now, that discloses the state of affairs. This man served his country in the North-West; he endured, no doubt, the ordinary hardships incidental to that campaign, and he came back home, having at some period in his life—whether in the North-West or not, I am not aware, nor do I think it is possible to ascertain—but still, having at some time contracted the seeds of the disease which ultimately carried him off. He became disabled while in the service. This is not the case of an ordinary volunteer, but more that of one of the regulars, his whole time being devoted to the service. Having become invalided, having become insane, he is discharged from the service, and without having recovered his mental health he dies and leaves a widow and children, whom, I think, should be pensioned upon the country. In this particular case it was impossible to show that the soldier lost his reason while on actual service. If it was a case of physical disability we could trace cause and effect, but it is wholly impossible to do so now, and no enquiry could show, so far as reasoning upon the case goes, clearly and beyond all doubt, that his disease was contracted in the service. I make that admission. I think it is right I should do so; but I ask the country to presume in favor of the man and now in favor of his widow and children, to give the presumption in his favor, under the ordinary principle of law. He was in sound health, body and mind, when he went to the North-West, so far as appears. He no doubt complied with the regulations in that behalf, no doubt he was examined and certified as being in good health, and therefore if he was well in body and mind when he went to the North-West, it is clear that he contracted that disease whilst in the North-West or immediately after his return. Insanity is the outcome of mental excitement of various kinds, and I think the circumstances immediately preceding the outbreak of insanity in his case were such as to excite the ordinary mind, and the benefit of the doubt should be given to those whom he left behind. I think the Minister of Militia is very favorably disposed towards this case, but I understand there is merely a technical difficulty that prevents him from making an allowance under the circumstances, namely, that the law did not meet the case. Am I right?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad there is nothing more than a difficulty about the law. I have looked through the Queen's Regulations upon the subject, and I think I can find a clause under which relief can be given. If the hon. gentleman will look at section 934 of the Regulations and Orders of the Militia of the Dominion, he will find the following clause—and I may say that the sections preceding that section provide for compensation according to different scales, and then there is a general sweeping clause to this effect :

"In instances where the regulations do not meet the circumstances of the individual case, they may be especially considered by His Excellency the Governor in Council."

That section, I think, will meet the case. This is the only case, so far as I am aware, of this character, that is the outcome of the campaign in the North-West; we are not likely, therefore, to have the precedent, such as this would be if it were established, abused, and it being the only one I do not think there can be any good reason advanced against an allowance being made in this case. It would meet with the approval of the militia. I have received a

Mr. MULOCK.

great many communications on the subject from men in the service, and they seem to wonder the case has not been dealt with before. I do not propose to upbraid the Minister on the matter; he is carefully endeavoring to guard the public exchequer and to prevent fraud; but, in view of what has occurred, he will probably be able to see what a grateful country will expect of him in this case, and meet it in the spirit I have suggested, and give the presumption in favor of the unfortunate soldier.

Mr. DENISON. I think this is a case which should be enquired into by the Minister of Militia, so that something may be done. The widow of the soldier called and explained the circumstance to me, and I must say that she made out a very good case. I have no doubt that if this man had become insane when on the North-West expedition his widow would have received something in the way of a pension, and as there is a doubt as to when his insanity came on, whether in the North-West or immediately after his return, the question of pension, of course, is one for the Minister to consider. The widow says that immediately after he came back she noticed something strange in his actions, and she thinks something was wrong with him at that time.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The papers which have been asked for by the hon. gentleman who has spoken on this subject, and who expressed the deep regret which I feel myself in regard to the case of the Widow Neely, I shall be only too glad to bring down as soon as it is possible for me to do so. The facts of the case are, I believe, exactly as the hon. gentleman has stated them to be. As reported to me the case of this man is as follows: He enlisted in "C" Company of Infantry, the permanent corps of Toronto, on the 21st February, 1884. He is reported to have done very good service indeed during the troublesome times in the North-West. He followed his corps under orders, and he did his duty fully as well as any other man who took part in the troubles, and as well as any other member of that corps which distinguished itself during those times. He returned from the North-West on the 25th October, 1885. On April 10, 1886, he became insane, and he had to be removed from the hospital where he had been admitted on the 28th March, to the Insane Asylum on the 17th April. When the matter was brought before me as Minister of Militia it became my duty, however great might be my sympathy for this individual case, to investigate the matter. The case was brought before me upon the ground that the insanity from which the unfortunate man suffered was the result of his service in the North-West. The law, as the hon. gentleman very correctly stated it, did not provide for any case which did not come under the statute giving pensions to those who had taken part in the troubles, and the matter was submitted to the surgeon of his corps, Surgeon Strange, a gentleman whose eminence as a physician is universally admitted, and that officer reported to me that it was impossible for him to trace the disease from which this man suffered during the service which he had done in the North-West. Consequently it became impossible for me, as the Minister administering that Department, to bring this individual case under the statute granting pensions to those who had been wounded or suffered disability from the service which they had done at the front; and, as the hon. gentleman knows, the law does not provide for any gratuity or any pension to those in the permanent corps or in the militia, except in specified cases, and the specified cases do not meet the case of Neely. I have already taken some little trouble investigating the matter and I intend to submit to the Government a recommendation which, provided it is approved by the Governor in Council, will permit me to do something for the widow. The hon. gentleman must admit that, the

case having been submitted to me under the circumstances which I have just referred to, it was impossible, as the law existed, for me to provide for the case; and in answer to the communication from the widow of Neely, I stated, as it was my duty so to do, the circumstances which prevented me granting her any compensation for services which he had rendered in the North-West. I hope that whatever can be done will be done, because I admit that it is one of the very hardest cases that have come before me for a long time as Minister of Militia.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very glad to hear that it is the intention of the Minister to do as he has stated, and provide some gratuity for the widow of this poor man. As I understand, the intention of the Minister is to ask the Government for some compensation for the widow. I think, Mr. Speaker, that when he takes this into his consideration he might very well go further. I see no reason in the world why the widow of this man should not be treated in the very same manner as if the man had been shot in battle, or had died during the campaign. So far as I can see it is no very violent presumption to suppose that the disease from which the man died cannot be explained in any other way than that it was brought on by the hardship of the campaign. We understand very well that if he had not served in the campaign he could not have contracted the disease he died from. Under such circumstances I repeat what I said a moment ago, that it is no violent supposition to suppose that this man was brought to his death by the fact that he served in this campaign. There is no other evidence.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I beg your pardon, there is other evidence which will be shown when the papers are brought down.

Mr. LAURIER. What is the evidence?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman will excuse me for interrupting him I will just read to him a very short extract from the report of Surgeon Strange, who it will be remembered was the surgeon of "C" Corps of Infantry to which Neely belonged. Surgeon Strange reports that having gone carefully into his case he is of opinion that Neely's service in the North-West had nothing whatever to do with his insanity. It does not appear, therefore, that this man has any claim for compensation under the statute, by which I am allowed to give compensation, for any disability incurred in the North-West, and there are no funds at the disposal of this department to meet any such case.

Mr. LAURIER. I understand that the hon. gentleman could not do otherwise than he has done under the statute. The point I wished to make was this: If no other cause can be assigned for his disease it was no very violent presumption to suppose that death was brought about by the hardship of the campaign. Under such circumstances the Minister must arrive at the conclusion that some compensation should be given to his widow. I suggest that if the law as it stands does not provide for the case, the law can be made by this Parliament to provide for it. If the hon. gentlemen asks for the gratuity, Parliament will be only too happy to grant it. As far as this side of the House is concerned we will not grudge the money, and we will be happy to aid in anything that can be done by the Government in this connection.

Mr. IVES. I would like to add my influence, if I have any, to that of the hon. gentlemen who are urging the Minister to deal liberally with this case. I think the Minister of Militia, though perhaps perfectly just, is not inclined to be quite sufficiently generous. There have been other cases before the present one in which I humbly think he had the law and the right to give some assistance, but which the hon. gentleman refused. I do

not think that the country would begrudge a little assistance in a case of this kind, or in any other case of a similar character, when volunteers are injured in actual service. I think there is no disposition in the country to treat the volunteers in a niggardly manner at all. It is generally understood that the pay that they get is not a very large remuneration and that there is nothing in it to recompense them for injuries they may sustain in actual service. I know that the feeling of the country is that when a volunteer is injured in actual service he should be recompensed or indemnified in some way. Of course we cannot expect to imitate the liberal proportion of the pension list of our neighbors to the south. We have not a big surplus at our disposal to do it, but we have enough money to treat our volunteer forces fairly and not stingily. Those claims are founded in equity, and I think the Minister would be supported by both sides of the House if he would give a little more generous interpretation to the law and to his powers in this respect than he has been in the habit of doing.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think that the portion of the report of the medical officer read by the Minister of Militia entirely covers the case.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I only read an extract.

Mr. MULOCK. That may be. I cannot see that the widow and children would be disentitled to compensation merely because you cannot prove that the disability was brought about by the campaign in the North-West. There is the fact that the man was on duty; and it is immaterial, so far as this question is concerned, whether this infirmity was brought on by service in the North-West or by service elsewhere. He was in the service at the time he was cut down. Therefore his case is entirely one entitling him to consideration at the hands of the country, quite irrespective of whether you can prove that his disease originated in the North-West or not.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. He was entitled only to pay for 30 days. That would not amount to much.

Mr. MULOCK. Here we have a case where a man in the service of the country, and actually wearing Her Majesty's uniform at the time, is cut down by disease and ultimately dies, and leaves his family at the mercy of the country. Is there any technicality that can be allowed to intervene to prevent the country doing its duty under such circumstances?

Mr. AMYOT. I entirely agree with the request that some help should be given to the widow of this man. The soldiers in that campaign were submitted to great hardship, and I think as a country we should have some gratitude for those who exposed their lives under such circumstances. I hope, and I believe, that the case will be treated liberally. If we have nothing in the law to enable us to do justice to this widow we should change the law. It is time yet, as it is always time to render justice.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT ST. HYACINTHE.

Mr. DUPONT (Translation) moved for:

Copies of all letters, memorandums and other documents relative to the construction of public buildings in the city of St. Hyacinthe, such as a post office, customs office, &c.

He said: The district of St. Hyacinthe, Mr. Speaker, is interested in the prosperity of the city of St. Hyacinthe. Not only is the city of St. Hyacinthe the centre and county town of the district, bearing the same name, but it is also the business headquarters of a population numbering over 100,000. In respect of institutions devoted to learning and science, St. Hyacinthe is one of the best endowed in the Dominion

of Canada, and its connection with the training of youth, in letters, is well known throughout the country. This instruction is distributed among the young and loyal subjects of Her Majesty to be employed, with time and as events allow, for the good of the country. But, furthermore, the city of St. Hyacinthe, from a merely material point of view, and in respect of its commercial and manufacturing importance, rivals its own moral and intellectual standing. It will be generally remembered that this young town was almost destroyed by fire in 1876. More fortunate than the sister city of St. John, N.B., St. Hyacinthe, in spite of this disaster, showed an increase of population in the census of 1881. Since then, owing to our present system of protection, St. Hyacinthe has gone on steadily growing and improving, in a remarkable manner, and I have no doubt that, at the ensuing census, no town will make a better showing, in the way of increased population. I have, indeed, no hesitation in saying that the number of residents, and the commercial wealth of St. Hyacinthe, will have doubled by 1891. In 1879, there were no more than 200 workmen employed at St. Hyacinthe. To-day a capital of \$1,000,000 is devoted to the several manufactures that have since then sprung up; the number of hands in the different factories and shops is from 1,200 to 1,500, and the total of yearly wages figures up to \$300,000. The city of St. Hyacinthe owes this wonderful material improvement both to the enlightened and enterprising spirit of its citizens, and to the policy adopted in 1879 by the present Government. As a result of this policy, the revenues of the Government have sensibly increased, and, with available money in the exchequer, the Government have been enabled to promote the growth of useful undertakings throughout the country, and, especially, to raise public buildings, in the chief towns of the Dominion, as monuments of the general prosperity. I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to be able to recall the fact to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that this district largely contributed to the establishment of the National Policy, by electing three representatives commissioned to sustain it. Considerable improvements have been achieved, exclusive of great railway enterprises, in different towns and cities of the country, but St. Hyacinthe, notwithstanding its claims and deserts, has not received her share. We are not envious of the improvements made elsewhere, and rather congratulate the Government thereon, but it seems to me that the town of St. Hyacinthe has not come, if it has not even been passed over, or given to others, and I fancy that the public interests demand that St. Hyacinthe be no longer overlooked, but obtain the public buildings referred to in the motion which I have just made. I hold in my hand a list of the several towns in which the Government have put up public buildings, and, of course, the value of these buildings must depend on the revenues contributed by these towns to the public treasury. I find that the city of Annapolis is having, and will have, public buildings to the amount of \$19,500. The population of Annapolis is 2,833; its port, post office and excise duties fetch into the treasury the sum of \$13,211. North Sydney, with a population of 5,484, gave a revenue of \$29,216. South Sydney, with a population of 3,667, gave \$4,610. There are many other important towns having their public buildings, and who contribute a less revenue than the city of St. Hyacinthe. Thus the little town of Aylmer, with a census of 1,781, contributes \$1,309. Coaticook, with 2,682 souls, gives \$40,232, and I see in the Estimates a sum of \$16,000 for a post office and custom house there. Joliette supplies a revenue of \$33,181, and the Estimates have \$10,000 for public buildings there also. Fraserville, the town of the hon. member for Témiscouata, (Mr. Grandbois) pays a revenue of \$5,450, and in the estimates there is the sum of \$6,000 for a custom house and post office in that locality. St. Hyacinthe, with a population of 5,321, in 1881, which is perhaps 10,000 to-day

Mr. DUPONT,

and will surely rise to 12,000 or 13,000 in 1891, at the next census, without any public buildings, without any facilities for importations in the town, without any accommodation whatsoever in the way of public offices, yields the Government a yearly revenue of over \$80,000. The city of St. Hyacinthe has been overlooked up to date, and the Government has not thought of giving it the public buildings which the public service and the public interest require. The business importance of this young and flourishing town will not allow of any further delay in the construction of their bridge. As I said a moment ago, St. Hyacinthe is splendidly endowed with institutions for the education of youth. The municipal government have also built fine buildings for their own use. I may even add that the Americans have recognised the business importance of St. Hyacinthe, by establishing there a consul and a vice-consul. It is almost a matter of regret for the people of the St. Hyacinthe district to see the stars and stripes of the neighboring Republic floating over buildings that are suitable and do honor to their flag, while the Dominion colors float over paltry buildings, and poor sheds, wholly unworthy of the town of St. Hyacinthe as a port of entrance, of its customs, and of its post office service. I therefore demand, Sir, of the Government, and especially of the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin), as also of his colleague of the Montreal district, to turn their eyes a moment to this obscure corner of their country, and to endow St. Hyacinthe with the public buildings which its importance as a town and its business requirements imperatively need. Furthermore, Sir, I am of opinion that the Government are bound in justice to see to the construction of these public buildings which have been, and are, asked for with energetic persistence. The post office, as it is to-day, stands almost in the street, the space being five or six feet by twenty. I was once the witness of an unpleasant sight, when a large crowd of citizens stood in front of the post office, at a season when it was very annoying to be exposed to the inclement weather. The crowd had to wait in the open street till the mail matter was delivered, as the inside of the office was filled to suffocation. The Government are somewhat to blame, Sir, for the narrowness of these quarters and the present unsatisfactory state of things at St. Hyacinthe. Its protective policy has done much for the improvement of the town, and I judge that the Government are bound to give St. Hyacinthe the buildings which it demands, in order to facilitate the transaction of the increasing volume of business now carried on in that locality. I may assure the Government that the whole deputation, as well as all the business men of the town, will be proud of the boon and very grateful for the same. I trust that the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and his hon. colleague of the Montreal district, will prove to the active and enterprising business men of St. Hyacinthe that they have lost nothing by waiting, and that the Government are inclined, even now, to build these edifices at once, and of such dimensions as shall meet the wants of the locality, so as not to be obliged to repair or rebuild them four or five years hence. I do not think, Sir, that a sum of \$40,000 or \$50,000 would be out of the way in the construction of public buildings that would prove an ornament to St. Hyacinthe, when the reflection is made that the district of St. Hyacinthe has poured millions into the public exchequer without ever receiving, in return, a single cent, in the line of public improvements, since the establishment of Confederation. In other respects, Mr. Speaker, I fancy that these improvements are as much in the interest of the Government as in that of individuals, because between this and the next five years, through the increase of business, under the fostering care of Government, this important town will have received more than sufficient revenue to meet the outlay of \$50,000 or \$60,000. This is an expenditure which the hon. Minister of Public Works, who has always shown

a disposition to do justice to all localities in which the spirit of interprise and the enlightenment of the citizens has manifested themselves, will make for St. Hyacinthe, as he has done everywhere else.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I must first congratulate the hon. member on the able manner in which he has set forth the question submitted by him to the House. He has specially interested the hon. members, on both sides, in giving the statistics relative to St. Hyacinthe, with respect to the increase of its population, the want of its possible business and its general thrift. The hon. gentleman adds that it is rather the Government's fault if St. Hyacinthe sends forth a cry of distress in reference to the public buildings which it has not. The hon. gentleman says truly, I think, that if the construction of these buildings has become a necessity, that improvement is due to the National Policy of the present Government, which has caused the large increase of business in St. Hyacinthe, and the rapid increase of its population. This is perfectly true. Last fall I was invited by the Town Council and the citizens of St. Hyacinthe, belonging to both political parties, to visit their city, in order to see myself the condition of things, the increase of the population and generally the requirements of the locality. I admit, Mr. Speaker, that I should very much have liked to see the prosperous town of St. Hyacinthe, which does so much credit to our Province and its progress, but I decided on not going just then, preferring to learn from the representatives of the locality, by the documents laid before me, and the statistics in my possession, how matters really stood. If I had gone to St. Hyacinthe, and, after the reception promised me, had returned to Ottawa and asked of my colleagues to accede a money grant, and of Parliament to sanction the measure, I might have been charged with a desire to repay my reception on the banks of the Yamaska, but as I did not go, and learning since from my political and other friends, the condition of things at St. Hyacinthe, and its wants, and viewing, furthermore, that the information furnished by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) in respect of the public buildings are strictly accurate, I may assure the hon. gentleman that this matter had not escaped me, and that, now it is before the House, with the force imparted to it by the hon. gentleman, in making his motion, I shall deem it my duty to draw the attention of the Government thereto, and perhaps the Supplementary Estimates will make manifold the intentions of the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. I trust that the hon. Minister of Public Works will persist in the intention which he has just expressed, of some day visiting St. Hyacinthe. I am quite persuaded that, if he does not find there as many political friends as in other portions of the country, he will meet adversaries who will be glad to see him, under any circumstances, and when he does make this visit it will not be, I hope, to ascertain whether St. Hyacinthe should have the public buildings so long asked for—for, according to the remarks just made, this matter must be about settled, especially in the mind of the hon. Minister of Public Works—but to choose the site where they are to stand. I am happy to be agreed, for this once, with my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont), on the subject of the need of these buildings at St. Hyacinthe, but there is one point, however, on which I am not at one with them, and that is, that the improvement of St. Hyacinthe is due to the National Policy. That is most certainly not the opinion of the St. Hyacinthe people. On the contrary, what is now asked for at St. Hyacinthe is not the National Policy, but Reciprocity.

Motion adopted.

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. EDGAR moved for:

Copies of all papers, documents, telegrams and correspondence in connection with the land grant to the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Company, or relating to the construction of said railway.

Copies of all papers, documents, telegrams and correspondence in connection with the land grant to the North-West Central Railway Company, or relating to the construction of the said railway.

Copies of all papers, documents, telegrams and correspondence as to the construction of a railway from a point on the Manitoba and North-Western Railway, or the Canadian Pacific Railway *via* Rapid City westward, by any parties other than the corporators in the charter of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.

Copies of all papers, documents, telegrams and correspondence as to the incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company, or relating to any land grant thereto, or to the construction of the line of the said railway or any part thereof.

He said: The papers asked for in these motions relate to the very important line of railway from Brandon to Battleford. This route was in contemplation of adoption by the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway Co. That company was changed to the North-West Central Railway Company, which disappeared, and now the line is in possession of the Great North-West Central Railway Co. It is one of the most important lines of railway in the whole North-West, being 450 miles in length, and having a land grant of 2,280,000 acres, second only in importance to the land grant made to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Two years ago, in the opinion of this House, the construction of this railway was a matter of extreme urgency. We know the interest that was taken by the House and the country in matters connected with the former charter. An opportunity was given by the House to the owners of that charter to place a deposit in the hands of the Government as evidence of their good faith, and to prevent their charter from lapsing; and the very unusual and special course was taken by this House to give to the Government the power, while the House was not sitting, to charter as a company, any body of persons whom they chose, with full powers to build this railway in case of the default of the then existing company, and they were also given power to award the land grant to the company so to be incorporated. The Minister of Public Works, as chairman of the Committee on Railways, during the Session of 1886, telegraphed, I think, to the Legislature of Manitoba, telling them the Governor in Council would incorporate a good company to build the road. Well, what has happened? The old company made default. The Government without much delay incorporated a company by letters patent, on the 22nd of July, 1886, and gave it the land grant, and as something appears to have been considered wrong or incomplete in the original charter, the applicants asked the Government to amend that charter, which was promptly done by the Government in August of the same year. I do not complain of delay on the part of the Government up to that time; but what has been done since then? We hear that the company have organized and have paid in \$50,000 to the Government as evidence of good faith; but when there was such great urgency, as everybody admitted there was in 1886, for the construction of this railway, why has there been delay? It was only recently, when we saw a Bill presented to this House by the Great North-West Company to confirm their letters patent, that we discovered what may perhaps account for the delay. It appears that there was a mistake in the letters patent granted to this company by the Government in July, 1886, the charter not being in conformity with the Act of Parliament which authorised it. That admission was made the other day by the Minister of Justice, when he stated to the Railway Committee that he had suggested to the incorporators that they would require to get legislation. What I complain of is that the Government granted a charter inconsistent with the Act authorising it. If the Act was not

what they wished it to be, why did they not come to the House last Session and get the necessary legislation to put it right? There can be no excuse for this delay. It cannot be altogether blamed on the incorporators either, for when the Minister of Justice advised them to get legislation to confirm their charter, I cannot be surprised that they did not or would not go on under the charter as it stood. It does seem to me that a great deal of explanation will be required from the Government as to why they allowed such an important measure of railway construction to lie absolutely dormant for two years. The enterprise is no further ahead now than it was in July, 1886. There is no need of discussing in what way the charter was not in accordance with the Act; but I may briefly say that the Act required that the charter should provide for the payment of all the legal obligations of the former company, and the charter undertook to interpret what that meant by defining certain obligations which the new company was to be bound by. I do not know what Parliament would have stated had it been asked to define the obligations more distinctly in the Act; but the Government defined them by letters patent, and they have to admit that that part of the charter requires confirmation by an Act of Parliament. I move for these papers, and I think they will show that the Government are responsible for the delay in the construction of this railway through that rich portion of the North-West. Everything, apparently, was ready for the work two years ago. The Minister of Public Works announced that everything was ready; and yet the Government allowed the whole of last Session to pass without asking this House to rectify matters. Although they have come now for legislation, we do not know that the people of that part of the country may not have to wait two years more before the work of construction is commenced.

Motion agreed to.

MILITARY CHAPLAIN, ST. JOHN, P.Q.

Mr. AMYOT moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and certain residents of St. John's, P.Q., respecting remuneration for the services of Rev. M. Aubry, in attendance on, or as Chaplain to the Military School at St. John's, P.Q.

He said: If the information I have received is correct, the Rev. Mr. Aubry, who has acted as the chaplain of the school of St. John since the Government has had charge of that school, has never received a cent for his services, and has besides to pay for driving there and back. The Imperial Government used to grant \$300 a year for the same service. As I understand, the Rev. Mr. Aubry claims \$2 a week, and that amount has been refused to him. I do not know personally the facts of the case, but I state them as they have been given to me; and if they are correct, I think it is unfair to ask for the services of a chaplain and then to refuse to pay for them. The chaplain is as well entitled to remuneration as any other individual, and I think the Government should not begrudge the small amount he claims. I hope it will be sufficient to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to this injustice to have it remedied.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think it would be very much more convenient to discuss this matter when the papers are brought down. The hon. gentleman has referred to information which was conveyed to him. In the face of that declaration, I should not like to contradict any of the statements he has made, without having the papers, which must speak for themselves, before me. I must, however, draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that under the regulations, which are the law under which the department must act, no provision is made, and no authority is given, to the department to pay a chaplain. The report made to me is that the School of Infantry at St. John

Mr. EDGAR.

attend the religious exercises in the parish church, like everybody else, and that no extra religious services are rendered, such as were rendered when the Imperial forces were stationed in Quebec. Then there was a special service for the force, and naturally such service was remunerated. This is a matter, however, in which I would have been very happy indeed to have seen my way clear to authorise the payment of remuneration, if, under the law, which is above me, as it is above everybody else, I could have given it. When the papers are brought down, the correspondence will disclose the action which the department has taken in the matter.

Mr. AMYOT. I would have had no objection to wait until the papers are brought down, but we never know when they will be brought down. They may take one year or two years to come down. I asked for papers last year; they are not before the House yet. I will only say that if no services have been rendered by the Rev. Mr. Aubry, he is not entitled to remuneration, but if he has rendered services he certainly is entitled to be paid for them; and if the law does not allow it, the hon. the Minister of Militia, who has power to change the by-laws and regulations of the Militia, should have them changed. It is absurd to pass by laws which work injustice, and then say that the by-laws will not allow justice to be done. Let us make the by-laws in such a way that justice will be done to every one.

Motion agreed to.

WATER FOR THE MILITARY DRILL SHED AT QUEBEC.

Mr. AMYOT (Translation) moved for:

Copy of correspondence exchanged between the Government and the Quebec Corporation in regard to the water required for the drill shed of the City of Quebec.

Some time ago, Mr. Speaker, I had inserted in the Orders of the Day a question, and the hon. the Minister of Militia did not seem to understand what I wanted. It had reference to water for the drill shed at Quebec, and he thought there was reference to a school of navigation. I meant to speak of the water necessary for soldiers when on parade. They require this water from time to time, as is allowed by the regulations in force, and they must have water likewise to wet the earth, so as to prevent the dust from soiling the uniforms. That was the use of the water I had reference to. Since that time, the troops have no longer need of paying for the water which they require, the Government having been good enough to supply them. My motion, therefore, is of no avail and I withdraw it.

Motion withdrawn.

DISMISSAL OF GEORGE OLIVIER.

Mr. RINFRET (Translation) moved for:

Copy of all correspondence, petitions and papers of all descriptions, having reference to the dismissal of George Olivier, as postmaster of the parish of St. Agapit, in the County of Lotbinière.

He said: At the last Session, I made precisely the same motion before the House as I present to-day; the motion was carried by the House, but no return was made, or at least none was made to my knowledge. If I revert to the question again this year, it is because the dismissal of Mr. Olivier took place under very peculiar circumstances; at the conclusion of an election for the Local House, in the County of Lotbinière, wherein Mr. Beudet opposed Mr. Laliberté. This election was held almost immediately after Riel's execution and, from what we could gather, the Government meant to make it a test case. And, indeed, although only a local election, a crowd of agents and friends of the Government worked in this election, employing every means to ensure the return of the Conservative candidate,

Mr. Beaudet. Not only did they resort to corruption, but they descended to the most shameful intimidation. Thus every party in any way depended on the Federal Government, such as lighthouse guardians and parties in the employ of the Montreal Harbour Commission, for the deepening of Lake St. Peter, were threatened with dismissal if they voted for Mr. Laliberté. The postmaster of St. Agapit did not belong to the Conservative party, his views in favor of the Liberal party being well-known, but all the same he is a man who busied himself with politics only in a quiet way, although working his share for his party. Now, almost immediately after the election, this man was dismissed. The pretext was, at the time, that the Government wanted to shift the post office from St. Agapit. But this reason was idle, especially if one takes into account the fact that the charge did not meet the views of the residents of the parish. It is true that the office was placed nearer the church of St. Agapit, but this is further from the centre of business and trade, and the citizens of the parish complain both of the change and the dismissal.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thought that my colleague, the Postmaster General, was in his seat, but I see that he is not. I am not in a position to reply to what the hon. member has just said, but still the papers will be brought down and I am convinced that when the hon. gentleman will have examined them, he will find that what he was told about this dismissal was exaggerated, and if that gentleman was relieved of his functions it must have been for good reasons.

Motion agreed to.

FIELD EXERCISE—TRANSLATION INTO FRENCH

Mr. AMYOT (Translation) moved for:

Copy of correspondence relating to the translation into French of the *Field Exercise*, from the 23rd July, 1879, exchanged both between the Militia Department and Lieutenant Colonel Audet, and between one of them and the manager of the Compagnie d'imprimerie Canadienne of Montreal, and Benjamin Sulte, Esq., and Gilbert Berthiaume, and any other in regard to this translation.

The documents to which allusion is made in this motion are as follows:

23rd July, 1879.—Letter of the Deputy Minister of Militia to A. Audet, offering him, in the name of the Minister of Militia, the translation of the *Field Exercise*.

28th July, 1879.—Reply of A. Audet accepting the conditions.

29th July, 1879.—Letter of Colonel Panet, authorising A. Audet, in the name of the Minister of Militia, to begin the translation at once.

16th March, 1880.—A memorandum from the Minister of Militia to Colonel Audet, instructing him to have the French translation of the *Field Exercise* printed by the Compagnie d'imprimerie Canadienne of Montreal, on certain conditions.

20th March, 1880.—Letter of Colonel Panet to the manager of the Compagnie d'imprimerie Canadienne, of Montreal, proposing the printing of the translation of the *Field Exercise*.

1st April, 1880.—Letter of Mr. Thibault, manager of the Compagnie d'imprimerie Canadienne of Montreal, accepting the conditions proposed by the department for the printing of the *Field Exercise*.

2nd April, 1880.—Letter of the department to Mr. Thibault, authorising the printing of the translation and informing him that the copy would be furnished by Mr. Audet.

25th November, 1880.—Letter of Mr. Thibault to the department, stating that the Compagnie d'imprimerie had received fifty pages of the translation of the *Field Exercise*.

11th February, 1881.—Letter of Mr. Audet to Colonel Panet, stating that the translation was made and sent in at the end of November or the first days of December.

26th March, 1881.—Letter of Mr. Audet to Mr. Benjamin Sulte.

29th April, 1881.—Letter of Mr. Thibault, in the name of Mr. Desjardins, M. P.

14th May, 1881.—Letter of Mr. Audet to Mr. Sulte.

24th May, 1881.—Letter of Mr. Thibault to the Department.

10th June, 1881.—Letter of Mr. Audet to Col. Panet, in reply to a letter from the latter, requesting him to deliver the whole copy of the translation.

7th July, 1881.—Note of Mr. Benjamin Sulte to the effect that he had corrected the proofs of the French original as far as the foot of page 102 in the English.

19th March, 1885.—Letter of Gebhardt & Berthiaume, successors of the Compagnie d'imprimerie Canadienne.

These are the chief documents which I require. There are others coming in between, but I trust that they will all be brought down.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) I understand that the hon. gentleman produces a list of papers which he is desirous of having.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I simply read the titles of the documents in order that they might appear in *Hansard*, but I might send a copy to the department.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. (Translation.) My reason is that I do not know which are the papers forming the docket.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I will send to the department a list of the documents which I require.

Motion agreed to.

CLAIM OF DR. J. A. MORIN.

Mr. AMYOT (Translation) moved for:

Copy of the claim of Dr. J. A. Morin, of St. Charles, Bellechasse, for medical services rendered to Odilon Fournier, brakeman on the Intercolonial Railway, wounded at St. Charles aforesaid, in the performance of his duties as brakeman, on the 28th March, 1885, the services lasting from the 28th March, 1885, to 8th June, 1885, and the correspondence exchanged on the subject.

He said: I make this motion to call the attention of the Government to a grievous injustice which is just now being committed. The Intercolonial, which is Federal Government property, is often the cause of serious accidents. In this case one of the employes was badly wounded in the hand; a physician of the neighborhood was called in; and the services lasted, as I have already said in my motion, about two months and a half. The doctor had to amputate three fingers and one thumb, under very difficult circumstances, and bestowed prolonged attention to the case, and for all that he is offered \$25. I do not hesitate in saying that if the officials of the Department—for I do not impute that to the Department itself—were serious they would not act in that way. Why, \$100 would not be an adequate return for the services rendered by the doctor. Here are the facts as reported to me by the physician himself:

"The accident took place on the 28th March, 1885. The aforesaid Odilon Fournier had his hand crushed in the wheels of a train, and it became necessary to amputate three fingers and the thumb, and treat the little finger for a compound fracture. In order to save certain useful portions of the hand, I had to amputate the fingers where they were half crushed, and exposed to complications and a long treatment, a matter of small importance if compared with the use to which the stump of a finger may be for a man so infirm. In fact there was inflammation and gangrene of the shreds, but, by dint of care, I succeeded in saving all the parts preserved at the amputation. The treatment lasted to the 8th June, 1885. Then I sent in my account for \$94.75. It was returned with a copy of the tariff. I made up the account again, as much as possible on the lines of the tariff and figured \$110.50. But

this tariff allowed only \$5 for each amputation of a finger until after cure I could not, therefore, accept this amount, and was refused more than \$25. The amount might have been sufficient for an amputation in sound flesh, but not in bruised flesh, where serious complications were bound to take place and taking long to heal. You will see by the letters written and the accounts what amount of work I did. I hold that the company have no right to impose their tariff on me. I was asked to do the work, by the agents of the road, without any conditions, and hence I deem that they cannot refuse to pay my account as it is, if not extravagant. I should certainly not have undertaken to do the work for the price offered me to-day. My account is not exorbitant."

And he adds the reason why he fancies he was not paid. There is no need only saying it to the House, as it will probably be guessed at. But I particularly draw the attention of the Government to the facts. I think that the physicians employed by Government should be treated justly, wherever they may be and whatever may be their views. All that should be done is to find out what they have and pay them accordingly. If the Government refuse this justice, doctors will decline attending to such cases, and the public service will suffer thereby.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In reply to the hon. member I may say that the information received in regard to the subject comprised in his motion, is that given by himself, viz., that Dr. Morin was called to attend a brakeman named Odilon Fournier, wounded on the Intercolonial, the 28th March, 1885; that for his services he was offered \$25, which is said to be in accordance with the Intercolonial tariff. I do not know what this tariff is, but at all events Mr. Morin claims \$110.50. It goes without saying that Mr. Morin cannot get the sum of his account, which he deems reasonable, from the department, and he will have to do, like everybody else in such cases, put his demand before the courts. As to the tariff, I cannot say whether it tallies with that of the medical faculty, or whether it is a tariff special to the Intercolonial. At any rate the papers will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

BAY FORTUNE BREAKWATER, P. E. I.

Mr. McINTYRE moved for:

Copy of report of engineer who recently examined the breakwater at Bay Fortune, King's County, Prince Edward Island, with a view to its extension; together with copies of all petitions, letters, &c, in relation thereto.

He said: The construction of the breakwater at Bay Fortune is the result of the voluntary exertions and contributions of the people there, as it has not yet received a cent from the public chest. In the summer of 1886, an engineer went down to the locality and examined the work, but there has been no report of that examination published, as in all similar cases. Why, I do not know. In 1887, last winter, the people of that section of the country sent a large petition to the Department of Public Works asking for aid to finish the breakwater. Their means had all been exhausted, and they thought that, as they had given so much of a voluntary kind, the least the Government could do would be to give them a slight amount of assistance. As I understand, at present, for want of the work being constructed out to the bar, the water is digging a false channel, but if they had sufficient means to push the work out to the bar, it would save the harbor and make a complete work of it. In connection with the manner in which the water is acting just now I will read an extract from a letter I received a few days ago, which will more fully explain it. The writer says:

"Were it not for the promises held out to us by the Government party we would never have expended so large an amount of labor upon it, knowing well that it was too heavy an undertaking to accomplish without some assistance from the Government. The great misfortune about it is that, not being able to carry the work out to the bar, as we intended, the current is now cutting a false channel around the outer end of the breastwork, and, if not stopped, will most certainly ruin the harbor, if not already destroyed."

Mr. AMYOT.

The section of the country is a large agricultural and fishing section. It is a wealthy part of the country, and the people are very far distant from their market. In the fall of the year, the roads leading to that market, which is the town of Souris, are extremely bad. With a little assistance from the Government, they could complete the work, which would make the harbor a good one for the exportation of their produce and for fishing purposes. I think the public spirit which has been displayed by these people deserves some consideration from the Government, and I trust the Minister of Public Works, in his Supplementary Estimates, will not forget the action these people have taken in their own behalf. The work must be of great importance to them or they would never have undertaken it. I trust the Minister will see the necessity of giving these people some slight assistance. It would not take a large amount now to finish the work, seeing that, in the winters of 1886 and 1887, the people by their own voluntary labor constructed no less than 460 feet of it, and a very short addition would make the harbor complete.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no objection to the motion of the hon. gentleman, with this exception, that, instead of saying "the report of the engineer who recently examined" this work, it should be the report of the chief engineer in connection with it, because the engineers on the works make their reports to the chief engineer, who reports to the Government. If the hon. gentleman will consent to that change, without a formal motion, I have no objection to its passing. I may say that the examination was made, and the chief engineer reported upon it, but, though there was an expression of opinion or wish in the petition that was sent in, the hope that at no distant date assistance might be obtained from the Government, there was no special application for a grant of money. So the matter has stood there, but now that the hon. gentleman has called my attention to it, I will see what the report says.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

SQUATTER'S CLAIM IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return containing copies of all letters, correspondence, affidavits, &c, connected with the location and sale or settlement of N. $\frac{1}{2}$, section 16, Township 24, Range 29 West, 4th Meridian, North-West Territory.

He said: I desire to bring before the notice of the House a matter connected with a piece of property in the North-West, the north half of section 16, township 24, range 29 west of the 4th meridian. It appears that a person named Topping was a squatter on this land, and a person of the name of McLeod bought out the squatter's rights, went into possession of the land, and made some improvements. The land at this time was not in the market for sale. When it came into the market, Mr. McLeod went to make his entry, but to his surprise he found that a man named Walker had made the entry and made some payment on it. He complained to the land agent that Walker had been permitted to make his entry while he was virtually in possession of the property; and I believe, according to the Land Regulations, it became necessary for Walker to file a declaration stating that there was no one in possession and that no improvements had been made before he could be permitted to enter. If Walker made that declaration, it was a very improper declaration for him to make, because it is clear that McLeod was in possession of the lot and had bought the right of the man I have named. Mr. McLeod applied to have Walker's entry cancelled, and to have his own name inserted as the owner of the property. The board refused to do that, and McLeod was virtually cheated out of his property. He had to give up possession and

leave the lot. He lived close by for twelve months, and during all that time Walker neither went into possession nor made any improvements. At the end of the twelve months, McLeod made an application to the land agent to be permitted to become the possessor of the property, paid his money and filed the declaration that there was no improvements whatever made by Walker on the property. He waited the full time of twelve months to give Walker all the opportunity he could reasonably expect to make improvements, but Walker made none. McLeod's application was sent forward, but, to his surprise, it was refused. The Land Board would not consent to give him the lot after the twelve months, during which he had waited, though Walker had had that time to make the necessary improvements under the statute. These are the statements he made to me; I am not in a position to say whether they are all true or not, but, if they are true, it evidently shows that advantage has been taken of this man for some reason. I cannot say what the reason is, but it is quite clear, if the statements are true—and he puts them in such a shape that I am disposed to think they are true—that, although he was an actual settler on that lot, by some influence, which may have been improper influence, he was removed from that property and it was given to Walker, who was put into possession, but never made any improvements for a year. The reason the Land Board refused to give the right to McLeod was said to be that Walker had stated he had let a contract to a man named Campbell to do some breaking. Mr. Campbell did nothing, however. He had the whole year, but there was not a sod turned. Of course Mr. McLeod expected fully at the end of the year, under those circumstances, that the privileges would be granted to him that were ordinarily granted to any party seeking to become a regular settler. Still, within twenty-four hours, he says, after he had made application to become possessor, there were some four or five teams put on the property for ploughing. Walker pretended to comply with the Land Board regulations. He claimed that he had let this man, Campbell, the contract for breaking, and Campbell had not carried out the contract, and owing to that fact improvements were not made. Well, if a man simply requires to present a statement of this kind in every case, and that excuse is accepted, and the actual settler, the man who has been in possession, according to the statement he has made to me, is virtually turned out—although he still offers to preempt and do the work afterwards—I think that is rather a singular state of affairs. Now, we find that all the papers have been sent to the Minister of the Interior, and I say if there is any truth in these statements it is a very unfortunate thing that men who are disposed to become actual settlers should be hustled around in that kind of a way. I think if there is any class in the world who should receive the earnest considerate attention of the Land Board there, or of the Minister here, it is the men who are prepared to go in as actual settlers and perform the improvements. Now, in moving for the papers which I believe are in the possession of the Minister of the Interior, I may be met with the statement that it would be better to wait until the papers are brought down in this case. Well, I have noticed that in many cases, where orders of this House have been passed, it is very late in the Session, and sometimes not until the following Session, that we get the papers. I felt it my duty to draw the attention of the Minister to this matter now, lest we might not get the papers during the present Session.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is no objection to the papers coming down, and I have no objection whatever to the statement the hon. gentleman has made. I think when the papers come down he will find that he has been misinformed on one or two rather important points. As he has put his statement before the House, I may as well state the

actual facts as they exist with regard to this lot. Major James Walker obtained entry for this half section as a homestead and pre-emption in the spring of 1886. He was then residing upon the north-west quarter of section 12, in township 24, range 1, west of the 5th meridian, and, being within two miles of his homestead, he obtained the entry under the provisions of sub-clause 6 of clause 38 of the Dominion Lands Act, commonly known as the two miles radius clause. Subsequently, application was made by one J. R. McLeod, on whose behalf, I think, the hon. gentleman makes his motion really worse, as to those three or four acres, than if the prairie had never been broken at all. To obtain homestead and pre-emption entries for the same land, on the ground that in 1884 he had purchased the squatter's claim of one Richard Jaffing, who was alleged to have built a house and done some ploughing on the north-east quarter, McLeod stated that he had himself also done some ploughing. The records of the surveys branch give no indication of these improvements at the time of survey, and an examination of the land by the homestead inspector showed that prior to Walker's entry three and a half acres would appear to have been broken, but by that time, not having been cultivated, the area broken was overgrown with weeds, and the so-called improvements were valueless. The land was open for entry in May, 1885, and between that time and the spring of 1886, when Walker got his entry, a period of nearly 2 years, McLeod neither resided upon the land, nor applied for entry. There was, therefore, neither residence nor cultivation of the land at the time Major Walker got his entry. The land was opened for entry in 1885, and if McLeod desired, as a squatter, to obtain any right, it was his duty under the Act to make his application within three months of the opening of the land for entry; but between that time and the spring of 1886, when Walker got his entry, a period of nearly a year, McLeod neither resided upon the land nor applied for entry. The law requires squatters in advance of survey to apply for entry within six months of the date when the township is open. In the spring of 1887 McLeod applied to cancel Walker's entry on the ground that the latter had failed to break and prepare for crop the prescribed area of the homestead quarter section within the first year. The inquiry instituted by the Land Board showed that Walker had made a contract, just as the hon. gentleman has stated, with one Campbell, to break the land for him in the autumn of 1886, but early frost prevented him from performing it; and although the prescribed area was not actually broken within the year, a greater area than the law required was prepared for crop before the date of inspection, and the Board sustained Walker's entry. The decision was appealed against, but was finally confirmed by the department, after consideration of all the evidence. These are the facts which will be shown when the papers come down.

Motion agreed to.

THE QUARANTINE SYSTEM OF CANADA.

Mr. FISER. (Translation) I rise to move for the appointment of a special committee to enquire into the manner in which the quarantine service of Canada is conducted, as also into the best means to be adopted to prevent contagious diseases from entering into the country, with power to hear, before the committee, persons expert in the matter, the said committee having to make a report. Mr. Speaker, the motion which I have the honor of making is one of the most important on the Orders of the Day. There is no question in it of money matters, but of the public weal. *Salus populi suprema lex.* I may say at once that, by this motion, I have no mind to blame either the quarantine administration or the Department of Agriculture.

I may add, on the contrary, that in my estimation, our quarantine system is second perhaps to only one other in America for efficacy. Still, it is far from perfect. If I have undertaken to make this motion, it is because I have been powerfully encouraged thereto by distinguished men of the medical profession and sanitary bodies, such as the Quebec and Ontario Boards of Health. I have with me several letters of eminent physicians approving the scheme, which I ask leave to read to the House. Here is part, that of Dr. Lachapelle, of Montreal, Chairman of the Provincial Board of Health :

PROVINCIAL BOARD OF HEALTH,
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC,
MONTREAL, 14th March, 1888.

DR. FISET, M.P., Ottawa.

DEAR SIR,—I wholly approve of the appointment of a committee of the medical men of the House to study the important question of our quarantine. I am convinced that the information thus obtained will be quite important, and I judge it is the duty of the Legislature to overlook nothing that would place our quarantine on the most perfect possible footing. The experience supplied by the New York quarantine last fall is sufficient to make us appreciate the importance of this matter.

Your very obedient servant,
E. P. LACHAPELLE.
Chairman.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, last autumn, when we apprehended that contagious disease might come to us by way of New York, Boston or Portland, cholera broke out at New York, brought by the steamers, we were quite deceived, laboring under the impression that their quarantine system was efficacious, when, on the contrary, it revealed a thorough disorganization, in fact the New York quarantine is far being as serviceable as ours. I shall now read a letter from a distinguished practitioner of Quebec, Dr. Catellier, who is quite experienced in quarantine matters :

QUEBEC, 11th March, 1888.

MY DEAR DOCTOR,—I cannot do otherwise than applaud your plan of improving, within possible bounds, our quarantine system. Indeed in the face of the dangers by which we are threatened, chiefly cholera, it is quite opportune to busy ourselves with the public health, and enquire whether contagious disease may come by way of the St. Lawrence, on steamers transporting passengers and emigrants. If your committee is a serious one, it will surely render service to the public and to the Government, ever anxious to divert contagious disease from the public.

Ever yours,
L. CATELLIER, M.D.

I am happy to add that Dr. Catellier is one of those who prompted to me the idea of asking for this committee. We shall next take the letter of Dr. Robillard, of Ottawa, chairman of the Board of Health of this city :

OTTAWA, 20th March, 1888.

DR. A. K. FISET, M. P.

DEAR SIR,—Every measure within the meaning of the motion which you propose making, asking for a special committee to enquire into our quarantine system and its administration in our ports, ought to fetch you the approval of every sensible person. A question so important to the welfare of Canadian people, and so full of actual interest, in view of the gradual encroachment of cholera on the continent, demands the special attention of the Federal Parliament, while we ought to establish measures on such a footing as to forestall all doubt of their efficacy.

Your devoted servant,
C. A. ROBILLARD, M.D.

I have a letter from Dr. Montizambert, the quarantine medical officer of Grosse Isle, a distinguished man, who fully appreciates the importance of such a committee as we shall see :

71, St. Ursule St.,
QUEBEC, 23rd March, 1888.

DEAR DR FISET,—Pray accept my grateful acknowledgments for your letter dated the 21st inst. enclosing copy of your notice of motion, and preparing me for a possible summons to appear before the committee.

I need hardly answer you that if so required, it will be a pleasure as well as a duty for me to give such aid as I can to secure the best precautions to prevent cases of contagious diseases from entering into the country.

MR. FISET.

It is a matter, the importance of which can, in my opinion, hardly be over-estimated.

"Salus populi suprema lex."

With kind regards,
Yours ever sincerely,
FREDK. MONTIZAMBERT, M.D., F.R.C.S.

I shall now submit a resolution passed by the Provincial Board of Health of the Province of Quebec, at a meeting held last month :

PROVINCIAL BOARD OF HEALTH,
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC,
76 St. Gabriel Street, S. O.
MONTREAL, 24th March, 1888.

Extract from the minutes of the meeting of March 24, 1888.

Resolved : That the Provincial Board of Health of Quebec, after taking cognisance of a notice of motion of Dr. Fiset, M. P. for Rimouski, before the House of Commons, for Monday next, relative to the important question of Canadian quarantine, take advantage of this opportunity to certify their gratitude to the mover for this act of philanthropy, and to reiterate to the Government what he has already communicated to them, praying that they will take such action as they will deem proper to shield our people efficaciously, on the receipt of the report of the committee which, we trust, will be appointed to that end.

(Certified.)
ELZÉAR PELLETIER,
Secretary.

As you see, Mr. Speaker, this resolution of the Quebec Provincial Board of Health is a thorough approval of the motion now before the House. The Ontario Board of Health does the same thing. On the 27th March, 1888, the secretary addressed the chairman of the Quebec Provincial Board of Health, Dr. Lachapelle, as follows :—

PROVINCIAL BOARD OF HEALTH,
TORONTO, ONT., 27th March, 1888.

MY DEAR SIR,—You will not have failed to have noticed that at the last meeting of this Board a report from the committee on epidemics was adopted, urging this Board to unite with your Board in pressing upon the Dominion authorities the urgent necessity there is for having Grosse Isle equipped, so that the good regulations of 1887 may be made practicable. I understand that there is danger of there being no grant made this year for a deep water wharf for making the work of disinfection possible; and as this is a *sine qua non* to rapid and effective work, without unnecessary delay, it is desirable that any influence that our united efforts can bring to bear, will be brought now, before the supplementary estimates are published. Will you have the matter brought before the Chairman and your Board, and let me know by telegraph what you will do, and if a deputation would meet us at Ottawa, and if so, at what date. Trusting that your Board is meeting with encouraging success in its work,

I have, &c,
PETER H. BRYCE

Dr. Lachapelle communicated the substance of the present motion to Mr. Bryce, on the 29th March, 1888 :

CONSEIL PROVINCIAL D'HYGIÈNE,
PROVINCE DE QUÉBEC,
76 rue St. Gabriel,
MONTREAL, 29th March, 1888.

PETER H. BRYCE, Esq.,
Provincial Board of Health,
Toronto.

Are you aware of Dr. Fiset's motion, in the House of Commons, for special committee to enquire into quarantine service and best precautions to be taken, with power to examine persons of experience? Will it not be better to wait for action of that committee. Willing to join your efforts.

E. P. LACHAPELLE,
Chairman.

Mr. Bryce answered by wire :

TORONTO, 29th March, 1888.

E. P. LACHAPELLE,
Chairman,
Provincial Board of Health,
Montreal.

Delighted at cooperation. Learned to-day of Fiset's motion for committee. Agree that it may be well to wait for a few days for developments.

PETER H. BRYCE.

I have also the approval of the hon. Senator, Dr. Pâquet, member of the Quebec Provincial Board of Health. The

newspapers of the Dominion have likewise signified their approval. *Le Canadien*, of Quebec, has a powerful article in support. With the leave of the House I shall read from the *Toronto Mail*, of 2nd April, the following article, a little long, but full of interest:—

"ST. LAWRENCE QUARANTINE

"That the protection of the country against the introduction of contagious diseases through emigrants from Europe is a matter of the utmost importance needs no demonstration; and that the people of our ocean ports are fully alive to the great necessity which exists for taking every possible precaution against contagion is shown by the motion of which notice has been given in the House of Commons by Mr. Fiset, M. P. for Rimouski. His motion is as follows: 'That a special committee be appointed to enquire into the manner in which the quarantine service of Canada is carried on; and also into the best precautions to be taken to prevent cases of contagious diseases from entering the country; with power to examine persons of experience in these matters. The said special committee to report to the House.' We are glad that this matter has been brought up in Parliament, and have no doubt that the committee will be granted. It will afford an opportunity for bringing prominently before the House various matters which have been from time to time referred to in the press, and for directing the attention of our legislators to views which in Ontario have been frequently expressed in resolutions of the Provincial Board of Health, and in the neighboring Province in memorials adopted by the Boards of Trade of both Montreal and Quebec.

"The reasons why the people of the West should be as anxious about this matter as those of the St. Lawrence ports are apparent. In these days of 'ocean greyhounds' and short passages, it may very easily happen that a person exposed in some Liverpool lodging house or on shipboard to smallpox, will have reached Manitoba or the Western States before the disease, with its incubative period of two weeks, will have appeared. Our readers will not have forgotten the case referred to in the report of the Provincial Board for 1886, in which one batch of Russian immigrants caused outbreaks of smallpox on the Canadian Pacific steamers, at Sault Sainte-Marie, in Michigan, in Manitoba, and in Dakota apparently by means of their clothing, which had been exposed on shipboard to the infection from companions left sick at Grosse Isle quarantine. The strong representations made that year to the Department of Agriculture resulted in new quarantine regulations, which were put into force in large measure in 1887. These demand inspection of every vessel entering the St. Lawrence; and the Grosse Isle station, thirty miles below Quebec, is admirably situated for the performance of this work. According to the resolutions passed by the Provincial Board of Ontario at its last meeting, and which appeared in the *Mail* at the time, it would appear, however, that for performing the work of inspection thoroughly, without a long delay of the steamers, it is necessary that the present wharf be extended into water deep enough at low tide to allow vessels of the largest tonnage to run alongside, instead of as at present, either having to be inspected by means of a steam-launch which runs out to them, or by their anchoring in mid-stream until high tide. This latter delay they cannot be expected to endure, while it appears that grave dangers, as well as difficulties, attend any attempt to fumigate large steamers by the sulphur-blast apparatus as at present operated from the deck of the steam-launch. If the wharf were extended the disinfectant batteries would be stationary upon it, while a rag-disinfecter and Troy laundry for disinfecting baggage and personal effects might be conveniently situated for prompt and effective use. Remembering the lamentable exhibition of want of preparation at the New York quarantine last year when a cholera ship made its appearance—which, had it occurred early in the season instead of in autumn, would almost certainly have resulted in an epidemic in that port and perhaps beyond it—we cannot afford to wait until either small-pox or cholera makes its appearance in the St. Lawrence to test the appliances at Grosse Isle for handling the hundreds of ships which annually come up the river. By all means let the enquiry be held, and, if defects still exist, we trust that, in the interests of national safety, they will be remedied, and every possible precaution taken to protect the cities and towns inland, along the lines of immigrant travel, as well as the Atlantic and St. Lawrence ports, from the introduction of epidemic disease, destructive of life and business alike."

This is what the *Quebec Chronicle* says, a paper that has been strict on quarantine matters:

"We are glad to see by the telegraphic reports from Ottawa that there is a notice of motion now before the House of Commons for the appointment of a special committee to enquire into the manner in which the quarantine service of Canada is carried on; and, also, into the best precautions to be taken to prevent cases of contagious diseases from entering into the country; with power to examine persons of experience in these matters. The said special committee to report to the House."

"We trust this committee will be accorded. And that they will, amongst other things, report to the House in favor of the strong recommendations recently made by the Provincial Board of Health of Ontario, which appeared in our columns on the first of last month."

I will have occasion to read the report of the Ontario Board of Health. The *Chronicle* continues:

"The Board urges that the quarantine station of the St. Lawrence be equipped with the modern appliances now recognized to be essential for the protection of the country. These are, to quote from their report: 'Requisite buildings placed at the extreme end of the extended wharf for (a) Fumigating furnace, reservoir and exhaust fan; (b) For locating superheating chamber to 230° Fahr; (c) Boiler and steam connection therewith; (d) Troy laundry for disinfecting bedding, ship linen, mattresses, flags, curtains, carpets, rugs, all personal baggage and wearing apparel, which shall be removed from ships to this building for purposes of thorough disinfection."

"Before the Quarantine Station can be equipped with these essential appliances, the wharf must be extended into deep water so as to receive them, and to enable vessels to come to it to discharge their passengers, &c., when necessary, and to be disinfected. The imperative necessity for this extension of the quarantine wharf to meet the altered requirements of the present we have already urged upon the Government.

"This matter has also been the subject of strong memorials from the Boards of Trade of both Quebec and Montreal, based upon the representations of the shipping interest of those ports, which dreads the extra delay and demurrage from landing everything in ships' boats.

"Cholera is still threatening us from Europe and South America. Its sudden advent to New York last autumn is fresh in the memory of all, and has led to the thorough overhauling of the quarantine station there.

"With all these warnings pressing upon their attention the Dominion Government will indeed be utterly without excuse if caught unprepared. And we therefore call upon them to place an amount in the supplementary estimates for the extension of the quarantine wharf into deep water, so that as quickly as possible it may be able to receive steamships when necessary and so that those disinfecting appliances may be placed upon it which are so essential for the protection of the country from epidemic disease."

This makes three leading journals, *Le Canadien*, the *Mail* and the *Chronicle*, agreeing to the motion which I have the honor of making.

After Recess.

Mr. FISET, Mr. Speaker, when I closed my observations at six o'clock, I stated that I had no mind to blame the Department of Agriculture. This is not a resolution of censure that I propose; just the contrary. But we, the medical men of this House, are of opinion that matters can always be mended and improved. Neither have I said that our quarantine system was defective. I stated, rather, that it was the second in America, but still far from perfect. I quoted several authorities to show the importance of the committee which I ask for. I shall make still one more citation, which will probably determine the Government to appoint the committee that I solicit. Here is what the *Chronicle*, of the 1st February, 1888, says. It expresses, first, the need of being wary this year, and quotes the resolutions of the Ontario Board of Health. Before the citation the paper says:

"At the last meeting of the board, Dr. Government, who like our own Dr. Montizambert, at this port, is an authority on sanitation and quarantine, read the report of committee on epidemic, which at this time, has an especial significance for us. The report deals in an ample manner, with the question of additional apparatus required for the more effectual exclusion of epidemic diseases at the gate of our Dominion, viz: Grosse Ile Quarantine Station. As the question is one in which every man, woman and child in our city and province are immediately interested, we republish it here. It reads thus:

It would, perhaps, take too long to read the whole report; here is the conclusion:

The report was adopted as read, and the following series of resolutions were proposed by Dr. Government and seconded by Dr. Cassidy.

"Whereas the Provincial Board of Health of Ontario have reason for belief that the quarantine station at Grosse Isle would have great additional power in the work of protecting the inhabitants of our Dominion from the entrance of infectious diseases by certain additions to the very admirable provisions already in operation, be it resolved that the following additional enforcements be urged upon the Dominion Government, viz:

"1st. A steam launch or tug boat of sufficient size, strength and horse power for boarding in all weather, day and night, vessels in the offing waiting for clearance.

"2nd. Repair and extension of the western wharf sufficient for permitting vessels, on board of which during the voyage cholera or small-pox had occurred, to ride at anchor at low tide during the process of disinfection of such ships.

"3rd. Requisite buildings be placed at the extreme end of the extended wharf for (a) Fumigating furnace, reservoir and exhaust fan; (b) For locating superheating chamber to 230 Fahrenheit; (c) Boiler and steam connection therewith; (d) Troy laundry for disinfecting bedding, ship

linen, mattresses, flags, curtains, carpets, rugs, all personal baggage and wearing apparel, which shall be removed from ships to this building for purposes of thorough disinfection.

"4th. That as the present service is a day and night one for eight months in the year, and thus the medical superintendent and his assistant are debarred from practice, the salary of the superintendent should be an adequate one, as also that of his assistant.

"5th. That at the meeting of the Association of Executive Health Officers of Ontario, convened for the 5th February next, the Members of this Provincial Board, or a committee thereof, shall bring this subject before said meeting and suggest the propriety of concerted action on this matter of guarding against epidemic disease.

"6th. That the Chairman be authorized to appoint a committee from this board to interview the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa during the coming session of the House of Commons regarding the questions involved in the above resolutions, and that the Quebec Provincial Board of Health be invited to join with the committee of this board in the proposed interview."

Thus you see, Mr. Speaker, it is not a simple member of Parliament who asks of the Government the formation of a committee to inquire into the working of our quarantines, but it is the general public, the most distinguished physicians of Ontario and Quebec, who ask for it. The Government have doubtless done their duty, but they should remember that we have at present a perfect system of disinfection. The process is quite new, and I am willing to believe that the Government have knowledge of these improved methods. It is not so long ago, in 1825, that the efficacy of quarantines was denied. They had not in those days the perfected means which we now possess, and the quarantines of that epoch could not give such good results as in our day. All is altered now. The system devised by the renowned Joseph Holt, of Louisiana, is unquestionably the most perfect in existence. The State of Louisiana and the city of New Orleans were looked upon as places where strangers could not venture without taking the yellow fever, but since the introduction of the Holt system, New Orleans is no longer a hotbed of epidemic, and, indeed, for the past five years, there has been no yellow fever there, nor in the neighborhood. This sanitary result is due to the great precautionary measures that were employed. I may perhaps be allowed to explain the New Orleans system. Dr Holt established three quarantine stations one at 110 miles from New Orleans; the other, at 103 miles, and the third, at 70 miles. When a vessel reaches a port, the doctor in charge of the quarantine at the first station goes aboard to examine the vessel carefully. If he discovers no contagious disease, or if the vessel does not hail from an infected port, he at once issues his certificate, and the vessel goes up to New Orleans. If the vessel comes from an infected port, but has no sickness on board, and if its record is good, then it is sent to the third station, that is, the one that is 70 miles from New Orleans, although there is no sickness on board. The vessel is kept in quarantine for a few days, but not beyond five days, and during that time, it is put through a thorough process of disinfection. If, on the other hand, the vessel is infected, a despatch is at once sent to the principal station and thence a boat is sent to take the vessel and lead it to the station that is 103 miles from New Orleans, where it is thoroughly disinfected. The sick are separated from the well and they are sent to the next station, that is at that what lies 70 miles from New Orleans. There, again it is submitted to disinfection, without, however, undue detention. Then, finally, a certificate is issued allowing the vessel to go off the Mississippi. Owing to these precautions, New Orleans is to-day a very healthy city, where there is less sickness than in our Canadian towns. It is worthy of remark, Mr. Speaker, that all these quarantine expenses, which are undoubtedly heavy, are borne by the State of Louisiana. Here it is quite different. Our quarantines are kept at the expense of the Dominion, and it is that which gives them their superiority over those of the United States. The Government of Canada are charged with the quaran-

Mr. FISER.

ties of all the Provinces, the expenses being borne by all the Provinces. The burden is much less for each, and less considerable on the whole. I must say at once, in justice to the quarantine staff of Grosse Isle and especially to its chief, who is a personal friend of mine, and whom I deeply esteem, that they are a body of superior officials. I think that the superintendent of Grosse Isle Quarantine would be happy to share his responsibility with a Board of Health. The Provinces of Ontario and Quebec have already their respective Boards of Health. Why should not the Dominion have its Board of Health which would divide its responsibility with the medical superintendent of Grosse Isle? It is hardly just that the responsibility of preventing contagious diseases from entering that country should bear exclusively on the shoulders of the latter officer. I am convinced that Dr. Montzambert would view with favor the establishment of such a board. Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the steamers carrying the mails are obliged to stop at Rimouski for a first inspection. If there are contagious diseases on board, they are sent to quarantine, but I beg you to notice that this applies only to the mail steamers. I doubt whether we have sufficient guarantees at Rimouski. There is an inspector, but he is alone. He goes on board of his little tugboat, to meet the steamers from England, loaded with immigrants. Of course there are none arriving that way at present, but they come to New York in larger numbers than ever. Our officer at Rimouski performs his inspection, but the man must return to shore and with the small salary which he receives, can be able to do his work as he should? And even if he were able, he has not at Rimouski the means of disinfection. This is another point to which I call the attention of the Government, because there are not only the mail steamers, but several lines of steamers on the St. Lawrence. Now if, as in Louisiana, we had not three stations but two, we should have a much more perfect system. True, that this would entail expense, but in the matter of public health the question of expenditure must be met, to establish a quarantine as perfect as possible. I have been informed that, this year, the Government purposed making some outlay for the improvement of the quarantine system. While going to any expense, why not organize our system on a perfect footing at once? I do not know yet whether the Government share my views. Nor do I know whether they will grant my motion. At all events, I shall have performed my duty, and I state that if the Government substitute themselves to the committee, which we ask, I think they will be making a mistake. After all, since the American States and the Provincial Administrations take the trouble of clearing themselves of such responsibility, by placing it on the shoulders of the Boards of Health in each Province, why should the Federal Government refuse to be enlightened by men of experience who might be heard before the committee? The question of expenditure need not deter the Government. The number of persons before the committee will not be large, but the public and this House have certainly the right to be informed with respect to the guarantees afforded by our quarantines, for the prevention of the entrance of contagious diseases into the country. The public surely have the right of being enlightened as to the means that are employed to screen them from contagion. When the public shall have been thoroughly reassured; when they feel confident that the Government are doing all that lies in their power, taking every measure requisite to prevent the introduction of contagious disease into the Dominion, one-half of the battle will be won. A patient having implicit faith in his physician is already half saved. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Government, in view of my good intentions and of the benefit which the public will derive therefrom, will grant the motion which I propose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has introduced the subject in a very proper way before this House, and I have no doubt he has presented a good deal of information to hon. members as well as to the Minister of Agriculture. I think the hon. gentleman should rest satisfied with the statement he has made and withdraw the motion, because the proposition is really casting a censure upon the quarantine system which now prevails. I think the hon. gentleman does not pretend to find special fault in regard to the quarantine system as it now obtains in Canada. I believe it is very well managed, very skillfully managed and carefully looked after, and the immunity from disease has resulted from the watchful manner in which it has been carried out and shows that the system has worked well. Like every human organisation it may be improved, and the Government, especially the Minister at the head of this branch, will consider well the statements made by the hon. gentleman, and perhaps it may be that some of the suggestions made by the hon. gentleman will, on full examination, meet the approbation and thanks of the government and the head of that special department. If this should be the case the Government will, of course, adopt them. In the meantime I ask the hon. gentleman to be satisfied with the statement he has made, and with having submitted information to the House and to the Government and the country, and not press his motion further.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure my hon friend has no intention of censuring the Government by making this motion or in any statements he has made; but if he has done nothing more than draw the attention of the Government to this very important subject, the House will be indebted to him for the statements he has made. I must, with justice to the Minister of Agriculture, say that he is doing his very best, I am sure, to discharge the important duties of this branch of his department, but at the same time the system is perhaps capable of improvement, as my hon. friend has already stated. I agree with the First Minister that perhaps my hon friend will allow the matter to rest here and leave the matter with the Government, and if there is any responsibility the Government must assume it.

Motion withdrawn.

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS SUBWAY.

Mr. PERRY moved for :

Copy of report of engineers and surveyors appointed to survey the Straits of Northumberland from Carleton Point, Prince Edward Island, to Cape Jourimain, New Brunswick, during the summer of 1887, with the view of ascertaining the practicability of building a subway across the Straits.

He said: I desire to direct the attention of the House to the fact that this question has been brought before Parliament on previous occasions, I am sorry to say with the same results each time, and that is the adoption of a do-nothing policy. Nothing tangible has yet been done, and no attempt has yet been made to carry out the arrangement made between Canada and Prince Edward Island, at the time of Confederation. It is well known that years ago this question engaged the attention of the Local Legislature of Prince Edward Island, and as far back as two years ago a deputation composed of the leading members of the Island Government were sent to England with these complaints, and with an address to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty would interfere and compel the terms entered into at Confederation to be carried out by Canada. Nothing so far has been done. Yet the summer following, I believe, surveys were made for a subway from Cape Traverse on the island side to Cape Tormentine, and the report of the surveyors and engineers is rather favorable to the practicability of building a subway across the straits. From

my place last Session I had the privilege of asking the Government if it was their intention to cause further surveys to be made, and the First Minister who leads this House answered simply no, that it was not the intention to cause any further survey. This question was asked in view of the letter which the right hon. gentleman had written about a week and a half before the general election to Senator Howlan, of Prince Edward Island, no doubt with a view to influence the elections at that time. The hon. gentleman in his place stated that he really wrote that letter in answer to a letter from Senator Howlan, but the face of the letter itself conveys a contradictory view, because it is in answer to our conversation. I believed the hon. gentleman at the time when he wrote that letter was in earnest, but I now find he is not in earnest, that he has no fixed policy with regard to carrying out the terms of Confederation with the island any more than the Government of the day have in regard to reciprocity between Canada and the United States. At one time the right hon. gentleman said we shall not have further surveys made, and yet last summer we were told there were surveys made from Carleton Point on the island, about two miles west of Cape Traverse, to Cape Jourimain, in New Brunswick, about one and three-quarters or two miles west of Cape Tormentine. I am told that this report is a very favorable one. I have not seen it, but I have seen a sketch of it in the Conservative press, in the *Summerside Journal* and the *Daily Examiner* of Charlottetown, papers which are no doubt in the confidence of the Government and papers which support the Government. But nothing has yet been done; the Government have not decided in the matter. On going a little further into this question I find that the delegation sent from Prince Edward Island to Her Majesty had to face the opposition of the hon. Finance Minister, at that time Canada's High Commissioner in England. He gave the delegate of the island all the opposition that his eloquence could give on that occasion. But, Sir, I think he is bound down by his own statement of the policy with regard to this subway and that he is bound to carry it out. Now, Sir, here are the words of the hon. gentleman on that occasion :

"Messrs. Sullivan and Ferguson admit in a subsequent paragraph that the island has prospered as they put it 'notwithstanding the inaction of the Dominion Government.' This statement, in view of what has already been stated, may be left to take care of itself; but the object of their representation appears to be to secure the laying of a metallic subway across the straits of Northumberland, through which the railway communication could be effected, 'the cost of which undertaking,' Messrs. Sullivan and Ferguson say, 'would not exceed a sum which it would not be unreasonable to ask the Government of Canada to expend.' If it can be shown that such a work is practicable, that it can be constructed for a reasonable outlay and maintained without a large expense, the matter seems to be one that may fairly be placed before the Canadian Government for consideration."

I do say that the island has prospered notwithstanding all the obstacles thrown in the way of its prosperity by the Dominion Government not carrying out the agreement. I am not here prepared to say that the island did not prosper. We do not come here to beg from the Government, but we simply want what is due the people of our Province and what the Government by solemn contract has promised. I suppose they are waiting for the island people to threaten rebellion and I suppose it is the only practical way we can get our rights. Are we to have instances of this kind from day to day and from week to week? Here in this extract which I have read we have the High Commissioner binding himself and binding the Government of the day to carry out their promise and I want the Government to pronounce upon this question. Now I would like to ask the Government how far they have gone in the consideration of this matter? I suppose they will tell us that they had a survey in 1886, that they have had another survey in 1887 and that they had an Act before Parliament two years ago incorporating a company to

build this subway. I am told, and I have reason to know that a Company has offered the Government to build that subway provided the Government gives them a certain amount of subsidy. That subsidy is asked for Prince Edward Island in order to enable the Government to carry out the terms of Confederation, but yet we are told that Prince Edward Island has no subsidy to get. When a subsidy is required in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec or Ontario, there is any amount of money to be got for subsidies in these Provinces, but there is nothing for Prince Edward Island, even though it is to enable the Government to carry out a sacred compact made with the people of Prince Edward Island at the time of Confederation. They tell us, when we ask our just rights, that there is no money for a work of great magnitude that is necessary to enable the Government to carry out the terms of Confederation with that Province. We heard a great deal about loyalty the other day, and let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, and let me tell this House, and let me tell the Government more particularly, that the people of Prince Edward Island are loyal subjects to Her Majesty Queen Victoria. They are loyal subjects, but I am sorry to say I would not vouch much for their loyalty to the present Government until they carry out the promises made at Confederation. Sir, in another little corner of this document, when the High Commissioner on that occasion is introducing the delegates from Prince Edward Island to Earl Granville, he says:

"Messrs. Sullivan and Ferguson conclude their rejoinder by saying: 'With regard to the claim for compensation by reason of the non-fulfilment of the terms of Confederation the undersigned submit that a review of the facts adduced will conclusively show that the island has suffered great loss, and is therefore entitled to indemnity.' In the first place it is incorrect to say that the terms of Confederation have not been complied with."

I would like to ask this House if the terms of Confederation have been complied with in this case? Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, says that the terms of Confederation have been applied in every other case. That is doubtful. It is an assertion which may admit of argument, but the fact remains that the terms of Confederation have not been complied with so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, and that the Government has not made even a decent effort to carry out the terms of Confederation with that Province is an established fact. It is a fact that since 1873 the terms of Confederation have not been fulfilled on the part of the Government of Canada to the people of Prince Edward Island. Sir, I contend that the people of Prince Edward Island are not in a position to keep up with the progress of the rest of the Dominion; that they are not in direct communication with the Dominion, that we are now for three months without having steam communication from the island to the mainland, and we have to drag our bodies the best way we can in those open boats. The Government have not half the requirements necessary to carry passengers across the straits and we have to use half a dozen boats exclusive of the Government boats in order to carry those passengers from one side to the other. Is that what the people of that Province ought to expect? Is that what the people of New Brunswick ought to expect from the Government which renders it impossible for them to visit their neighbors across the straits of Northumberland? Is that what the travelling agents of the manufacturers of Ontario ought to expect from the Government that they are not able to cross the straits and offer their samples to their good customers of Prince Edward Island? Is this the way the Government intend to redeem and carry out their solemn pledge to the people of Prince Edward Island? If there was one thing more than another that induced the people of the island to enter Confederation it was upon the solemn promise that the Government had their right hand held out to assist them. They entered Confederation because they relied upon the promise made by the Government that

Mr. FERRY.

they were to have continuous communication between the island and the mainland. This was the promise that induced them particularly to join Confederation. What has the result been? Up to this day the people of the island have been neglected and the promises made them have not been carried out. Up to this day when they ask the Government to carry out the terms of Confederation they are told "we have no money." I am here to state to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, to the Government, and particularly to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—and no one knows better than he does, if he knows anything at all—that the terms of Confederation have not been carried out, and that not even an attempt has been made in this direction. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries appears to know very little about the navigation between the island and the mainland. He appears to not even know how many trips the steamers make there in the year. When I found fault with the Government for having paid a large amount of money to the steamer *Neptune*, and when I asked them about the matter in Parliament last year that gentleman defended the action of the Government and stated that the steamer *Neptune* had plied across the straits two and a-half months. What does the return of his own Department show? It shows that that steamer commenced to cross on the 20th December and made her first trip, and that she made her last trip on the 4th of February. Yet the hon. gentleman said that the steamer crossed for two months and a-half. Does he call that two months and a-half? His words are in black and white in the *Hansard*. It is a good thing we have a *Hansard* in this Parliament in order to hold the hon. gentleman to his words. This shows all the hon. gentleman knows about his department, but I suppose he will not deny his own return, which shows that his statement was not correct, but that he was astray one month. Well, Sir, the Earl of Granville was aware that the people of the Island desired to induce the Dominion Government to carry out the terms with Prince Edward Island. On that subject Earl Granville said:

"I explained to them that the Queen had no power, either by statute or otherwise under the Constitution of Canada, to give any direction in this matter, and that, therefore, I should not be able to advise Her Majesty (who has been pleased to receive the Address very graciously) to take any action upon it, but that it would give me much satisfaction if, by the exercise of any friendly offices which I could tender, I should be able to contribute to the settlement of a question in which the Provincial Government were so much interested. I added that I had confidence in the friendly spirit in which the matter at issue would be dealt with on both sides, and this led me to hope that some acceptable arrangement might be come to."

I would like to ask the Government if they have made one decent attempt to carry out these suggestions? Earl Granville winds up by saying:

"It would reflect great credit on the Dominion Government if, after connecting British Columbia with the Eastern Provinces by the Canadian Pacific Railway, it should now be able to complete its system of railway communication by an extension to Prince Edward Island."

But, Sir, all these good offices on the part of Earl Granville have been disregarded by the present Government. I suppose we may be told that they will do something to-morrow; but to-morrow never comes with these gentlemen so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, and I am afraid it is not going to come for some years yet. Now, if the Dominion Government intend to carry out the terms of Confederation, I hope they will take steps to do so without any further delay. They have had two surveys across the straits, and we know that an effort has been made by a company to build that subway provided a subsidy is given. During the last Parliament one of the Senators, I think Senator Howland, stated in the Senate Chamber that not a member from the island had said anything in his place in favor of that subway. I am here to contradict that statement. The *Hansard* will prove that every member from Prince Edward Island who spoke on the question spoke

forcibly in favor of the terms being carried out by the building of the subway if it was practicable. I say that was a wrong statement to make; it was done, I suppose, with the view of making it appear that the members from Prince Edward Island, because they belonged to the Grit party, were not favorable to the welfare of the island. We find that on nomination day the hon. Minister of Finance telegraphed to Hon. Donald Ferguson, who was a candidate in the interest of the Government, to say that the Government were desirous of carrying out the work of the subway. What does that mean? Does it mean anything or nothing? There was one thing it meant, that was, to defeat the Liberal candidate. It had not the effect of doing that, but it had the effect of showing that the Government failed to carry out the solemn promises they had made. The hon. Minister of Finance further telegraphed to Mr. Ferguson as follows:—

“On the platform on nomination day I came out very strongly in support of connecting Prince Edward Island with the rest of the Dominion.”

I suppose he meant by steam. He left out the word steam, but I do not see any other way of making the connection. The climax was his last telegram, as follows:—

“It is necessary, in the interest of the Government, that the island should send a united phalanx to support the Government.”

No doubt, in the interest of the Government, but not in the interest of Prince Edward Island. Taking all these things into consideration, I think the people of Prince Edward Island had a right to expect that the Government were sincere and were determined to carry out the terms of Confederation with respect to the island. No doubt they are very comfortable on the Treasury benches, because they are not so unfortunate as the poor farmers and the poor fishermen, because they get their \$8,000 a year without having to pay a single cent of taxation. I can tell them that if they expect the people of the island to be contented and happy, and to consider themselves as part and parcel of the Dominion of Canada, they must carry out the terms of Confederation. The people of Prince Edward Island, although they are only few in numbers, are not to be despised. They are British subjects; they are descendants of people who have fought for their rights and liberty; they are descendants of people who have exterminated the landlords who had no right to the soil; and the Government are almost tempting the people of the island to go back to their previous position. I am here to state what the people of the island have a right to get and what they have not got, and I state it above board. I hope the Government will lose no time in laying upon the Table this report of the surveyers, commissioners and engineers, and I believe it will warrant the Government to commence operations, and subsidise that company to build the subway with as little delay as possible. I am told that a company is now exploring the straits between West Point, P. E. I., and Richibucto Head, with a view of establishing continuous steam navigation there. Is the Government not cognisant of this fact? Are they so ignorant of the condition and welfare of the people of Prince Edward Island as not to know that this is going on? I suppose I will be answered one of those days that they know nothing about it and care just as little. But, as I said before, I hope the Government will take warning; I hope that they will go to work and that there will be no to-morrow policy in this matter, but a policy of immediate advance. I hope they will show by their action that they are in earnest, for they have had sufficient surveys made there to know whether it is possible to build a subway or not; and if the reports are such that the Government will be warranted in building the subway, if the scheme is practicable, and the cost is not beyond a reasonable figure—and according to Messrs. Ferguson and Sullivan the island was entitled years ago to \$5,000,000 for the

neglect of the Government in carrying out the terms of Confederation—the Government should not lose any more time. There is nothing now to cross the straits with. The *Northern Light* has been fast in the ice for over three months, and is not fit to make a trip when the ice is in any way strong. The Government know this, and yet they have the audacity to tell us she is the best boat they can get. Years ago, when she was new they ran her down, but now, when she is wrecked like their own policy, she is the best they can get for the work. I suppose we will be told that the people of Prince Edward Island are not entitled to any consideration because they have sent here six men in Opposition. Well, the six men are British subjects and white men, men who have a right to be here, men who were sent here by well-to-do constituents, and constituents who are not of the character which the hon. member for Annapolis gave to his constituents. I was amused to hear him say the other day that to his constituents books and papers were a luxury; and I dare say if they read more than they do, they would send somebody else here to represent them besides that hon. gentleman. The people of the island are a reading people, and what is better they have common sense and a good spirit as to their rights. Their rights they must get, if not from this Government, I hope from the next, and I trust the time will not be long before we have another Government.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I thought the hon. Minister of Public Works might have taken advantage of the occasion to state to the House and the country whether any other arrangements have been made for carrying on the construction of a public wharf at Cape Tormentine, a contract for which the hon. gentleman entered into some years ago. The hon. gentleman knows that three or four years ago a sum of money was voted for the construction of a railway from Cape Traverse to connect with the main trunk line on the island, with the object of building a very long pier or wharf there, and another on the New Brunswick side, in order finally to have a steam ferry there in the summer months, and, when possible, in the winter months. The wharf was built on the island side. I dare say the hon. gentleman has some report on the work and is aware it requires extension. On the New Brunswick side a contract was entered into some years ago, and the work was commenced, but after a hundred yards was partially constructed the contractors abandoned the work altogether, and it is now lying in a dilapidated condition which is really pitiable and humiliating. Is it the intention of the Government to prosecute vigorously that work the coming summer, or have they made up their minds to abandon it altogether? I thought it was possible, in view of the important promises which the hon. the Minister of Finance made just previous to the last elections, that he would consider most favorably the construction of a subway, and in view of the letter which the leader of the Government wrote to the people, saying that a survey would be made of the straits to ascertain whether the construction of a subway was practicable, that the hon. gentleman might have abandoned the construction of this pier for the larger scheme. Of course, if he has, from information that the work is practicable, come to that conclusion, I will only be too glad to support him, but if not, I will be glad to learn that the old scheme is to be carried out and prosecuted vigorously. I can only express my regret that the hon. the Minister of Marine is not in his place, because I would like very much, after the speech of my hon. friend with reference to the communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, to have heard from him what action the department has taken with the view of constructing another boat to supplement the *Northern Light*. I heard it casually stated that they were going to spend a large sum of money on the steamer

Alert, and was very glad to hear that contradicted by somebody who professes to know, because I wish to express as strongly as I can my disapprobation of such a course. I have heard it rumored since that the department are about to call for tenders for the construction of a larger and better boat to supplement the *Northern Light*. I hope that rumor is true. I was in hopes we would have had an official statement made to-night by the hon. the Minister of Marine, because after the plain, practical and convincing statements made by my hon. friend, based as they are upon historical facts and upon the declaration made by the High Commissioner to Earl Granville as to the intention of the Government, and upon the suggestion which Earl Granville made to this Government, I hope we would have heard to-night what the policy of the Government is. I think my hon. friend has made out a complete case, and has put the House in full possession of the facts, and I do think our long-suffering people are entitled to have their grievances in this very serious matter removed. We have been year after year pressing this matter, and I am sure the House does not want me to go over the old story, and I am not going to do it again to-night, because my hon. friend has anticipated me and has put the points better than I could, but I do hope to have some assurance from the Minister in reference to that wharf, and, if he can give it in the absence of the Minister of Marine, some information as to the action of the Department of Marine in reference to the construction of another steamboat.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was about to rise just now, when I saw the hon. gentleman wished to say a few words, and I thought it better he should speak first so that I might answer both gentlemen—the mover of the resolution (Mr. Perry) and the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies)—at the same time. In answer to the last question of the hon. gentleman, I may say that the contract for the wharf or pier at Cape Tormentine was broken by the Government because the contractor did not proceed with the work quickly and evidently could not go on. Under those circumstances we called for new tenders, and have given a new contract. The contract has been signed, and I understand that the contractors are men who are quite able to perform the work, which will be proceeded with with all due vigor.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Will the hon. gentleman state who they are?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not remember now. When the Estimates come on, I shall be able to give the names. As to the boat, I cannot positively say, but, as far as I recollect, the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is to provide a new boat. In reference to the remarks of the mover of the motion, I may say, first, that there will be no objection to bring down the papers, and second, that the survey made in 1886 was communicated to the House and hon. gentlemen know what was the result of that survey. The hon. gentleman complains that no work has been done in the direction of constructing a subway. I do not suppose he expected that we would proceed in that way. He knew, and I think the hon. gentleman who spoke last stated, that the Minister of Finance had made a statement that we would give our attention to that work, and that we would have new explorations made to see whether the work was a feasible one or not. Well, I am glad to say that the last survey, which was made in July and August, 1887, has given a much better result than the first survey of 1886, and, if we go on in that way, improving all the time, we shall find the distance very small.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) By the next election.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not say that. The hon. gentleman says so, and I am glad to hear him fix a
Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.)

date, because the Government of course will thus know the wishes of hon. gentlemen on the other side. The engineer in the month of August took a series of borings in a line from Carleton Point to a point in New Brunswick, I think Munsey Point. The greatest depth of water found is ninety-one feet, the bottom is more favorable than on the line of soundings taken in 1886, and the distance is six and a half miles, which is one and a half miles less than on the line of borings taken in 1886. This shows that, as I said, if we go on in that way, we shall find the distance very small, and I think that in any case this result is much more favorable and must please hon. gentlemen so far, at all events, as the survey goes, as it shows that, if the matter has been left over for a year to obtain new soundings and new measurements, the time has not been lost in vain, that we have obtained a much better line by this survey than we had in 1886. I have no objection to the granting of the motion.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I would like to be permitted to ask the hon. gentleman whether the result of the survey has been so satisfactory as to induce him to believe it to be right and proper that he should propose a subsidy or a vote to the House to carry the work out, either by means of a company or by Government contract?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid that is a question which I cannot answer immediately. I think it is one of those questions that must be left to the consideration of the Government, and the hon. gentleman may be sure, after the surveys which we have made, that the Government will give to the matter their best consideration.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I fear we cannot hope for anything in the supplementaries?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is a pleasure left for the hon. gentleman to discover.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Have the Government any offers from any company to build a subway for any particular sum?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not aware. There may have been some offer of that kind in the Railway Department, but I am not in a position to answer that definitely.

Motion agreed to.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION.

Mr. LAURIER moved for:

Copies of all correspondence exchanged between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland concerning the admission of Newfoundland into the Confederation.

He said: I have no intention to comment on the subject at this moment. My only object is to have as soon as possible before the House the papers on that important question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I hope the hon. gentleman will not insist upon his motion after what I shall say. This matter is now engaging the attention of the Government, and, as the hon. gentleman will see from the newspapers that a delegation is coming to Canada about this matter, we think the public interest would not allow us to lay this correspondence now before Parliament.

Mr. LAURIER. If I understand from the hon. gentleman that the correspondence is still going on, that it is not yet in a fit condition to be published, I will not press my motion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister, I suppose, has no objections to inform us when he expects the

delegation to arrive, and perhaps he might give us the names of the gentlemen, if he has been made acquainted with them in advance.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not able to give the names of the gentlemen who will form the delegation, nor the precise date of their coming to Canada, but I suppose it will be about the end of this month.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell us whether the Parliament of Newfoundland has authorised the delegation, or whether their Parliament has given any authority to a delegation to come here.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not able to give that information.

Motion withdrawn.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

The following member, having previously taken the oath according to law, and subscribed the Roll containing the same, took his seat in the House:

DAVID BISHOP MEIGS, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Missisquoi, introduced by Hon. Mr. Laurier and Mr. Fisher.

ASSISTANCE TO WRECKING VESSELS.

Mr. EDGAR moved for:

Copies of all papers, &c., with reference to: 1. The refusal of the United States authorities to allow Canadian wrecking vessels and machinery to assist Canadian vessels while in distress in United States waters. 2. The refusal of the Canadian authorities to allow United States wrecking vessels and machinery to assist United States vessels while in distress in Canadian waters.

He said: There is a Bill before the House standing, I think, for its second reading, introduced by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), which relates closely to this subject, and I sincerely hope the hon. member will press his Bill, and that it will receive the support of both sides of this House. His Bill is to permit American vessels to aid vessels which are wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters. I suppose that that Bill would not have been introduced by that hon. gentleman unless the Canadian authorities had hitherto prevented American vessels from aiding wrecked or disabled vessels in Canadian waters. I have no doubt, however, that the reason why the Canadian authorities took this exceeding harsh line was because the American Government prevented Canadian vessels from assisting vessels which were wrecked in American waters. I think it will be of considerable advantage to this House, in the consideration of the Bill to which I have referred, if these papers are brought down, so much, at least, as the Government feel at liberty to bring down, and I hope they will bring them all down. The motion refers not only to correspondence and Orders in Council with reference to the refusal of the United States authorities to allow Canadian wrecking vessels and machinery to assist vessels in American waters, but also as to the refusal of the Canadian authorities to allow Americans to do so, so that we will have both features of the case before us when we have these papers. I have no doubt, as I said before, that the Canadian authorities could not have adopted the harsh measures which they have in this matter, and which are to be cured by this Bill, unless the Americans had done the same, but I find in the United States Congress they do not take exactly that view of the case. They seem to think that the Canadian Government has acted much more harshly towards them than they have acted towards the Canadian Government. However, the papers will show how that is. But in order to show the House the view that is taken of the matter on the other side, I will refer to a resolution which was introduced into

the House of Representatives by Mr. Nutting, early in the month of February. In that resolution it is recited:

"Whereas, it is alleged that the Canadian authorities for years have refused, and now refuse to allow American wrecking vessels and machinery to assist American vessels while in distress in Canadian canals and waters."

So far, I take it, he must be correct, or else the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac would not be necessary. He then goes on to make an allegation, which I confess, I very much doubt, but he says:

"And it is alleged further that Canadian wrecking vessels and machinery have been, and now are allowed to come into American waters and assist any vessel there in distress."

Now, whether that is so or not, we will perhaps find out when this correspondence is brought down. But he quotes a couple of letters from American vessel owners and captains which show certainly the great hardship to them of the practice of the two Governments. One is a letter from Oswego, dated 1st February, 1888, by Mr. John K. Pope. He says:

"On or about the 30th day of September, 1881, I, being controlling owner of steam-barge *Thompson Kingsford*, was notified that she was ashore at Wellington, Ont., and immediate assistance was needed. I informed our wrecker, Mr. Allan, who expressed himself ready to start, providing the Canadian authorities would give him permission to work in their waters. I therefore applied by wire to the hon. Minister of Marine at Ottawa, and after a long delay was informed that the assistance needed could be procured at Kingston, and the application was denied. I thought the treatment was severe, especially as my tugs were all ready to go, and we could have got the barge out of danger in 24 hours. As it was, during the delay, or rather by the delay, in waiting for an answer, she was subjected to a severe gale, causing great damage and eventually costing us about \$1,200 more than it would if we could have done the work ourselves. Again, about the 19th day of August, 1882, the same barge was sunk in the Bay of Quinté by collision, and I again made application to go to her relief with my own appliances, and was again refused."

Then another letter was quoted by Mr. Nutting, which was sent to him by Albert Quonce, also of Oswego, dated 1st February, 1888, in which Mr. Quonce stated:

"At the suggestion of Mr. Allan I make the following statement: On or about the 3rd day of November, 1882, the schooner *Camanche*, of which I was controlling owner, was sunk in the Welland Canal, near Port Colborne. Although Buffalo was but twenty miles from her and assistance could have been secured in six hours, we were told that American assistance would not be permitted, although at that moment the steam pumps were loaded and ready to come. The result was we had to wait for assistance from Amherstburg, nearly three hundred miles distant, and causing a delay of three days. Owing to the delay the vessel's cargo swelled and sprung her entire deck up, and almost ruined the vessel."

These statements will show the view taken on the other side, of our harsh law, and I am sure if we can do anything to secure an improvement for the sake of common humanity as well as for the sake of commercial friendship with the United States, the Government will hasten to bring down these returns so that, if possible, we may have them before us when considering the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick).

Mr. BOWELL. I would suggest that in the first paragraph the words "not already brought down," be inserted after the words "departmental orders." Some years ago a large amount of correspondence was laid before the House, and I do not suppose it is necessary to duplicate the return.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was the return printed?

Mr. BOWELL. I think it was; I know it was, because I have a copy of the printed return on the table in my office.

Mr. EDGAR. When was the return made?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not sure, I cannot say the year, but I can furnish the information. However, all the correspondence and orders made in regard to this subject will be brought down, other than those which have already been

laid before the House. I might state in connection with this subject that much of the complaint made by hon. gentlemen in Congress and also made in the American newspapers by those engaged in the wrecking and tugging business in the United States, is not based altogether upon facts. I may add that the first order that was issued, refusing to allow American tugs and wreckers to operate in our waters, was issued by my predecessor when Mr. Mackenzie was leading the Government of the country; and further that instead of the present Government having adopted, in the language of the hon. gentlemen opposite, harsh and almost inhuman measures and enforced them, the orders have been materially modified since I have had the honor of being at the head of the Customs Department. In no case in my recollection where a vessel has been what is termed in actual distress have American vessels or American appliances, whether pumps, tugs or wrecking appliances, been refused, it has been done only in cases where there have been absolute wrecks or beyond immediate danger of destruction, such as those referred to by the hon. gentleman and by Mr. Pope, of Oswego, where a vessel was reported to be in a position that very little damage would accrue to the hull or any portion of it until Canadian assistance could be procured. Take for instance the case to which the hon. gentleman has referred and to which Mr. Pope, of Oswego, referred. That case was one in which the appliances, which were ready to go to the aid of that crew from Kingston, could have reached the vessel just as soon as appliances which were in Oswego, and in fact much sooner, because the vessel was on our shore; but the fact was that the vessel that had been wrecked belonged to parties in Oswego who have their own appliances and who wished to save the expense attending the employment of a Canadian wrecker. Whether reciprocity in wrecking should be adopted is a subject which will come more pertinently before the House when the Bill presented by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is under discussion. If the hon. gentleman who has taken the trouble to read the charges made against the Canadian Government, had read the correspondence which was lately laid before Congress, which occurred between the authorities there and the owners of the *Algoma*, which was wrecked on Isle Royale, at the head of Lake Superior, he would then have ascertained clearly what the policy and what the conduct of the American Government were when application was made by Canadians to use their own wrecking appliances in order to save life and property. It would place quite a different view upon the statements made by the hon. gentleman who spoke in Congress on the subject lately. I do not desire at present to discuss this subject any further. The papers will be brought down, and it will be found that whenever applications have been made on behalf of American owners of vessels in distress, where there was even a probability, by the immediate use of American appliances, of saving either life or property, or of preventing a vessel on shore going to pieces, they have inevitably been granted, and in no instance where application has been made has any other answer been given than that if Canadian appliances cannot be procured, then American appliances may be used. I am sorry to say the same course has not been pursued in all cases by the American Government towards this country. I might mention, further, that the Americans, after the issue of the Order in Council preventing Americans from wrecking and tugging in connection with wrecked vessels in Canada by the late Government—a few years—and enforced by the present Government, the United States passed an Act offering reciprocity in wrecking and tugging, so far as wrecking is concerned, in Canadian and American waters. That, I frankly state, has not been accepted up to the present day; whether it should be accepted now is a question for the House to decide when the subject is brought before it.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think there is one feature of this matter that has been to some extent lost sight of. I am speaking subject to correction, because I have not looked the point up for some time, but my recollection is that under the Treaty of 1842, fixing the boundary between Canada and the United States, at the lakes, each country has the right to navigate the waters of the other, that is from shore to shore. I think that is the provision contained in the treaty, and that being the case, the same rule which applies to the coast waters of the sea should apply to the waters in the lakes. I have no doubt, looking at the decision in the *Franconia* case, the right of navigation is a right possessed under the law of nations, that each State can exercise that right, even though the waters should be under the sovereignty of another and different community. If I am right in that view, then it is quite clear that legislation either on the part of the Congress of the United States or of the Parliament of Canada is an interference with the right of navigation, and is a violation of the right secured by treaty. Now, the right of navigation also implies the right to relieve a vessel in distress. If an American vessel coming upon the coast of Canada should be stranded upon our coast and has not gone to pieces, she is still in a condition capable of being navigated. It is undoubtedly the right of the people of the United States under the treaty that is subsisting between the two countries to come to the relief of that vessel because that is the right of navigation, and to assist her from the perilous condition in which she is placed. A like right may pertain to a shipowner in case a vessel belonging to a Canadian was stranded upon the American coast. Of course our country would have the right to regulate the matter of wrecks, but a vessel that is simply stranded is not a wreck, and it seems to me clear from my recollection of the provisions of that treaty that neither the Government of Canada nor the Congress of the United States have any right to interfere or legislate with the freedom of navigation. It is in derogation of the rights secured to each by the treaty, and it is not in the power of the Parliament of Canada to legislate away the right of the people of the United States secured by that treaty, nor is it the power of Congress to legislate away the rights secured to us. If they choose to denounce the treaty and it comes to an end then the question as to how far each shall navigate the portion of the waters within the sovereignty of the other, is in a wholly different position. As long as that treaty exists it seems to me that neither the Congress of the United States nor the Parliament of Canada have any right whatever to legislate in the way they have done by interfering with the rights of shipping.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has raised rather a nice point, and I really cannot supply any information from my own recollection about the terms of the treaty of 1842. I take it in that treaty for the navigation of inland waters and the laying down of the boundary, that in fact inland waters are treated in the same way as if they were on the open sea and that the general principle would apply to those lakes as to the open seas.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Quite so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With regard to the right of assisting in saving wrecks at all events in respect to such wreck as would involve the raising of vessels which are wrecked on shore, either nation has authority to legislate. They prevented formally our vessels going to the rescue of Canadian vessels stranded on their shores and we have done the same thing.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The courts took a different view.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At all events they thought their right to do so was clear and they passed an

Act of Congress altering their law in that regard so as to induce us to make the same alteration in our law. If they considered that our right existed to the extent that the hon. gentleman mentioned there would have been no necessity for that Act of Congress, and no necessity for any Act on our part. The hon. gentleman has referred to the matter in a manner which exhibited a great deal of legal acumen. It is a very important question and I shall look into it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The First Minister will remember the decision of the courts in the *Franconia* case. Their argument was that the right of navigation was not interfered with by the sovereignty of a country on the sea coast. It is provided in the treaty that we should have the right of the navigation of the lakes from shore to shore. The rule that applies to a wreck does not apply to a stranded vessel that has not yet become a wreck.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know how far that may be extended. If articles and other manner of appliances are required for raising the vessel, I should say that it must be done in reference to the law of the land in respect to the customs regulation. I fancy that if a vessel stranded, and that when the tide in the lake rises again she could get off, that that is not a wreck. When a vessel is stranded and artificial means or any such other means are obliged to be used, that is in the strictest sense of the term a wreck.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I fancy, Mr. Speaker, there are very few precedents for this in the case of our inland waters.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. None at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Unless it might be in the case of the Black Sea and similar European waters, a part of which were held by one power and a part by the other, but I hardly think that this even would fit exactly. I do not think that even in the Black Sea there are many precedents to be found.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are plenty of wrecks there.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the treaty makes the water navigable from shore to shore, we stand exactly in the position of a vessel on the high seas.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. When a vessel gets on shore she is not in navigable waters and she is not in the high seas. She is on the shore of the country where she is stranded. It is that fact which requires legislation to enable wrecking vessels and appliances to come to her assistance without reporting at the customs house or without paying duty. Under the treaty of 1842 they have a right to navigate waters on Lake Superior, Lake Ontario and the other lakes. Those are the navigable waters, so if a vessel gets stranded on the beach she is not in the navigable waters. It is a question as to how the treaty would affect her. I think the matter will come more fully before the House when the Bill on this subject is brought before the attention of Parliament.

Mr. MITCHELL. I differ with my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) in that view. One vessel may get stranded in a certain place, yet the waters may be navigable for another vessel of less capacity and lighter draft of water, and therefore she is in navigable waters. I also differ from the statements made by the right hon. gentleman who leads this Government in relation to his description of a wreck. A vessel may be stranded from a variety of causes. She may be stranded from the fact of the tide falling, or the fact that she is driven ashore by a fierce wind, but she may be quite susceptible of being taken off. It may be possible to lighten that vessel so as to float her off again. Therefore that is not a wreck. There are

hundreds of vessels along our coasts and the coasts of other countries that get stranded, but they are taken off again and they are not wrecked. It appears to me, therefore, that this measure has arisen out of a retaliatory Act passed by the Canadian Government. I speak from memory and I think I am correct in saying that some years ago, when the late member for Kent, Mr. Rufus Stevenson, was in this House, I think he instigated the presentation of a Bill which subsequently passed into law to prevent the Americans from sending their wrecking vessels over to operate in our waters. The reason being, as alleged at the time, if my memory serves me right, that the Americans refused to allow Canadian wrecking vessels to operate in American waters. Hence the present law which has led to those remarks in the Congress of the United States. I thought at the time that this law passed that it was not a prudent measure, still it was passed as a work of necessity, and I believe as a work of retaliation. I think the Government should take the matter in hand with a view to getting some common understanding on the wrecking of vessels between the countries, so that each country should be permitted to operate in the waters of the other, on the St. Lawrence and the lakes. It seems to me there ought to be no great difficulty in accomplishing that purpose.

Mr. CHARLTON. It would be a nice point to determine the difference between a stranded vessel and a wrecked vessel. Whatever may have been the treaty rights of the Americans with regard to the navigation of the great lakes, it does not seem that they chose to take advantage of those rights or to interpret them as my hon. friend from Bothwell does. The restrictive measures were initiated by the American Government. They passed a regulation or an order from the Treasury Department, prohibiting Canadian vessels from assisting vessels wrecked on the American shores of the great lakes. That order was rigidly enforced, and to my personal knowledge the course taken by the customs authorities in Canada with regard to wrecked vessels has been much more liberal and humane than the course taken by the American authorities. The American authorities have found when their order was put into operation, that while the greater part of the tonnage of the great lakes was under the American flag, the majority of the wrecks were on the Canadian coasts, and the order they passed worked to their own disadvantage. It is on that account that they are so anxious now to have a humane system adopted. If they were deriving the greatest advantage from the present system, I do not suppose we should hear of any agitation in Congress for a change. It would be to the advantage of American vessel owners to employ their own appliances for recovering wrecked vessels, and were the demand of the American Government acceded to by Canada, the result would be that the entire wrecking business would pass into American hands; and unless the arrangement can be made to extend further, unless our tugs can get the privilege of the American coasting trade by our extending to their tugs the same privilege on our side, I think the American demand is one that the Parliament of Canada should not listen to. We are simply following the policy the Americans themselves inaugurated. That policy is working to their disadvantage, and I do not know but it would be wise to let it remain as it is. I can testify to the truth of what the hon. Minister of Customs has said, that in all cases where property or life is endangered, the customs authorities of Canada do grant permits; but where circumstances of that kind do not govern the case, they naturally look after the interests of our own wrecking companies, and in the operation of the regulations of the Department, great care, I believe, has been taken to give proper attention to the exigencies of the case, where the exigencies have arisen. I repeat that the Americans have inaugurated this system,

and as it would be to their advantage and not ours, I think we should refuse them reciprocity in the wrecking business.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Would it not be a breach of faith?

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not think so. At all events, this question will come up under the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), then I think it will be seen that the demand of the American Government does not rest on as good ground as it seems to.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would suggest that the hon. leader of the Government get the Minister of Justice to make a report on the subject, and, if the question is a question of right under the treaty, that our right should be raised by correspondence with the authorities at Washington.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that if there is a right to navigate the waters, there is a right to an easement over the whole water to the shore, and it must follow that the vessel of either nation can help the other in distress, no matter what coast it may be upon. When a vessel is stranded, in the mere sense of being beached, from the lowness of the water or other cause, so that it can be taken off, either by the exertion of its own crew, or by relief, that is one thing; but where the vessel is sunk, so that it cannot be raised again and brought to the top of the water and made a living thing without artificial aid, that is a downright wreck, and must be governed by other principles than those applicable to stranded vessels.

Mr. EDGAR. Whatever may be the refinements of the definitions relating to treaty rights on this subject, the Parliament of Canada has taken a pretty clear ground on the subject of dealing with wrecks, outside of the three-mile limit and anywhere in the waters of Canada. By the Wrecks and Salvage Act it is provided that receivers of wrecks may be appointed by the Governor in Council, and that when any British or foreign vessel is wrecked, or stranded, or in distress at any place within the limits of Canada, the receiver shall take possession of it, and hold possession of it for a time, and if anyone ventures to dispute his authority he is subject to severe penalties. I take it that the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac, if it passes, will be read along with this old Act, and will apply to all cases covered by the Wrecks and Salvage Act, that is, to all cases of wrecks or of stranded or distressed vessels in any part of Canada within the central lines of the lakes. I suppose that is the view the hon. member will take of it.

Motion agreed to.

SUPERVISION OF BANKS.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved:

That it is expedient to provide for a better supervision by the Government of all the banks of the Dominion.

He said: I desire to invite the attention of the House, and particularly the Government, to a question that appears to me to be rather an important one, that is, the desirability of a better supervision of all the banks of the Dominion. It is a matter of notoriety that during the past few years a number of the banks in the Dominion have fallen into liquidation or bankruptcy. There must be some cause for that state of things. Perhaps it is their mismanagement, perhaps it is due to the trade policy of the Dominion or it may be due to other causes, but one preventive, I think, would be a better supervision of these banks by the Government. It is true, at present the banks furnish monthly returns to the Government, but I am sorry to say that in some instances these returns are not altogether reliable. If they were made in such a way as to be perfectly accurate, the public

Mr. CHARLTON.

confidence in the banks would be better maintained. I hold in my hand a return, partly taken from the Government blue-book, and partly obtained from the Department of Finance, from which it appears that no less than nine banks have become bankrupt within the last few years. They are the Mechanics' Bank, the Consolidated Bank, the Metropolitan Bank, the Bank of Upper Canada, the Liverpool Bank of Nova Scotia, the Commercial Bank of New Brunswick, the Bank of Prince Edward Island, the Exchange Bank, and the Acadian Bank of Nova Scotia. Out of all our banks, there are ten which, of late years, have become insolvent. It may be said that these banks are private institutions, and I will grant that they are, in so far as their shareholders and directors are concerned. But they partake more of the character of public institutions towards the state. They get their charters from the state, they do business and attract the confidence of the people under the provisions of their charters; they invite depositors to make deposits; they invite public confidence in their stock, and they must be considered more as public than as private institutions. It is in their character of public institutions that the Government have made certain regulations forcing the banks to make returns to the Government. If these returns were made so as to prevent the public from forming false impressions, I would consider them sufficient, but they are not sufficient. If one would compare the returns of these banks which suspended payments with the last returns they made to the Government, you would certainly not have much confidence in the statements made by the directors. I consider it, therefore, my duty to bring before the House this question, in which a great number of the people of this Dominion take an interest. So many people have dealings constantly with the banks that this is a question which interests the public at large. One reason why the Government should proceed in this matter, is that they have already proceeded in regulating, to a certain extent, the management of banks. Take what is done with regard to insurance companies. The Government have appointed a Superintendent of Insurance, whose duty it is to ascertain the value of the assets of insurance companies and decide whether they are sufficient to meet the liabilities or not. There is a perfect analogy between the two. If, in the case of the insurance companies, the Government has thought fit to appoint a Superintendent, it ought certainly to appoint one in the case of the bank. I can see very well the objection that can be raised to the appointment of a bank superintendent. The objection will be that, considering the banks to be private institutions, we have no business to enquire into the management of their affairs which should be left exclusively in the hands of the shareholders and directors. But this is not a sufficient reason for depriving the Government of some direct control over the management of the banks, so that the public confidence in them will not be misplaced. I, therefore, am of opinion that this is a wise suggestion, though I do not believe that, coming as it does, from this side of the House, the Government will adopt it. I hope the Government will take it into their serious consideration. I make it in view of the sad list of insolvent banks which we have had within the past ten or fifteen years. Not only have I upon this list the number of banks that have fallen into bankruptcy, but also the number of banks which have been obliged to reduce their capital—whether from mismanagement, or misfortune, or bad supervision. But it is clear that the shareholders have very little to do in supervising the action of their directors. The supervision is done about once a year, and the shareholders cannot go to the vaults of the bank and count the specie or look at the different assets. Now, the banks that have reduced their capital are twelve in number, and it will be seen that the dates of their misfortunes are not very far back. They are the Standard Bank, the Ontario Bank, the

Jacques Cartier, the Banque du Peuple, the Banque de Ville Marie, the Union Bank of Lower Canada, the Maritime Bank of New Brunswick, the Bank of New Brunswick, the Bank of Nova Scotia, the Bank of Yarmouth and the Union Bank of Halifax, and the Banque Nationale is now coming before this House and asking for a reduction of capital. I hope the Banque Nationale will be the last of the number. Besides these banks that have reduced their capital, there are many other banks which have not for some years paid dividends. They are the Banque de St. Jean, the St. Hyacinthe, the Union Bank of Lower Canada, La Banque Nationale, La Banque du Peuple, the Union Bank of Halifax and the Maritime Bank of New Brunswick. These eight banks for a long time paid no dividends. It appears to me that at particular periods the bank superintendents should be empowered to ascertain the results of the operations of each bank, and that is all the public care for. By appointing a proper and trustworthy person who would be intended not to dive into the private affairs of the bank for the mere pleasure of looking into them and trying to find out the private business of B. C. or D., but a trustworthy, discreet, reliable and honest person, we should have an officer of the utmost utility to the public, and many of the shareholders of the banks would be grateful to the Government for creating such an office, which would certainly prevent a good deal of bad management; and the mere fact of having a superintendent over these banks who go at a moment's notice to examine their affairs would put these men on their guard, and they would be always ready to give a true and faithful account to the public of what was going on behind their counter. I would suggest that, in addition to the returns made by the bank to the Government, there ought to be a special return made showing how far the directors become liable to the banks on their private accounts and how far some of the directors in some of the banks go to accommodate their friends, not as mere trustees of the bank but as themselves doing the banking business on their own account, that is to say, endorsing as directors for their friends and getting a little *donneur* for doing it. That is one of the causes of the troubles in many instances into which the banks fall. It would be well also to discover whether the directors borrow much more from the banks than the value of their stocks. I think, if a director has any status in trade, he ought not to be allowed to borrow from the bank of which he is director to any large extent. If he has any credit, he should go to another bank and borrow, but should not borrow of the bank of which he is a mere trustee. There is one point also in regard to which the superintendent would be very useful, and that is to ascertain the real assets of the bank. These assets are very often made at a much greater valuation than they ought to be, and we see every day that, when a bank goes into liquidation, the assets of the bank, which have been said to be of a good amount, have dwindled to about one-third of their supposed value. Therefore, if this valuation was made and was well known, the Government and the public would not be deceived as to the real assets of the bank. The responsibility of the directors of the bank ought to be better determined by the law. In the Province of Quebec it is true they are considered merely as *mandataires* and they have that responsibility alone, but they ought to be considered as having a much greater responsibility. They have the responsibility, for instance, of the stock of poor widows and orphans. In that light, they should be considered as much responsible as tutors and curators are. They are to take care that the property of those widows and orphans is protected against false speculation and they should be responsible for its management so far. It is very certain that, if the Government or the public had been informed two, three or four months before these banks whose names I have given fell into bankruptcy, if the Gov-

ernment had had a correct statement of the affairs of these banks, certainly some of these banks would have suspended before they did. These banks would not, up to the last moment, have had the confidence of the people because of the returns of the Government, and therefore I say that, under these circumstances, the appointment of a superintendent and good complete returns made to the Government would give security to the public and also more satisfaction to the shareholders. With this in view, and being moved only in the interests of the people of this Dominion, I move the resolution of which I have given notice.

Mr. INNES. I willingly second the motion just proposed by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), because I consider the subject one of very great importance indeed, and worthy the attention of the House and of the Government. I do not intend to go into the matter at any length, but simply to refer to one or two cases which I feel sure will afford very strong reasons indeed for some action being taken by the Government on this question. I think the Committee on Banking and Commerce to-day recommended the passing of an Act for the winding up of the Federal Bank. We know that that institution, by injudicious management, was very greatly weakened some time ago, so much so indeed that it has been forced to wind up. But its position so far is very good, because I believe that not only the depositors but the shareholders will receive nearly everything they have put in. How very different will it be in the case of the Central Bank! I would recall to the attention of the House some facts in connection with the history of that short-lived institution—short-lived, indeed, but, during the time it was in existence, characterised, I suppose, by worse management and more rascality than we ever knew in the history of any banking institution in Canada. I think it was during the Session of 1854 that the charter was granted to this bank. It commenced business in the spring of 1855, and in two and a half short years it collapsed—on the 15th of November last. Scarcely any one interested in the institution, except those who were guilty of wrecking it, knew anything of its actual position. In fact, one or two or more of the directors did not really know its actual position till within a day or so of the time it closed its doors. How then could the general public, the shareholders throughout the country, and the large number of depositors know anything of its condition? It was impossible that they could do so when the directors, who should have been interested, who ought to have known the actual position of the bank, were ignorant of that position. Why, the return made by the bank on the 31st October shows it to be in a healthy position. It will be of interest to give the figures just to show how they were afterwards falsified. I may premise that the capital of the bank was one million dollars, and that there was half a million paid up. The following statement, made to the Government, shows the affairs of the bank to 31st October, 1857:

Reserve fund.....	\$ 45,000
Notes in circulation.....	492,855
Other deposits payable on demand.....	977,506
Other deposits payable after notice.....	1,147,534
Due to other banks.....	18,482
Total Liabilities.....	\$2,631,378
Specie on hand.....	\$ 54,073
Dominion notes.....	120,068
Notes and cheques of other banks.....	138,454
Balances due from other banks.....	23,382
Balance due from agencies.....	9,278
Government debentures or stock.....	29,710
Loans or discounts secured by bonds, debentures or other securities.....	73,967
Loans to municipalities.....	3,949
Loans or deposits unsecured in other banks.....	21,449
Current loans, discounts and advances to the public.....	2,436,058
Notes or bills discounted and not specially secured.....	15,678

Notes or bills overdue and secured by mortgage, &c.....	22,799
Other assets not included in above.....	18,058
Total assets	\$3,231,518
Total liabilities.....	2,631,378
	\$ 600,140

Remember that this return was made to the Government and sworn to, I suppose, by the president and cashier on the 31st October, 15 days before the bank closed its doors. Not only that, but early in the month the board of directors met and declared the usual dividend of 6 per cent. Now, what was the actual position of the bank at that time? We find from the report of the liquidator, four months afterwards, that the actual position, at the very time the false returns were made, sworn to and sent to Ottawa, was this: claims proved against the bank, \$1,362,920; claims not proved, \$351,420; filed since 28th February, \$34,824; amounts unclaimed, \$57,155; making the liabilities of the bank, \$1,856,319. As one of the liquidators remarked, the bank had been wrecked to the amount of about \$1,000,000, the actual capital for which it was chartered. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, in the same return, the amount that the directors had borrowed, either by themselves or for their firms or partnerships, is placed at \$73,690. This return was also sworn to, of course, in accordance with the Act. But we find that the actual state of affairs was very different indeed, for the Master in Chancery, after he got fairly into the investigation of the affairs of the bank, found they had actually exceeded that sum, and had deliberately broken the law in borrowing more than the law allowed; and, in addition, they had issued \$70,000 of notes in direct contravention of the statute. It was found in evidence before the Master that the president, by himself, had borrowed \$16,000; that he, in company with one of the directors, had borrowed \$21,000, making \$37,000; and that this director, J. Mitchell Macdonald, for himself owed the bank \$138,000; that another director owed \$23,000, another \$24,000, and still another \$6,000, in all \$202,000, in addition to the \$73,000 which were returned and sworn to by the bank officials on October the 31st. When the statement was laid before the Master in Chancery, about the time that he commenced his investigation, on the 22nd January, he said:

"He had the duly certified return made by the said Central Bank, of 9th November, six days before the suspension, in which it was reported to the Government that on the 31st October, there was not only a surplus of \$600,000, actually over and above all liabilities, but sufficient securities on current loans to cover all liabilities. He took this statement as true, and the directors and officials of the bank would be required to give an account of what disposition of this large surplus they made between the 31st October and 15th November, when the bank suspended. The law called on them, as custodians of the trust placed in their hands, to give a rigid account to the last cent. The criminal law held them accountable if the returns were fictitious. Under the provisions of the Winding-up Act, not only the shareholders but the creditors had the right to examine minutely all directors and officials, and to scrutinise their dealings. If false returns were made, the officials making such returns were criminally liable, they might be imprisoned, and compelled to pay all deficient amounts with interest. Presidents, and directors, and officials of banks should know, and the sooner they realised their responsibility, the more it will be to their advantage, that they could not shelter themselves under a mere pretence. The returns they make must be true in figure and in fact, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. He would call upon the liquidators to make a most minute and searching investigation. The tribunal possessed large inquisitorial powers; they would have to exercise these to the utmost, and it was a duty that they owed to public justice and to those whose property and means of livelihood were imperilled."

Such was the opinion given by the Master in Chancery at that time. It was supposed when this announcement was made that the parties who were thought to be guilty, would be brought up for examination, but we find that they very soon made themselves scarce. The first one that left, whose extraordinary transactions with the bank, I suppose, have been unparalleled in the history of any bank—I refer to Cox, the broker—he was the first one who left, considering, I suppose, that it was unsafe for him to remain.

Mr. INNES.

The next one who left was the cashier. He also owed the bank from \$30,000 to \$50,000. Then followed the director whom I mentioned. He owed \$138,000 to the bank. Then the president, partly on account of ill health, and no doubt afraid that he would be subjected to a rigid examination, or, perhaps, something worse, found it convenient to go across to the other side. The result has been that not one single individual connected with this institution, not one of the parties who had anything to do in wrecking the bank, has yet been arrested. And what is to follow? The shareholders will be called upon for the double liability, and the depositors will have to lose a portion of their hard-earned money. This is the actual state of affairs. I do not think it necessary for me to go into details in connection with some of the transactions. How it was that this man Cox obtained his connection with the bank, how he was able to get so much out of the bank, the amount due by him being \$170,000; how it was that D. Mitchell Macdonald obtained such a large sum out of the bank—it is not necessary for me now to explain, as the whole matter has been ventilated through the newspapers during the course of the investigation. It is not necessary to call attention as to how Barnett obtained about \$130,000 on the mere security of some trumpery diamonds, or what were said to be diamonds; it is not necessary to refer to Baxter's connection with the bank or the case of Allen, the cashier and manager, who was doubly responsible, being entrusted with the management of the bank, but who left it a debtor to the extent of from \$30,000 to \$50,000. These men, or at least the directors and the cashier, were directly responsible to the shareholders, and they were untrue to their trust; and not only so but they rendered themselves liable under the law, if they had been arrested, to imprisonment and punishment. It is calculated that these directors and the parties I have mentioned are owing the bank about \$500,000, being the actual amount that was paid up as capital. Any one knowing these facts can readily realise the amount of suffering and privation that will be caused throughout the country wherever there was a branch of the institution. I suppose that Toronto, where the head office was situated, suffers to the largest extent; I think the city in the riding which I have the honor to represent, perhaps, suffers next. The inhabitants of Guelph, business men and depositors in the city and throughout the riding, had deposits in the bank to the extent of \$382,000, and I believe they held from \$60,000 to \$70,000 in stock. Such a large sum being locked up one would think would be apt to cripple business. I am very happy to say that it was scarcely felt to any appreciable extent, and business men and others were able to tide over the temporary difficulty, and there was scarcely any difference noticeable, financially, from so much money being locked up. But, no doubt, there were cases of privation and of suffering not only there but also in other places, and even if the amount expected shall be realised the depositors will lose about 25 per cent. of their hard earned savings, and some people had their all deposited in the institution. There is no doubt that the shareholders will be called on for their double liability. No wonder Chancellor Boyd, in removing one of the liquidators, in giving his opinion concerning the bank, said:

"The revelations of the bank's transactions showed an alarming state of affairs. When we consider the history of this bank, the position of the men in connection with it, and the total terrific wreck which has occurred, one is obliged to say that there has not only been gross incompetency, but I might almost say idiotic mismanagement and dishonesty in the conduct of its affairs."

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we have such a revelation, surely it is high time for the Government to take hold of this matter and so amend the Banking Act as will secure us a better guarantee of safety than seems to be given at present by the existing Act. The directors should be compelled to make a

clear and full statement of the bank's affairs. That is one clause of the Banking Act as it stands at present; but we know, and I have shown to you, that the directors and cashiers are capable of making false returns, and are capable of swearing to them. The Banking Act provides that no dividend shall be declared which will impair the capital of the bank. We have seen that this clause of the Act was also disregarded. The Act provides a penalty for the over-issue of bills. In the case of the Central Bank there was an over-issue of bills; but the bills have been destroyed, and, strange to say, and unaccountable as it seems to me, the authorities that should take hold of these matters have not brought the directors to task for a direct infringement of the Act. The law is in some respects deficient, and in one principal respect it is defective. The provisions of the law are inadequate to secure the evidence of bank officers. The law provides for the examination by the court into the conduct of the officers who are supposed to have been guilty of a breach of trust, but a liquidator can do this only under the authority of the court. It is provided that notice must be given to the directors or the officers, and that simply serves as a notice and warning to them. In that respect I think the Banking Act requires amendment, for there should be more stringent provisions and a better and quicker process of bringing defaulting directors and officers to justice than we have at present. Then there is a lack of proper inspection. There should be a provision for better security for the depositors. We want a more stringent enforcement of the provision for the punishment of directors borrowing money from the bank. We want heavier penalties for making false returns. There are many other amendments which might be suggested and incorporated in a Bill when the subject is before the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and when they take the whole question into consideration, and I trust we shall ere long have a measure which will define more clearly the duties of the directors, which will make them more responsible in every respect in regard to the management of the banks, and which will secure more effectually the depositors and those who entrust their money to the bank, and also the shareholders who give their money to start the institution. A measure of that kind which would accomplish the object desired would, I am sure, secure the cordial support of both sides of the House.

Mr. LISTER. I shall only trouble the House for a few moments on this very important question which my hon. friend has brought before the attention of the Government and the House. There can be no doubt that the recent disastrous and disgraceful bank failures which have taken place within the last few years in this country will force the Government to take some action for the purpose of protecting those interested in the banks as well as the billholders. I have given this question some little investigation, and I think I can safely say that there is no country in the world to-day that has a worse banking system than we have in Canada. By the Act under which these banks are acting they have a right to issue bills to the amount of the paid up capital. I hold that no Government should give a bank power to issue anything to circulate as money; our bills should be issued by the Government of the country through banks upon proper security furnished by the bank. So far as the banks of this country are concerned, there is absolutely no security whatever for the billholders or any person interested in the bank, except the honesty of the officials of those banks, and it is to be regretted that during the last few years the public have learned that so far as honesty is concerned there is little, if any, security. There are many reasons why the bills should not be issued by the banks but should be issued by the Government itself. You take the whole Dominion of Canada, and we all know that bills

issued in one Province are not current in another, except at a discount. This is not as it ought to be. The bills issued by a bank in this country should be current all over the Dominion. If you go to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island or British Columbia, the bills issued in the Province of Ontario or the Province of Quebec are not taken as current money, and the people holding those bills are obliged to submit to a discount, although the bills themselves may be beyond question. There is a want of confidence in the banks of the country, and we know that runs upon banks are caused by people holding bills in small sums. They become timid, and their timidity extends to other persons who hold the bills, and the consequence is a run upon the banks. Now, Sir, I think there is no system of banking so completely successful or so completely sure to every person interested as the American system. The national banking system of the United States to my mind is the most perfect system of banking in the world. It is a system that has been taken up and largely adopted now by the several nations of the world, and this country possesses unusual facilities for introducing that system of banking. Why, Sir, we have to-day a debt of something like \$300,000,000, and we are paying interest to the English people upon this money. That debt can be paid off if the system adopted by the United States is adopted here. The interest could be paid to our own people by compelling the banks to accept from the Government, bank bills secured by the bonds of the Government. In that way the money received for that issue may be applied in payment of the debt which we owe to foreign countries and the interest which we pay to those people might be paid to our own people. As my hon. friend who has just spoken, properly stated, there is no proper system of bank inspection in this country. I said a few moments ago it depends upon the honesty of the officials who have the management of the banks, and the experience of the past few years has been such as to prove to us conclusively that this is not much security for people interested in those banks. In the United States they have a complete system of inspection. There is a Government inspector whose duty it is, upon the slightest complaint made of irregularities in the management of a bank, to at once take complete possession and control of the bank. He takes the keys of the institution and he makes a thorough and complete investigation, and if it is found that the directors are borrowing beyond what the law allows, or that there are any irregularities in the management of the bank, that has to be accounted for and made right before the bank can proceed. The result of that has been, Sir, in the United States, to make their system, as nearly as may be, a completely successful system. In looking over the returns from the Financial Department at Washington it is remarkable to see the very small percentage of the National Banks in the United States that have failed, and what large dividends have been paid to the creditors of those banks in cases where they have failed. There is another thing I think that the Government should take into consideration—because the time will shortly come when they will have to consider this question, and when it will be necessary to introduce a new Banking Act as the one which now exists will expire in a couple of years—and that is as to the question of allowing banking institutions to commence business with a smaller capital than they now do. Our banks now start with a large capital, they have a head office in some of the cities of the country and then branch out into the smaller towns. They are merely receptacles for the purpose of receiving the surplus earnings of the people, and that money is sent to the money centres and is used for the purpose of speculating in stocks and so on. There is no community in this country that has not over half a million dollars in surplus cash, and that money finds investment in the agencies established in those different points. It can find investment in the building associa-

ions started in the different towns throughout the country, but whatever money is invested or deposited with the chartered banks of the country is, as I said before, not used for the purpose of helping on the business men of the particular community, but it is sent to those large money centres, and there it is used for speculating purposes. I think I am safe in saying that not more than half the deposits throughout this country are used for the purpose of accommodating the business men of the particular section in which it is deposited. Now, Sir, the building associations of the country have proved to be a marvellous success. Whenever they have been started they have been successful. They have been the means of giving the people, who had surplus money in particular communities, an opportunity of investing that money, and I say that this is the best evidence that if the Government would permit banks to be established with smaller capital throughout the country, it would destroy, to some extent, the system of banks and agencies which now exist, and local banks would take the place of those large institutions. By doing this the surplus money of the community would be invested by people who understood the business wants of the several communities. The investment would be perfectly safe, and the public would run no risk whatever, if the Government undertook the duty of issuing the money themselves. It is said that this system would not be sufficiently elastic and in times when money was required to be plentiful it might not supply the demand. The experience of the United States has negated any such statement as that, money has been sufficiently plentiful there for all the commercial wants of that great country, and I do not think there would be the slightest difficulty in this country upon that score. The Government, as I stated a moment ago, should be in a better position as regards the debt of the country. All that it would require was to change the creditors from bondholders in England to the Canadian people themselves. A scheme of that kind would give complete security to billholders, it would save this constant run upon banks, because as I said those who start a run upon the banks of the country are those who are holding the bills, and when a failure takes place it is generally found that the people who suffered most are the poorer class of the community who are the holders of those bills. In the case of a failure they have to wait months and sometimes years before those bills are redeemed, or the holders of them have to pass them away at a very heavy discount, and at a very great loss to themselves. As my hon. friend says, they sometimes lose them altogether. Mr. Speaker, this is a question on which some action should be taken by this Parliament. It is a question which the people and the press of the country have been agitating for some time. It has been urged upon the Government by the press, and we all know that it is incumbent upon the Government to do something to give better security to the people than has been the case in the past. At present there is no difficulty whatever for a dishonest bank manager to completely wreck a bank before the public are aware of it. That is not as it should be. If it is not thought that the system which is in force in the United States would not suit the wants of this country, at all events we have a right to ask the Government to have a complete system of investigation and inspection, so that as far as it is possible the billholders and the people interested in the banks of the country should have proper security. As the matter stands now our system is the very loosest one that can be found in any of the commercial countries of the world. It is old fashioned, it has passed its day. The function of issuing money belongs exclusively to the Government, and if that is secured by Government bonds bought by the bank, then, Sir, it is of little consequence whether the bank under such circum-

Mr. LISTER.

stances has failed or not. Everyone knows that the bills will be redeemed when they are presented at the Receiver General's office or at such other place as may be appointed, just as is the case in the United States. There one never thinks of examining a bill to see whether the bank has failed or not. It is sufficient to know that it is a National Bank bill, and that on presentation at Washington it will be redeemed. This is an important question, and I hope it will engage the attention of the Government at no distant day.

Mr. CASEY. I did not expect that this motion would be reached this evening or that the discussion would take the wide range it has done, or I would have been better prepared to speak on the subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Move the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. CASEY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to make a remark with reference to a statement made by the hon. gentleman who made this motion. He has included in the list of wrecked banks the Bank of New Brunswick. That is a mistake, because that bank is not in the position of the others at all. It is quite true it has reduced its capital, but it has done that to return it to its shareholders, because it was not able to use the capital so returned. At present its stock is selling above par.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It was the Commercial Bank of New Brunswick which I stated had failed. The statement I read from is an official statement coming from the Department of Finance.

Mr. LOVITT. The hon. gentleman mentioned that the Bank of Yarmouth had reduced its capital. It did that because it had more money than it could lend out to advantage, and it asked Parliament to grant permission to pay it back to its shareholders, which was done. I consider that an evidence of good management, and not of bad management.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I wish also to state that the bank of which I have the honor to be president, has been mentioned in the same category, but no bank is in a better position in this country.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of the instructions given to the Chairman and members of the Royal Commission on Labor, and of all correspondence between the Government and the Chairman or any member of the said Commission.—(Mr. Beauvois.)

Copies of the petition of the Reverend Charles Hallé, Priest, and several other citizens of St. Pierre, on the Island of Orleans, County of Montmorency, dated the 18th October, 1887, asking the Minister of Militia and Defence to take care that they be protected from harm during the artillery practice which is carried on each year at the end of the Island of Orleans.—(Mr. Langelier, Montmorency.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Governments of the Dominion and Ontario in reference to a claim of the Six Nation Indians for compensation for lands flooded by the construction of a dam across the Grand River, at Dunnville, by the Welland Canal Company, in or about the year 1833; also, all Orders in Council and Departmental reports bearing upon such claim or the payment thereof.—(Mr. Somerville.)

Return showing the time the steamer *Northern Light* commenced running between Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia for the winter of 1887-88; the number of trips made; the number of passengers crossed; the date of last trip made up to date.—(Mr. Perry.)

Correspondence exchanged with the Imperial Government concerning the disallowance of the Railway Acts of Manitoba.—(Mr. Laurier.)

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11 p.m.

B

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 10th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 65) respecting a certain treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States. He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the second reading of this Bill, I desire to say that if I had not on so many past occasions experienced the kind indulgence of both sides of the House, I should hesitate to undertake, in the present state of my health, bringing forward the very important subject it now becomes my duty to lay before the House. I am glad to know, Sir, that the question of the protection of our fisheries, and of the results that have followed the course that was adopted by the Government and Parliament of Canada, has not been a party question. I am glad to know, Sir, that in approaching the very important subject that I am now submitting to the House, I can rely on the patriotic consideration of this question by gentlemen on both sides of the House to whom it is thoroughly familiar, and who on various occasions and in various capacities have been called on in the past to deal with it. For more than a hundred years this question has been a source of irritation between the Imperial Government of Great Britain, the Government of the United States, and the people and Governments of British North America. So long ago as 1783 a treaty was made between the Government of Great Britain and the Government of the United States at Paris. Article 3 of that treaty provided:

"It is agreed that the people of the United States shall continue to enjoy, unmolested, the right to take fish of every kind on the Grand Bank, and on all other banks of Newfoundland; also in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and at all other places in the sea where the inhabitants of both countries used at any time heretofore to fish; and also, that the inhabitants of the United States shall have the liberty to take fish of every kind on such part of the coast of Newfoundland as British fishermen shall use (but not to dry or cure the same on that Island), and also on the coasts, bays and creeks of all other of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America; and that the American fishermen shall have liberty to dry and cure fish in any of the unsettled bays, harbors and creeks of Nova Scotia, Magdalen Islands and Labrador, so long as the same shall remain unsettled; but so soon as the same, or either of them shall be settled, it shall not be lawful for the said fishermen to dry or cure fish at such settlement, without a previous agreement for that purpose with the inhabitants, proprietors or possessors of the ground."

Now, I need not say to the House that the concession made to the people of the United States to enjoy in common with British subjects the fisheries of this country, was a treaty of a very extraordinary and abnormal character. I need not remind the House that the Treaty of Ghent, which was made between Great Britain and the United States at the termination of the War of 1812, is found to be entirely silent upon this subject, for the reason that the Government of Great Britain had arrived at the conclusion that it was impossible to permit the continuance of such an unwarranted interference with the rights of the people of British North America as had been enjoyed by the people of the United States under the Treaty of 1793. The Government of the United States took the ground that the treaty was not affected by the war. That

position, however, was strongly controverted by Her Majesty's Government, and as the representatives of the United States Government had been instructed not to concede on the question of the fisheries, and the Government of Great Britain were equally inexorable on that point, the only course that could be adopted was to give the question the entire go by. It therefore found no place in the Treaty of 1812. The Government of Great Britain, however, acting upon the principle that they had maintained—the principle which has come to be recognised throughout the world—that a war abrogates all treaties, and especially treaties of that character, asserted their rights in these territorial waters of British North America, and proceeded to seize fishermen of the United States for trespassing in these waters. The result of that course was the Treaty of 1818, in which this question was again considered by the two Governments, and I may call attention to the terms of the principal article of that treaty, so far as the fisheries are concerned:

"Whereas differences have arisen respecting the liberty claimed by the United States for the inhabitants thereof, to take, dry and cure fish on certain coasts, bays, harbors and creeks of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America, it is agreed between the high contracting parties that the inhabitants of the said United States shall have, forever, in common with the subjects of His Britannic Majesty, the liberty to take fish of every kind on that part of the southern coast of Newfoundland which extends from Cape Ray to the Rameau Islands, on the western and northern coast of Newfoundland; from the said Cape Ray to the Quirpon Islands, on the shores of the Magdalen Islands; and also on the coasts, bays, harbors and creeks, from Mount Joly, on the southern coast of Labrador, to and through the Straits of Belleisle, and thence northward, indefinitely, along the coast, without prejudice, however, to any of the exclusive rights of the Hudson's Bay Company; and that the American fishermen shall also have liberty, forever, to dry and cure fish in any of the unsettled bays, harbors, and creeks of the southern part of the coast of Newfoundland hereabove described, and of the coast of Labrador; but so soon as the same, or any portion thereof, shall be settled, it shall not be lawful for the said fishermen to dry or cure fish at such portion so settled, without previous agreement for such purpose with the inhabitants, proprietors, or possessors of the ground; and the United States hereby renounce, forever, any liberty heretofore enjoyed or claimed by the inhabitants thereof, to take, dry or cure fish on or within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America not included within the above mentioned limits: *Provided, however,* That the American fishermen shall be admitted to enter such bays or harbors for the purpose of shelter and of repairing damages therein, of purchasing wood, and of obtaining water, and for no other purpose whatever. But they shall be under such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent their taking, drying, or curing fish therein, or in any other manner whatever abusing the privileges hereby reserved to them."

Now, Sir, that treaty which was made between the Government of Great Britain and the Government of the United States, seventy years ago, has been the cause of constantly recurring irritation and difficulty between the two countries; and I need not remind the House that no portions of Her Majesty's dominions have been so vitally and deeply interested in that question as those now known as the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Newfoundland. This treaty is very striking in two particulars. It gives the same territorial advantages, but to a very limited extent, over a certain portion of the Island of Newfoundland and what is now known as Canada, to the Government of the United States as were given under the Treaty of 1793, and in return—for that unparalleled concession by any Government of one country to another—was secured the formal renunciation, on the part of the Government of the United States, of the liberty for their fishermen to enter any other portion of the jurisdictional waters of what was then known as British North America, except for four speci-

fied purposes. Even the privileges enjoyed under those four specified purposes were distinctly declared to be subject to their use in such a manner as in no way to abuse the privileges thus granted. The adoption of this treaty was followed by the passage of laws on the part of the Imperial Parliament and also of the British North American Provinces for the purpose of giving it effect. Of course, although the treaty distinctly laid down the international law as between the two countries, special legislation was requisite in order to provide a means for carrying that treaty out and for enforcing its provisions on the part of Great Britain and on the part of British North America. The exclusion of the United States fishermen from the fishing grounds of British North America led again to collision and difficulty. Seizures were made. The old difficulties that had existed before the formation of the treaty were again called into activity by the presence of United States fishermen in our waters, and by the measures which were taken, especially by Great Britain, for the purpose of protecting the rights of the inhabitants of British North America. The result of these difficulties was the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. The firm stand taken by Her Majesty's Government, the firm position taken to protect the undoubted rights of her subjects in British North America, led to the adoption, in 1854, of what is known as the Reciprocity Treaty, a treaty which for twelve years removed all difficulties in connection with this question. On that occasion there was no attempt to limit, define, or interpret the points that had been raised in the controversy between the two countries, but they received their quietus, and all these difficulties were removed for the time, by the adoption of a policy of giving to the Provinces of British North America and Newfoundland certain commercial privileges by which the trade between this country and the United States was extended.

I may say that I took the opportunity, when delivering my speech on the financial condition of the country a year ago, to draw the attention of the House to the results of that treaty, and I will just call the attention of the House again for one moment to a single extract in that speech, in which I referred to the trade results of what is known as the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. It will be found that the United States during those twelve years, from 1854 to 1866, exported to British North America home products to the extent of \$300,808,370 and foreign products to the extent of \$62,379,718, the total exports to British North America being \$363,188,088. The imports from the British Provinces into the United States during that period amounted to \$267,612,131, showing a balance during the twelve years in favor of the United States of \$95,575,957. That is to say, that they sent under the operation of that treaty into the British North American Provinces over \$95,000,000 more than we sent into that country. I have often been at a loss to know how any person in the United States, and much less how any person in Canada could disparage that treaty, or could speak of it as a one-sided treaty, altogether in favor of British North America, and not equally in favor of the United States.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would not the excess include goods passing through the country in bond and in transit, such as the exportation of wheat through the western canals?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think not. I think the hon. gentleman will find that these are the legitimate figures connected with the trade of the two countries, and I noticed, shortly after the delivery of that speech, that the Hon. T. F. Bayard, the Secretary of State of the United States, was interviewed in relation to this question, and, so far as the account of that interview went, I understood him to confirm the accuracy of the figures which I had used on that occasion. I say I have been greatly at a loss to know

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

how, under the circumstances, any person can be found, especially in this country, to treat this as a one-sided measure in the interests of Canada. So far as what is known as Canada is concerned, we know that the trade of our country took a very great bound, and that the result of the Reciprocity Treaty was to give a very sudden and great and steadily continued impetus to our trade with the United States; but, as I said before, the result was to give a still greater expansion of trade to the United States in relation to British North America. I am glad, after spending some three months in Washington, to be able to say that I had very intimate intercourse with gentlemen of different politics holding high positions in the Senate and House of Representatives, that I took many opportunities of discussing this question with them, and that the result is that I did not find one statesman in the United States who expressed his satisfaction with the termination of that treaty. I believe the general expression in that country is that commercially it was a mistake to have terminated that treaty, and that it would have been infinitely better for the United States and for Canada if it had been continued. That treaty was not abrogated on commercial grounds. It was not in consequence of any commercial reasons that the abrogation took place, but it was, as is well known, in consequence of an unhappy sentiment which grew up in the United States, that, during the time of the Civil War which rent that country asunder, the sympathies of the British North American Provinces were very strongly with the South. I think there is very great reason to question the soundness of that opinion. Although from the nature and the position of our country, being neutral territory, advantage was taken of it by the Southerners, by those who were engaged in carrying on that war from the South, to make Canada a basis of operations, the Government of Canada never showed the slightest favor, but took every means in their power to prevent British North America being made use of in that struggle. I think, if the records of the United States were examined, it would be found that ten Canadians, or ten British North Americans, fought in the ranks of the Northern side for every one who fought on the Southern side.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Twenty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am inclined to think that my right hon. friend is nearer the mark than I am when he says they were twenty to one. I scarcely know of any aid being given to the South, while we know that at this moment the Government of the United States are paying a large sum of money to persons who were British subjects then and are British subjects now, in Canada, for their services during that war. Taking that as the best test that the country can show as to where its sympathies were, as far as the most substantial and important kind of aid could be found, it will be seen that British North America rendered a great deal more support and assistance to the North than to the South. Now, I may say that the Treaty of 1854 removed for twelve years all these difficulties, but, unfortunately, from the causes to which I have alluded I believe to a large extent, a misapprehension of the true facts of the case led to that treaty being abrogated. Both parties in this country, both parties in the various Provinces—because it was before the Union of Canada—regretted that abrogation. I believe there was not a Province in what is now the Dominion of Canada that did not make every exertion first of all to avoid the abrogation of that treaty, and, after it was abrogated, to endeavor to have it or something equivalent to it restored at as early a period as possible. But those efforts were unsuccessful, and then, and while these efforts were being continued, as hon. gentlemen opposite know, Canada resorted to a system of licenses to prevent too

sharp an interference with the long accustomed habit of United States fishermen of fishing in the waters of British North America. We adopted a mode of endeavoring to prevent collision and difficulty. While there might be any hope of our being able to settle this question by a recurrence to something like the Treaty of 1854, every effort was made by the adoption of licenses to remove irritation and prevent collision of every kind, in order to favor, as far as possible, the solution of the question in that way; but ultimately we were obliged to fall back on the principle of protecting our fisheries; we were obliged to adopt such measures as the fishermen had a right to expect at our hands; being excluded from the American market by high duties, having their calling very seriously interfered with, they had a right to demand at the hands of the Government and the Parliament of Canada that measures should be taken for the protection of the rights which they undoubtedly enjoyed and which, under the Treaty of 1818, had been settled in what one would suppose was as clear and concise and emphatic a manner as it was possible for any question to be settled. The result was that seizures were again made, and the American fishermen, encroaching upon the waters of British North America, found themselves again in difficulties. The consequence was, as you all know, that in 1871 a new treaty was made, and I have often thought of the old adage, that "everything comes to him who waits," when I have thought of the manner in which my right hon. friend on my left was attacked in this House and out of it, in connection with the Washington Treaty, and the satisfaction he must have experienced when, after the treaty had been in operation for ten years, there was not a single public man in Canada but was ready to do everything possible to maintain and to continue that very treaty. On that occasion, as hon. gentlemen know, my right hon. friend made the same effort to settle this question upon the lines that had been adopted in 1854; the effort was to obtain from the United States, instead of a money payment for the privileges which their fishermen were anxious to enjoy in the waters of Canada, such an expansion of commercial intercourse between the two countries, as would meet the wishes of the people of Canada, and be a settlement that would commend itself to the judgment and approval of everybody. That effort, however, was not successful; and when the treaty was presented for consideration to this House I remember well when hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House felt it their duty to criticise very severely that treaty, and we were compelled, in self-defence, to say something in its support—I remember very well appealing to hon. gentlemen opposite, as I shall appeal to them to-day, not to press the Government unduly to show to Parliament and to show to the country the advantages that were obtained by the Washington Treaty of 1871. One of the conditions of the treaty was that an international arbitration should take place at Halifax for the purpose of ascertaining the greater value of the fisheries of Canada to the people of the United States over and above the remission of the duty on fish and the corresponding right to fish in their waters, so as to arrive at the amount that should be paid by the United States to Canada. I appealed to hon. gentlemen opposite on that occasion not to compel us, in self-defence, to show that the treaty which had been signed was one advantageous to Canada, not to compel us to take such strong grounds as would be used against us when that arbitration, at a subsequent time, should take place. Well, Sir, I am sorry to say that my appeal on that occasion was not as successful as I trust it will be on this occasion; I am sorry to say that we were forced to make some very strong and very clear statements to the House in justification of my right hon. friend for putting his name to the Washington Treaty of 1871. Well, just as I expected, and nobody knows better than the hon. member for

Halifax (Mr. Jones), who sits opposite—for this arbitration took place in the city where he lives—no person knows better than himself, that one main element of the United States case was the production of the very speeches which we had been compelled to make on the floor of this House in defence of that treaty. Every word that we uttered on that occasion was used to our disadvantage and to our detriment. I will not say that it was very successfully used, because I do not think that Canada has any great right to complain of the amount that was awarded on that occasion—\$5,500,000 for the period during which the treaty was to last, for the benefits derived by the people of the United States over and above those which were conceded by removing the duties on fish. Many persons have said, Sir, that we were not only successful in that arbitration, but that we were too successful, that, in fact, the award that was made was the main reason why the United States took the earliest possible moment to denounce that treaty and to terminate it. I do not believe, myself, that the award was too great. I believe it is almost impossible to over-estimate the advantages of enjoying the fisheries that, fortunately for us, are contained in the jurisdictional waters of Canada. But, unfortunately, that treaty was abrogated. And, Sir, I must, in passing, pay my tribute to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), who at that period led the Government of this country. It is well known that that hon. gentleman, in the discharge of what he conceived to be, and what undoubtedly was, the duty that he owed to Canada in the high position he occupied, adopted measures to prevent that question of money ever being considered. The hon. gentleman sent one of his colleagues, or if not one of his colleagues at the time, a gentleman belonging to his party, of great ability and of great attainments, the late Hon. George Brown,—he sent him to Washington to co-operate with the British Minister at Washington, and once more a strenuous effort was made to settle this question of the greater value of our fisheries over those of the United States, and over the advantages to be derived from having an opportunity of entering our fish free in the American market; I say, he obtained the appointment by Her Majesty's Government of the Hon. George Brown as a plenipotentiary, and that gentleman exhausted every effort in his power to carry out the views of the hon. member for East York, and again revive the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. As that treaty had been refused on a former occasion, he went further than the lines of that treaty, and by introducing a certain number of articles to be passed free between the two countries, as well as the natural products of the two countries, he endeavored to enlarge and expand what had been obtained by the Treaty of 1854. I believe there was not a single item that was free under the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, that the Hon. Mr. Brown did not embody in the treaty which he signed as to be made free between Canada and the United States, under the Treaty of 1874, which draft treaty was arrived at between the two Governments. As I said before, and as I said the other day, I feel it is only right, in passing, to say, that the effort to obtain the freest possible commercial intercourse between Canada and the United States, consistent with the rights and interests of the two Governments, is a policy that does not belong to one party only, but it is the property of both parties in this country. The hon. member for East York showed his hearty appreciation of the value of such a policy, when he was leading his Administration, just as much as my right hon. friend showed it on the occasion of going to Washington in 1871, and on all and every occasion when that question has come up for consideration. But the Senate rejected that treaty, or, at all events, did not take it up, and consequently we were thrown back upon arbitration; and I think it is a matter of sincere gratification, and

always will be to the people of Canada, to know that after the most careful and painstaking examination, after taking all the sworn testimony that could be adduced on the side of the United States, and by Canada, and after the most careful consideration of that testimony, and the fullest consideration of the whole question, that international commission awarded no less than \$5,500,000, or something approaching \$500,000 per annum, as the value of the fisheries of Canada over and above those of the United States and the additional advantage of a free market in the United States for the fish of Canada. Now, Sir, under these circumstances, that Treaty of 1871 was abrogated on 1st July, 1885. But I must do the Government of the United States the credit to say that they seemed to be equally impressed with the Government of Canada as to the importance of avoiding the difficulties and collisions that were likely to arise out of the abrogation of that treaty, and as those difficulties were likely to again present themselves a measure was arranged jointly between the Government of the United States and the Government of Great Britain, on behalf of the Government of Canada, for the purpose of endeavoring to prevent those difficulties again presenting themselves. Past experience had shown both countries how exceedingly undesirable it was to have men like the fishermen of the two countries, who were away from home, who were not under such easy control as persons on land are, carrying out measures the end of which it might be very difficult to foresee; and at the suggestion of the British Minister, Mr. Bayard, then and now the distinguished Secretary of State of the United States, entered into a temporary arrangement whereby American fishermen were allowed the privileges of the treaty during the remainder of the season—that is, the season of 1885—with the understanding that the President should bring the question before Congress at its next session, and recommend a joint commission by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain to consider the question “in the interest of good neighborhood and friendly intercourse between the two countries, thus affording a prospect of negotiating for the development and extension of trade between the United States and British North America.” I use Mr. Bayard’s words. The Government of Canada most readily assented to this view, and true to the policy that had been invariably pursued on both sides of this House, that of doing everything possible to promote trade relations between the two countries and to remove difficulties connected with the fisheries, the Government at once agreed that if the President would send to Congress a recommendation for the appointment of a commission having such objects in view, they would allow the American fishermen to have the same free access to the fisheries of Canada, as they had enjoyed during the continuance of the treaty. President Cleveland, keeping good faith with the Governments of Great Britain and Canada, sent a message to Congress on 5th December, 1885, premising that:

“In the interests of good neighborhood and of the commercial intercourse of an adjacent community, the question of the North American fisheries is one of much importance.”

He recommended a commission:

“Charged with the consideration and settlement, upon a just, equitable and honorable basis, of the entire question of the fishing rights of the two Governments.”

Unfortunately, the Senate did not approve the recommendation. The fishermen of Gloucester, who, naturally I suppose, confined their attention to their own interests, and regardless of the effects of the course they proposed to pursue, at once petitioned Congress in the most earnest manner against any such proposal. They declared they did not want to have anything to do with the fishing grounds or waters of Canada, and they induced the Senate to reject the proposal by a vote of thirty to ten, and the proposal was rejected accordingly. We were then thrown back, necessarily,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

upon the only means of protecting the rights and interests of Canada. I may say that a very mistaken apprehension has arisen from the continuous exertions of all parties and classes in this country to obtain reciprocal trade relations with the United States. The policy of obtaining the free interchange of the natural products of the two countries, the products of the sea, of the forest, of the farm and of the mine, as I have said, has been continuously the policy of both parties in this country, and they have pressed that in season and out of season upon our great neighbors to the south of us. And that, unfortunately, has led to a very erroneous impression. When my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was compelled to adopt the same policy that had been adopted by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who organised that department with great ability and who filled the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries with equally great ability during a considerable time; I say, when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries fell back upon the same policy his predecessor had adopted under like circumstances and took such measures as were absolutely necessary and indispensable for the protection of the rights and interests of the fishermen of Canada, the United States complained bitterly. Difficulties again took place. Fishermen, perhaps, are the most intractable and uncontrollable people in the world, and when a fisherman gets on board his little smack he thinks he is monarch of all he surveys, and he can go where he pleases, and do what he pleases. The result was that, as before, collisions occurred. Those parties brought themselves under the operation of the law, and it was absolutely necessary, as I have said, in the defence of the rights of Canadian fishermen, to make examples of those parties who showed that disregard for law. The result was, an entirely erroneous impression grew up throughout the United States. It was shared by the Government—by the Senate, by the House of Representatives. It was accepted by the great body of the people; and the press and the people of the United States, almost without exception, came to the conclusion, without a particle of ground to justify it, that Canada was enforcing a most harsh, ungenerous and unwarrantable construction of the terms of the Treaty of 1818, for the purpose of forcing reciprocal trade relations upon the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that this became a universal sentiment in that country. One can understand the mass of the people in the United States sharing such an impression. People said, and at the outset it seems a reasonable proposition: “Why is it that the fishermen of the United States of America cannot obtain the same consideration in a Canadian port that a Canadian fisherman obtains in the United States ports?” Well, Sir, the answer is obvious. The American Government renounced the right to enter our waters, as England and Canada never did renounce the right to enter the waters of the United States of America. The United States, in consideration of certain territorial rights over a portion of our country, in a part of Newfoundland and Labrador, and the Magdalen Islands, and in consideration of obtaining such territorial rights as I believe are unparalleled in the world in any other country, renounced forever the right of their fishing vessels of any kind whatever to come into the jurisdictional waters of Canada or British North America, as it was then called, except for specified purposes, and then under such terms and conditions as would prevent them abusing the exceptional privileges which the treaty allowed. This is obvious, but you cannot make the mass of the people understand it, and it is astonishing how many men of standing and position in the United States seem never to have grasped the fact that the fishermen of the United States occupy an entirely different position in the waters of Canada from that which the fishermen of Canada occupy in the waters of the United States. This was not done by any act

of the Government of this country, but one can see, Sir, how easy it is that the mass of the people, not understanding those terms, not understanding the character of this treaty, and not understanding the obligations which the Government of the United States had taken in regard to this question, should be misled. Then, Sir, another difficulty arose, and that was with reference to the rights that those fishing vessels should enjoy when in our waters. It was claimed by the Government of the United States, in 1818, that as no commercial vessel could come into the waters of British North America from the United States, that there was no intercourse, that those were privileges given to the fishing vessels by that treaty beyond anything that was enjoyed by any other class of vessels. And when a changed condition of things came about; when the commercial arrangement of 1830 had, as they contended, entirely changed the status of their fishing vessels in our waters—since, as they said, under that commercial arrangement it was provided that their trading vessels could enter freely the ports of British North America and our trading vessels could enter their ports—as there was no exemption or exclusion of fishing vessels, they claimed that rights had been acquired by the fishing vessels that entirely took them out of the category of the Treaty of 1818, under which they were restricted from going into our waters for any but the four purposes. I think, Sir, that that contention, upon examination, proves to be entirely unfounded. I do not think it would be possible for any constitutional lawyer to maintain that proposition for a single moment. The arrangement of 1830 was a commercial arrangement, founded upon an Act of Congress, on the one side, authorising the Government of the United States whenever the King in Council would admit United States vessels to the Bermudas, the Caicos and the British West Indies; that whenever the King in Council would, by proclamation, admit their vessels to these ports, they would admit our vessels in the same way to theirs. It was, therefore, a bilateral arrangement entered into and based upon an Act of Congress, on proclamation made by the President and upon the Order in Council made by the King. Now, Sir, the treaty is a superior instrument to that Order in Council, and that Order in Council is silent as to fishing vessels. The treaty solemnly declared that the people of the United States renounced forever the right to claim for a fishing vessel any such commercial privileges whatever. And under those circumstances it is a principle in law, constitutional as well as general law, and I believe accepted by all countries, that you cannot repeal and change and alter a specific provision by a general one unless some arrangement had been subsequently provided as to such specific provision. The general terms as to vessels in the commercial arrangement of 1830 and the absence of any reference to fishing vessels, left fishing vessels exactly in the same position as they were before. But, Sir, that was not the only ground. It was also claimed that in the Washington Treaty of 1871, to which my right hon. friend was a party, there was a bonding clause, and that this bonding clause provided that the United States vessels were authorised to tranship their cargoes in bond in the same way that Canadian vessels were allowed to tranship their cargoes in bond through the United States. But again, Sir, not only was there no reference made to fishing vessels being relieved from the renunciations of the Government of the United States under the Treaty of 1818, but there was the fact—as hon. gentlemen opposite, many of whom watched this matter at Halifax, well know—that when this question was raised and the representative of Canada said: “You are enjoying privileges here in the transhipment of fish under the treaty, and you are enjoying the advantage of buying bait and supplies of all kinds for your fishermen under this treaty, and you must consider what is due to the Government of Canada for those

privileges which you enjoy”—I say, Sir, there was the fact that Mr. Foster, acting as the Agent of the Government of the United States, moved a resolution declaring that under the Washington Treaty, the Government of the United States had no such right and no such privilege to tranship a cargo of fish or buy bait or supplies of any kind whatever. Although during the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 it had been freely permitted by the Government of Canada during the 12 years that Treaty was in force, they declared that under clause 29 of the Washington Treaty, as it stands there to-day, and under which this right is claimed, that they had no such privileges before the fishery clause was removed from that treaty, as it was by its abrogation. Therefore I say that when this matter comes to be examined, the House will see the position we occupy; the House will also see the difficult position we were in, with the public mind of the United States inflamed by a misapprehension on this question. When we had the Government and Congress of the United States acting as one man in relation to this question, it will be at once appreciated how difficult and how serious this matter had become. Although we were not giving an ungenerous or an extreme interpretation to the treaty at all, but were simply doing that which my hon. friend opposite found it necessary to do, as did his successor, that is, to defend the just rights of the fishermen of Canada—and no Government would be worthy of the name who would shrink for a single moment from that duty—the result was that because we took this action the sentiment of public men in the United States became inflamed, and instead of thinking of anything like increased freedom of commercial intercourse or of anything that was calculated to be of advantage or benefit to the two countries, they had recourse to the passage of what was called a Retaliatory Act. It was not a Retaliatory Act, but it was a Non-intercourse Act based upon an entire misapprehension of the position of the two countries and of the questions in relation to them. And as I said a year ago when standing here, it was an Act that was entirely uncalled for. Well, Sir, I then took the opportunity of drawing the attention of this House at some little length to the position in which we stood in relation to that Non-intercourse Act. I said that it was the only cloud on the commercial horizon of Canada, and I pointed out the unwarrantable character, as I considered it, of the Act. I pointed out that it seemed to be founded on an entire misapprehension of what the position of Canada was in relation to this question. I was very severely criticised—if not by hon. gentlemen opposite, who are always extremely indulgent to me—by the press representing them, for that speech. It was stated to be a very offensive speech, and to have a tone that was calculated to be extremely irritating to the Government of the United States, and two or three leading and prominent newspapers in this country have from that day to this asserted that here in my place in Parliament I declared that non-intercourse would be a very good thing for Canada. Well, Sir, as I dare say you know, I do not often correct statements made in the press, however much they may misrepresent what I say or do; but I may here take the opportunity of saying that no man can read the speech I delivered on that occasion and find any foundation whatever for any such statement. I did state that it would become the imperative duty of the Government of Canada, in vindication of the rights of our fishermen, to adopt the policy of protecting our fisheries. I stated that there was no warrant for such an Act as had been passed in the United States; and as the best means of protecting ourselves against the effects of a policy so unjust and so injurious to everybody—so detrimental to the interests both of the United States and Canada—I pointed out that, fortunately for Canada, we had attained a position that did not leave us so entirely at the mercy of our neighbors to the south of us as we should otherwise have been. I pointed out that

the construction of the Canadian Pacific and of the Inter-colonial Railways had given the people of Canada means for the free intercourse of one Province and one part of our people with another, without their being forced to go through the United States of America. I used language as strong, I think, as could be used to show the opinion I had of such an Act, when I said:

"Deeply as we would deplore so mad and so unjustifiable an act on the part of a great country like this great Republic of the United States adopting such a barbarous policy as that of non-intercourse with a friendly power, we stand in the proud position of knowing that if that policy were adopted to-morrow, we have perfected our own lines of communication and have the most complete means of communication from the farthest and most remote section of our country down to the sea."

I think, Sir, that that was calculated to show that we had to a certain extent protected ourselves from the ruinous position we should have been placed in if we had not those means of inter-communication; and I do not think that was inviting non-intercourse or intimating that it was a policy of which I approved. I said further:

"Non-intercourse would not be an unmixed evil. I would deeply deplore it; every member of the House and every intelligent Canadian would deeply deplore any interruption of the commercial relations which exist between this country and the United States, but I cannot forget that, if the policy of non-intercourse were adopted, it would lead to the development of those channels of communication between ourselves."

In another place I said:

"While I most earnestly hope no such policy will be adopted."

I thus call attention for a moment in passing to the language I then used in order to show that I was not guilty of the supreme folly that I would have been guilty of if I had spoken of non-intercourse between 60,000,000 of people of the United States of America and 5,000,000 on this side of the line as anything but what every intelligent Canadian would deplore, as I think every intelligent American ought to deplore it. But, Sir, I will just say that this speech does not seem to have been attended with the very unpleasant results that some people in this country feared, who thought it adopted too defiant a tone for a small people like the people of Canada, and was calculated to exasperate our neighbors and bring about those unfortunate results. All I can say is that those remarks received a very considerable amount of attention in the press of the United States. Some portions of them appeared in leading journals in the United States; and the result was, Sir, that instead of having any reason to suppose that I had been guilty of an indiscreet act in making the references which I felt, as a member of this House, I was bound to make in dealing with the position in which the country stood, the only result, so far as I am aware, was this. I do not know that the speech had any connection with it; but I know this, that a mutual friend—I have no objection to mentioning that it was Mr. Wiman—at an early day after this speech was delivered, intimated to me that he had had a long conversation with the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Bayard, and that that gentleman had said that he would be very glad to have an opportunity of discussing the mutual relations of Canada and the United States with either my right hon. friend the Premier of Canada or myself. I brought that statement under the notice of His Excellency the Governor-General and my right hon. friend; and as it was quite impossible for him to leave his place in Parliament at that time, I took advantage of the Easter holidays to accept this informal invitation. I went down to Washington, and was presented to Mr. Bayard by Her Majesty's Minister there. Our conversation on that occasion, as you are aware, was personal and private, but the House will be able to gather what the effect of that conversation was, when I refer to the result. It was on the 21st of May that I had that interview with Mr. Bayard, and I can only say that it

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

was a very gratifying one in every possible respect. That distinguished gentleman seemed fully to appreciate what he owed to the great country in which he filled the high function of Secretary of State, and he showed also his appreciation of the importance of maintaining the most friendly commercial relations with Canada. I am relieved, however, from any violation of secrecy in regard to that interview in view of the correspondence which occurred. Mr. Bayard told me that he would repeat our conversation to the President of the United States, and would communicate to me the result at an early day. On the 31st of May, I received a letter with which hon. gentlemen are all familiar. I will not trouble the House with reading the whole of it; but it is necessary, in order to give a proper view of the basis of the conference from which this treaty has resulted, that I should draw the attention of the House to some of the remarks made by Mr. Bayard in that letter. In his letter to me he said:

"The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain, which has been *questio vexata* ever since it was concluded, and to-day is suffered to interfere with and seriously embarrass the good understanding of both countries in the important commercial relations and interests which have come into being since its ratification, and for the adjustment of which it is wholly inadequate, as has been unhappily proved by the events of the past two years. I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I say commercial, because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to effect the legislative independence of either country."

I am glad to know that Mr. Bayard had too much respect for the people of Canada—and he has since learned, in the most conclusive manner, that his views were well founded—to come to any other conclusion than that no Canadian would ever consent to be legislated for by any other country in the world.

"When you were here I prepared to send my reply to the 'observations' upon my proposal for the settlement (of November 15 last), which were communicated to Mr. Phelps by Lord Salisbury on March 24, and also to express my views of his lordship's alternative proposition. Your visit and invitation to negotiate here was entirely welcome, and of this I endeavored to impress you. Conversation with the President has confirmed these views and now it remains to give them practical effect. Great Britain being the only treaty-making party to deal with the United States, the envoys of that Government alone are authorized to speak in her behalf and create her obligations. I presume you will be personally constituted a Plenipotentiary of Great Britain to arrange here, with whomsoever may be selected to represent the United States' terms of agreement, for a *modus vivendi* to meet the present emergencies and also a permanent plan to avoid all future disputes. It appears to me that as matters now stand the colony of Newfoundland ought to be represented and included, for a single arrangement should suffice to regulate all the joint and several interests involved. I should, therefore, be informed speedily through the proper channel as to the authorisation and appointment by the Imperial Government of such representatives."

"The gravity of the present condition of affairs between our two countries demand entire frankness. I feel we stand at 'the parting of the ways.' In one direction I can see a well assured, steady, healthful relationship, devoid of petty jealousies, and filled with the fruits of a prosperity arising out of a friendship cemented by mutual interests, and enduring because based upon justice; on the other, a career of embittered rivalry, staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility, in which victory means the destruction of an adjacent prosperity without gain to the prevalent party—a mutual, physical and moral deterioration which ought to be abhorrent to patriots on both sides, and which I am sure no two men will exert themselves more to prevent than the parties to this unofficial correspondence."

I replied on the 10th June to Mr. Bayard in the following terms. I will not trouble the House by reading the whole of the letter, but only such parts that will show the basis of this conference:

"MY DEAR MR. BAYARD,—I had great pleasure in receiving your letter of May 31, evincing as it does the importance which you attach to an amicable adjustment of the fisheries question and the maintenance of the cordial commercial relations between the United States and Canada, under which such vast and mutually beneficial results have grown up. I entirely concur in your statement that we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and that there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesman-

like plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I note particularly your suggestions that as the interests of Canada are so immediately concerned, Her Majesty's Government should be invited to depute a Canadian statesman to negotiate with you a '*modus vivendi*' to meet present emergencies and also a permanent plan to avoid all disputes,' and I feel no doubt that a negotiation thus undertaken would greatly increase the prospects of a satisfactory solution."

I concluded by saying :

"I have thought it my duty and also the most effectual manner of giving effect to your suggestion, to make known to Lord Lansdowne the purport of my correspondence with you. He is strongly desirous of facilitating a settlement, and will at once bring the matter before the Secretary of State, with an expression of his hope that no time will be lost in taking steps for establishing, by means of personal communications with your Government, a *modus vivendi* such as you have described, and also for arriving at an understanding in regard to a lasting adjustment of our commercial relations."

The result you know. I will read, in order to place the House in full possession of the exact state of affairs, an extract from Mr. Bayard's letter to Mr. Phelps, the American Minister in London :

"The visit here of Sir Charles Tupper, on behalf of the Canadian Government, was received with cordiality, and expressions were exchanged of a mutual desire for the settlement of all existing difficulties, and for the increased freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada. In consequence of the statement made by Sir Charles Tupper on the occasion referred to, I wrote him a personal and unofficial letter on 31st May, and received on 10th June his reply, and copies of this correspondence were duly sent to you. Yesterday, Sir Lionel West handed me, without comment, the following copy of a telegram to him from Lord Salisbury :

"If the Secretary of State will formally propose the appointment of a Commission as suggested by him in his correspondence with Sir Charles Tupper, Her Majesty's Government will agree with great pleasure."

'SALISBURY.'

"And I have just telegraphed you to the following effect :—

"PHELPS, Minister, London.

"Sir Lionel West handed me yesterday a telegram from Lord Salisbury agreeing to the negotiation suggested by him informally in correspondence with Sir Charles Tupper after his visit to this capital, and requesting me to make a formal proposal which will be forwarded to you at once.

'BAYARD.'

I intend to read but two other extracts as the only other parts of this correspondence which are pertinent to the subject :

"The number of plenipotentiaries to be employed on either side does not seem to be immaterial to the object in view. The Treaty of 1854 comprehended the same class of questions substantially, and as I have before remarked in my correspondence with you, was negotiated by the Earl of Elgin, at that time Governor General of Canada, and Mr. Wm L. Marcy, then the Secretary of State for the United States. By referring also to our prior treaties with Great Britain, it will be found that the number of plenipotentiaries employed on either side varied, and was frequently unequal."

He further said :

"It is regarded by the President as of the highest importance that a distinct and friendly understanding should without delay be arrived at between the United States and Great Britain touching the question of the rights which belong respectively to the citizens of the United States and the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty in relation to the fisheries on the coasts of the British possessions in North America, and as to any other questions which affect the trade and commercial relations between the United States and those possessions. You are, therefore, instructed to propose to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, the appointment of an Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, to meet in the city of Washington a Minister Plenipotentiary of the Government of the United States, duly authorized by the respective Governments to treat and discuss the mode of settling all questions which have arisen out of the fisheries on the coasts of British North America, and all other questions affecting the relations between the United States and Her Britannic Majesty's possessions in British North America."

The House having heard those extracts, will at once understand the circumstances under which this conference was brought about and plenipotentiaries appointed on both sides. Her Majesty's Government appointed the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain as leader of the conference on the British side ; they appointed Her Majesty's Minister at Washington, Sir Lionel Sackville West, as the second plenipotentiary. The Colonial Minister sent a despatch to Lord Lansdowne, the Governor General of Canada, to say that the British Gov-

ernment wished the Government of Canada to say who would be acceptable as representing the Government of Canada at this conference, and it is only right to my right hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald) that I should say that they intimated, as it was very naturally to be expected they would, that the appointment to that position of the same distinguished gentleman, who had acted as a Joint High Commissioner in 1871 with such ability and success would be entirely acceptable to Her Majesty's Government. I came out to Canada without the slightest idea whatever that I would be appointed in connection with this commission. I returned here after having discharged in London the duties which were incumbent on me and which I had been called upon to perform. Immediately, my right hon. friend told me that he was anxious that I should go to Washington as the third plenipotentiary. Lord Lansdowne was good enough to join in expressing his desire that I should fill that position. I daresay, if the truth were known, my right hon. friend here thought that having had so much to do with the negotiation of this conference, and representing, as I had the honor of representing in the Government of Canada, the interests of one of the most important of the Maritime Provinces, the Province of Nova Scotia, there was a certain fitness in my being called upon to discharge this duty. I thought that, under the circumstances, I could not decline, but I made it a condition that I should have the able and invaluable assistance of my colleague, the Minister of Justice, as the legal adviser of the British side at this conference, as I knew that matters of the greatest importance would arise in which the opinions and the advice and the legal and constitutional knowledge of that hon. gentleman would be invaluable. With the utmost readiness, that hon. gentleman at once consented to associate himself with me in that capacity ; and I must at the same time tender my heartfelt thanks to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whose province I was to a certain extent apparently invading, for the very zealous and hearty and valuable co-operation which his intimate knowledge of that subject enabled him to give us. I take this opportunity of saying that a statement which has been made by leading public journals in this country in reference to my own position on that occasion is erroneous. A good deal of sympathy has been expressed for me. I have already mentioned the great kindness which I have received even from my opponents, but an amount of sympathy has been extended to me which I must disavow having any occasion for. A great deal has been said and a great deal of sympathy has been expressed, as to the unfortunate position in which Sir Charles Tupper found himself in Washington in battling on the one side for the rights of Canada, and finding the pressure of Her Majesty's Government on the other side ; and that in fact I was compelled, by the strong line which was taken by Her Majesty's representative, Mr. Chamberlain, to yield and surrender what it must have cost me a great deal of pain and suffering to do. I would be unworthy of the position I occupy in this House if I did not at once disavow anything of the kind. I do not think it would have been possible for Her Majesty's Government to have made a better or a more judicious selection than they did in Mr. Chamberlain, as the leader of the British side in that conference. That hon. gentleman is one of the foremost statesmen in England ; that right hon. gentleman, as the House very well knows, as the leader of the Radical party in Great Britain, was perhaps especially qualified, by the position he occupied in Imperial politics, to be an acceptable envoy to the United States of America ; and, after three months of very intimate intercourse and association in the city of Washington, I have no hesitation in saying that I do not believe it would have been possible for Her Majesty's Government to select any gentleman who would have been more acceptable to all parties in that great

capital. In regard to my own position in that conference, I have already shown the House how largely I am responsible for what has taken place. The conference was initiated from the interview which took place between myself and Mr. Bayard. I was subsequently asked to serve as one of Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries on that important mission; but I am bound to say that if, instead of the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain and Sir Lionel Sackville West, I had had as my colleagues two of the foremost statesmen of Canada, taken from either side of the House, it would have been impossible to have had the contentions of Canada more uniformly supported than they were from the beginning to the end. If there is any mistake, if this treaty is not what Canada had a right to expect it should be, I am bound to say that there is no man more responsible for that than myself. These hon. gentlemen, from the beginning to the end, stood by the interests of Canada in the most unflinching way. I have heard, in this House and out of this House, that it was desirable that the time should come when Canada could appoint her own plenipotentiaries and envoys to deal with the negotiation of treaties, but I speak from experience and from a knowledge of the facts when I say that a greater mistake it would be impossible to conceive. In the position which Canada occupies, great and important as it is, and with the great future we have undoubtedly before us in the development of the enormous resources of this country, while the time may come when we will be in a position which will enable us to go into an international conference with that power and influence which alone will qualify a plenipotentiary to negotiate effectively with other countries, until that time comes it is impossible to overrate the value of having the Empire of Great Britain behind us. A plenipotentiary is able to command, when he is fighting a keen and hard battle for his country, just that amount of influence and power which that country commands among the States of the world; and I say that, until we obtain that influence and that power, nothing would be more detrimental or suicidal to the best interests of Canada than to divest ourselves of the potent influence of standing under the ægis of the mightiest Empire in the world. Now, I must say a single word with reference to my colleagues representing the Government of the United States. I have already given you a tolerable insight into the views of Mr. Bayard. That hon. gentleman, as the House knows, is the worthy representative of a long line of the most eminent statesmen in the United States, and no person in the Government of that country commands more uniformly or more deservedly the respect and confidence of the United States than the Hon. T. F. Bayard, the Secretary of State. In the Hon. W. L. Putnam, we had opposed to us a gentleman occupying so distinguished a legal position in New England that his name has been frequently heard within the last fortnight as the probable successor of that eminent jurist, the late Hon. Chief Justice of the United States; we had in him a gentleman more intimately acquainted with the fishing interests of the United States than almost any other gentleman who could be suggested, and whose legal standing and position are calculated to obtain the confidence and respect of all who know him. In the third plenipotentiary representing the United States, we had Mr. Angell, President of the Michigan University at Ann Arbor, a gentleman who, although a supporter of the Republican party, was selected in consequence of his great knowledge of international law, and the fact that he had been chosen by a Republican Government in the United States to discharge most important duties as a Commissioner to China, in the arrangement of a treaty. I do not believe, Sir, that it would be possible for any Government in the United States to select three gentlemen more eminently patriotic, more heartily devoted to the interests of their country, than the three gentlemen I have named; and after

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

sitting face to face with them for three months in keen and sharp controversy, the only result of our communication has been to leave upon my mind the very highest respect for the character, standing and ability of those gentlemen, and a desire not only of continuing the acquaintance which I had the pleasure of making with them, but that it should perpetuate a genuine and thorough friendship. I can only say, Sir, that when I came to meet them in conference, I was greatly surprised, and you will not be surprised to learn that such was the case after hearing the papers I shall read with reference to commercial intercourse. After the statement of the President of the United States in his Message of 1855, asking for a commission, after the letters which passed between Mr. Bayard and myself, you will readily understand that I went there expecting and looking forward to a settlement of this question on very much the same lines as those upon which it had been settled in 1854, and to some extent, in 1871. I am right in saying that the instructions with which I was charged by this Government were to obtain, if it was possible, as near an approach to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 as I could obtain, that is, the policy of carrying out free exchange in the natural products of the two countries. I was to urge that policy, and I think you will have no doubt as to the course pursued by me after reading the proposition that I made in the conference on the 3rd December, 1887:

"Sir Charles Tupper begged leave to submit a note containing the following proposal from the British plenipotentiaries. That with a view of removing all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of mutual arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Newfoundland."

It has been suggested that this is very vague. Well, I confess I am unable to see it. I considered that in formulating that proposal, I was bound to ascertain if the Government of the United States were prepared to accept any greater freedom of commercial intercourse, to ascertain to what extent they were prepared to meet Canada in order to secure for their fishermen the enjoyment of the advantage which they had under the Treaty of 1854, and under the Treaty of 1871. If that proposal does not formulate as broad and as general an invitation to the Government of the United States, as could be made, provided they were willing to deal upon a commercial basis at all, I should be very happy if any hon. gentleman will point out to me wherein the proposition is wanting. And what did Mr. Angell say?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The offer is unrestricted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says the offer is unrestricted, and I intended it should be so. I intended to give the Government of the United States the fullest opportunity of stating just how far they were prepared to go in reciprocal trade with Canada. I knew, Sir, that the air was full of theories of commercial union, full of proposals of unrestricted intercourse, and I thought I could not do a better service to Canada, under these circumstances, than to ascertain at the very outset what was the position of the United States as to that question. I do not hesitate to tell you what that position is. I do not intend to make reference to a past debate, in which I regret very deeply I was not able to participate, although as a large number of gentlemen dealt with that question on both sides of the House I think you were rather fortunate in not having another speech inflicted upon you on that occasion by myself; but I am bound to take this opportunity of saying that you may go to Washington, as I did; you may mingle for three months, as I did, with the leading men of all parties and all classes; you may go through the House of Representatives from beginning to end, and

canvass every man, and you may go to the Senate of the United States and canvass every man, and I say you will not find a single man who will talk to you on the subject of unrestricted reciprocity, as I did not find one at the time when public attention was being turned to it in this country.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). There are two Bills before Congress.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Was it not desirable that we should know what the views and sentiments of the United States were upon the subject? Talk to them, Sir, of commercial union—I tell you that I did not meet a man of any party, I did not meet an American statesman who would not hold up both hands for commercial union with Canada. Why, Sir? Because he knows that it would give Canada to the United States, he knows that you would never occupy the degrading position of having a neighboring country make your tariff, and impose taxes upon you. I say, Sir, that it is a condition of things from which the most craven Canadian would recoil. This proposition of unrestricted reciprocity, of free trade with the United States, with liberty to make our own tariff with the rest of the world, I say I did not meet a man—I discussed this question fully and freely from day to day with scores of leading public men in the United States—I did not meet a man that would talk about such a thing for a single moment. Why, Sir, they treated the very proposition with scorn. They said: "Do you suppose that we intend to make a free trade arrangement with Canada, that would involve free trade with England, and destroy the position that we occupy in relation to all the vast industries of this country? I say, Sir, that under these circumstances I did a service to Canada. And you have got the answer. You did not get from Mr. Bayard the statement: "If you will go the whole length of unrestricted reciprocity with us, if you will make everything free, then we will talk with you." Nothing of the kind. Here is the answer, coming from the leader of the Administration of the United States, which conclusively shows that—I was going to say, but, after the interesting and animated discussion we had in this House, I will not say that it was a waste of time to take up a fortnight of the time of Parliament in discussing that which it is just as rational as to have been discussing how to construct a railway from Canada to the moon. The answer is here:

"While continuing their proposal heretofore submitted—on the 30th ultimo—and fully sharing the desire of Her Britannic Majesty's plenipotentiaries to remove all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, the American plenipotentiaries are constrained, after careful consideration, to decline to ask from the President authority requisite to consider the proposal conveyed to them on the 3rd instant as a means to the desired end, because the greater freedom of commercial intercourse so proposed would necessitate an adjustment of the present tariff of the United States by congressional action, which adjustment the American plenipotentiaries consider to be manifestly impracticable of accomplishment through the medium of a treaty under the circumstances now existing. Nor could the American plenipotentiaries admit that such a mutual arrangement as is proposed by Her Britannic Majesty's plenipotentiaries could be accepted as constituting a suitable basis of negotiation concerning the rights and privileges claimed for American fishing vessels. It still appears to the American plenipotentiaries to be possible to find an adjustment of differences by agreeing on an interpretation or modification of the Treaty of 1818, which will be honorable to both parties and remove the present causes of complaint to which end they are now—as they have been from the beginning of this conference—ready to devote themselves."

Mr. Bayard gives a further illustration of the position in his letter to the Senate. It is dated Washington, 22nd March, and in it he says:

"In conformity with the invariable course pursued in previous negotiations, when the conference met it was agreed that an honorable confidence should be maintained in its deliberations, and that only results should be announced and such other matters as the joint protocolists should sign under the direction of the plenipotentiaries. With this understanding, which was strictly kept, the discussions of the conference proceeded, through its numerous and prolonged sessions, with that freedom and informality in the exchange of views which the nature of the negotiations required and without which its progress would have been materially hampered and any agreement rendered very difficult of attainment.

"Upon the conclusion of the treaty some members of the conference at once left the city under the pressure of other duties, and it is thus possible that some statements were excluded that otherwise might have been placed in the joint protocols."

I have explained to the House my great surprise at finding they did not give what I assumed that the purely formal protocols to which I assented would give, that is to say, all the proposals made, and the counter-proposals and the replies on both sides. I assumed that the protocols would contain those. Mr. Bayard has explained how it was that this was not done.

"After the conference had finally adjourned and Sir Charles Tupper had returned to Ottawa, a request was received through the British Minister that assent be given to the publication of a certain proposal which had been submitted by the British plenipotentiaries and declined by the Americans. The consent as desired was given, and I enclose herewith a copy of the papers so referred to. Every point submitted to the conference is covered by the papers now in the possession of the Senate."

I wish the House to note that. Although we have not given any proposals and counter-proposals, here is the statement, which I confirm as being thoroughly and entirely accurate, that the papers submitted to the Senate, as the papers submitted to you give all the information necessary for the consideration of this question.

"Excepting the question of damages sustained by our fishermen, which, being met by the counter-claim for damages to British vessels in Behring's Sea, was left for future settlement."

President Angell, who was one of the commissioners, after he returned home, made the following observations:—

"We were a long time getting down to the real work of the commission, all the parties interested were so varied. The British and Canadian commissioners were especially anxious to make a reciprocal free trade treaty a part of the treaty before they would settle on the fishery question. More than one-half the time was occupied in this manner. The real work has been done within the last month. We told them over and over that the tariff was a matter which must be settled by Congress, and that we could do nothing about it. I must say, if this treaty is not ratified by the Senate they will make a great mistake."

I give you President Angell's statement, and I will now give the House a still more authoritative statement, bearing on the same subject. I have here the report of the Judicial Committee of the House of Representatives, to whom was referred, in 1885, the question as to the power of the President to negotiate treaties with foreign governments. This report is No. 2680, 48 Congress, 2nd Session:

"Mr. Tucker, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report:

"The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the resolution of the House of Representatives embodied in this report, respectfully submit their report thereon."

"The resolution is in these words:

"Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee be directed to report to the House, whether the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, can negotiate treaties with foreign Governments by which the duties levied by Congress on importations can be changed or abrogated."

"The question thus referred to the Committee is one of great importance in its relations to our foreign intercourse and our internal Government."

"Your Committee have thus considered the question on the true interpretation of the language of the constitution; upon the construction of the Government itself; on the historic developments of the constitution from its British original through the articles of Confederation to its present form; on analogy to the British prototype; on precedents and the authority; and have come to the conclusion expressed in the following resolution, which, though the discussion has taken a wider range, is confined to the question submitted by the resolution referred to the committee:

"Resolved, that the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, cannot negotiate treaties with foreign Governments by which the duties levied by Congress can be changed or abrogated, and such treaties to be operative as law must have the sanction of an Act of Congress."

I have therefore shown the grounds on which the United States plenipotentiaries refused in the most positive manner, as they have stated in their reply, over and over again, to take up the question of trade relations. You may ask me then what Mr. Bayard meant by using the words "these commercial questions and this commercial intercourse between the two countries." I confess I

was misled. I confess frankly I took the same view as hon. gentlemen would take, I think, on reading his letter to me and my letter to him and his instructions to Mr. Phelps, and I was not prepared to be met by an absolute refusal on the part of the United States plenipotentiaries to take up and consider the question of commercial intercourse at all. But the explanation was this, and I think it is right and fair that in his absence I should give it. Mr. Bayard states now, and has stated throughout, his great desire to have the freest commercial intercourse between us consistent with the position and interest of the two countries. He says, if you want to see the policy of the Government of the United States you have it in the President's Message to Congress; there is our policy. Our policy is to meet this enormous surplus revenue in the United States, not by a reduction which will strike at the labor and capital of the country by reducing the duty on manufactured articles simply and purely, but it is to meet it by two courses—by making everything that operatives use cheap, by making it free, by making the natural products of the two countries free; in other words, by removing the duties from the food and things that are used by operatives, and by removing the duties from raw materials, which instead of injuring the manufacturing industries is a protective policy. I say, Sir, that after studying the policy of the United States, of the Democratic Party—the free trade party of the United States as they are very improperly called, for there is no free trade party in the United States, they have got beyond that long ago—after examining their policy, after reading the President's message, after reading the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, after reading the speech of Mr. Carlisle, the Speaker of the House of Representatives on taking the chair, I have come to the conclusion that their policy is just as close to the policy of the Government of Canada as any two things possibly can be. Our policy is to make natural products free; our policy is to make raw materials free; our policy is to make the country as cheap a country as we can for the artisan, and at the same time to give his labor a full return, by such protection of the manufacturing industries of the country as will build up those manufactures and give employment to the people. Now, Sir, that is our policy. Mr. Bayard and those other gentlemen said that "there is only one way to reach this (for Congress alone can take the duty off any article), and on account of the exasperation that has been excited in this country by those fishery difficulties you have an unanimous Bill passed by the House of Representatives and passed by the Senate and assented to by the President, you have to meet what they hold was the inhospitable conduct (they used good deal stronger terms in some of their State papers I am very sorry to say), of Canada in reference to the treatment of their fishermen, our representatives have said that they would never purchase from Canada any immunity for their fishermen by reciprocal trade arrangements" imbued, as their minds were, with the idea that we had adopted that policy to force reciprocity upon them. They imagined we did it for this purpose, instead of doing it as we did it to protect our rights. While we were ready to have the freest commercial intercourse in the natural products of the two countries we never attempted to use that as a means or as a lever by which to coerce the people of the United States. We were simply and wholly animated by a desire to protect as we were bound to do the fishermen of this country who are engaged in one of our greatest and most important industries.

Well, Sir, what was this Non-Intercourse Bill? It not only provided for shutting Canadian fishing vessels of all descriptions out of their ports but it contained a provision against all interchange of trade. Here is one of the provisions:

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

"That whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that American fishermen are visiting or being in the waters or at any ports or places of the British Dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied or abridged in the enjoyment of any rights secured to them by treaty or law, or are or they lately have been unjustly vexed or harassed in the enjoyment of such rights, or subjected to unreasonable restrictions, regulations or requirements in respect to such rights; or otherwise unjustly vexed or harassed in said waters, ports or places, or whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that any such fishing vessels or fishermen having a permit under the laws of the United States to touch and trade at any port or ports, place or places, in the British Dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied the privilege of entering such port or ports, place or places, in the same manner and under the same regulations as may exist therein applicable to trading vessels of the most favored nations, or shall be unjustly vexed or harassed in respect thereof, or otherwise be unjustly vexed or harassed therein, or shall be prevented from purchasing such supplies as may there be lawfully sold to trading vessels of the most favored nation; or whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that any other vessels of the United States, their masters or crews so arriving at or being in such British waters or ports or places in the British Dominions of North America are or then lately have been denied any of the privilege therein accorded to the vessels, their masters or crews of the most favored nation or unjustly vexed or harassed in respect of the same, or unjustly vexed or harassed therein by the authorities thereof, then, and in either or all of such cases it shall be lawful and it shall be the duty of the President of the United States in his discretion, by proclamation to that effect, to deny vessels, their masters and crews of the British Dominions of North America, any entrance into the waters, ports or places of or within the United States (with such exceptions in regard to vessels in distress, stress of weather or needing supplies as to the President shall seem proper) whether such vessels shall have come directly from said dominions on such destined voyage or by way of some port or place in such destined voyage elsewhere;—"

And this point, covering complete non-intercourse with the entire country,

—"and also to deny entry into any port or place of the United States of fresh fish or salt fish or any other product of said dominions or other goods coming from said dominions to the United States."

That was the law placed upon the Statute-book of the United States by the unanimous vote I believe of both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. If there was a "no" at all it was a single one. That expressed the sentiments and the feeling in the United States of America, and our friends the plenipotentiaries representing the United States, said: "If we make a treaty with you affecting the tariff, however small the inducement you might be willing to accept, it is certain of absolute rejection by the Senate, because the Congress of the United States have stated their position firmly, and they will not permit any interference on the part of the Administration of the United States by treaty, with anything that involves a change in the fiscal laws of the United States. They said, secondly, that not only was that the case but such was the hostility of public men in regard to Canada and the treatment by Canada of their fishermen, that if to-morrow any relaxation of the tariff of the United States was made by an Act of Congress it would contain a clause excepting Canada from its operations so as to deny us its advantage. But they said our policy is proclaimed to the world; you will read it in the President's speech; you will see it everywhere: our policy is as far as we can to make the natural products that come into the country free and what lies in the way of that policy is this irritation connected with the fishery question. If we can solve that, if we can take that out of the way you will find at once that our own independent policy—the policy of the United States on this question of commercial intercourse—will be such as to produce the most intimate commercial relations again with the Dominion of Canada." And, Sir, under those circumstances, denied as we were the free consideration of the question, of which fact I have given you abundant evidence, we turned our attention to the only means by which we could avert what everybody would feel would be the greatest disaster that could befall this country. We turned our attention to the means by which it could be averted and those were the removal of the causes of irritation between the United States and Canada (for it was

Canada rather than Great Britain that was referred to) and by removing those causes of irritation, and giving free scope to this policy to which they were committed, we believed that it would at a very early day give us everything that we could desire in the way of greater freedom of commercial intercourse. Now, Sir, I am in somewhat a similar position in explaining this treaty, which I have now reached, to that in which I was in 1871 when defending the treaty of my right hon. friend under somewhat different circumstances. Then I said: "Every word that you force us to say in support of this treaty will be used against us at Halifax in diminution of the payment that we are entitled to for the greater value of our fisheries." To-day I am in a somewhat similar position. For, every word that I say in defence of the treaty to which I have put my hand and to which I ask the sanction of this House with the utmost confidence, every word that I say in support of it may be used to-morrow in the Senate of the United States, where support to the treaty may be more difficult to obtain than it is in the House of Commons of Canada. The House will, therefore, understand that on this occasion it cannot be expected from me that I shall point out very elaborately the advantages accruing to Canada under the treaty to which we have placed our hands. What I say is this—I say, Sir, that the course that has been adopted in reference to this treaty has been adopted with a view to secure in the only way that was found practicable, the best interests of Canada. I am told, in fact I received a message, that the hon. leader of the Opposition wished me to lay on the Table of the House a map showing what Canada claimed under the Treaty of 1818 in regard to the headland question, and another map to show what the result of this treaty was—how much we had surrendered, or how much we had secured. I can only say that I am not able to respond to that invitation, for this reason, that this treaty provides, in regard to the delimitation, that the work shall be done by commissioners, two appointed on each side, eminent men of high qualifications, who shall mark on British admiralty charts the lines as they are laid down and agreed to in the treaty. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will at once see that it would not do for me to anticipate the action of that court of delimitation, or to undertake in advance to set aside the important duties with which they are charged, and give exactly my view of it.

Mr. LAURIER. I have seen it done.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He has seen it done, and he has seen it done in this very case. I have seen in the *New York Herald*—I do not know who gave it to them—the delimitation marked; and I have seen in the *Globe* newspaper that very enterprising journal which gives so much attention to these important questions—this question of delimitation dealt with, and a map published showing the results of the delimitation, both as to Newfoundland and as to Canada. Now, I do not intend to endorse the letter-press of this article, which declares that there has been a complete surrender of Canadian interests by myself; but I will say this much, that this is a very good effort on the part of an enterprising journal to put before the country the results of the delimitation as described in the treaty. It is very specifically described in the treaty, and those who study this map attentively, will, I think, be able to form a very fair idea of the results—quite as good as they would from any unauthorised map which I could have constructed, and which I would have no right to lay before the House. I do not think it was a complete surrender, and I will briefly tell the House why. But before proceeding to that matter, I may say that there was one subject on which I was glad to find that the American plenipotentiaries, and myself especially were entirely at one. They expressed no wish to acquire the right to fish in the jurisdictional waters of Canada. With that expres-

sion of opinion on their part I heartily concurred. I believe, Sir, it would have been difficult to obtain any possible treaty that could repay Canada for having her inestimable fishing grounds thrown open again to United States fishermen. With the recent modes of catching fish by means of purse seines, my fear would be that if our fishing grounds were thrown open to our neighbors to the south of us, in ten or fifteen years we should have very little better fisheries than they have. I believe such an event would lead to their destruction, and, therefore, I was very glad to find that there was no desire on the part of the United States to acquire the right to fish in the inshore fishing grounds of Canada; and I want it to be kept steadily in view that in all the arrangements provided by this treaty, Canada holds for Canadians her fishing grounds for their own exclusive use and benefit; and, Sir, with the intelligence, the industry, and the enterprise of our people, I am quite certain that they will be able under the provisions of this treaty to hold their own anywhere. I will now, Sir, proceed to deal with the subject of the treaty itself, and I take up first the most important question, that of delimitation. I need not tell you that that is a question in controversy. It is a question, as my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) knows, has been a most fertile cause of discussion between the United States and Great Britain and Canada. The Americans have maintained that what we termed our exclusive right to shut them out of all bays was not well founded in the treaty. They have maintained that they had an indefeasible right under that treaty to approach within three miles of the shore of any bay or indentation. My hon. friend shakes his head; but I hold in my hand authorities, and I could give them to him by the score, in which they have again and again maintained that position, and demanded that right.

Mr. MITCHELL. Did not Great Britain for forty years enforce her construction of that Treaty of 1818?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that nobody knows better than my hon. friend that Great Britain induced him to recall his regulations and instructions, after he had issued them, and restricted his jurisdiction to within three miles of the shore.

Mr. MITCHELL. And why? Because Great Britain could control the Government of this country, and I had to do it; that is why.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Never mind. My hon. friend's enquiry was as to the position of Great Britain, and I give it to him. Great Britain has always contended, and has rightly contended, for technical exclusion from any bay, and the Crown officers of England have sustained that contention. But my hon. friend knows that it is one thing to hold a technical construction, and it is another to undertake to enforce it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman let me put one question to him? He states that Great Britain has held a technical construction of the Treaty of 1818. I would say that Great Britain has actually enforced her technical construction for forty years. And with reference to what the hon. gentleman says about exclusion from bays, the first decision was given in reference to the Bay of Fundy, where the headland on one side was American and the headland on the other was Canadian or Nova Scotian. That was the first give-away of our treaty rights.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend then means that for the first forty years Great Britain held a particular view which she has abandoned for the last forty years.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not mean that. I will say what I mean if the hon. gentleman will let me. I say that for the first forty years Great Britain legitimately enforced that contention and the Americans recognised it. Under

the decision in the case of the Bay of Fundy, one side of which was American and the other side Nova Scotian, it was held that that bay was not exclusively an English bay, and upon the decision in that case our rights were given away and suspended by England, and were not enforced as strictly as they had been before.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, I do not intend to be drawn into a discussion by my hon. friend, because I do not question very much his statement; but I want to ask him whether he thinks a right which is technically claimed but practically abandoned for forty years, is gaining in strength. I take a different view. But perhaps my hon. friend will allow me to proceed, and reserve his remarks for a future period. On the 17th September, 1845, Lord Stanley wrote to Lord Falkland—

"Her Majesty's Government have attentively considered the representations contained in your despatches, respecting the policy of granting permission to the fishermen of the United States to fish in the Bay of Chaleurs, and other large bays of a similar character on the coast of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia; and apprehending, from your statement, that any such general concession would be injurious to the interests of the British North American Provinces, we have abandoned the intention we had entertained on the subject, and shall adhere to the strict letter of the treaties which exist between Great Britain and the United States, relative to the fisheries in North America, except in so far as they may relate to the Bay of Fundy, which has been thrown open to the North Americans under certain restrictions."

So that Lord Stanley, intimated practically that what was done in the Bay of Fundy was to be the rule.

Mr. MITCHELL. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The very opposite.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. He says in so many words that this was what they had intended but that they had abandoned the idea upon representation.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let the hon. gentleman read it again.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER:—

"Mr. Everett thought that the negotiations were now in a most favorable state—"

That is, after the Bay of Fundy was given up.

"—for a full and satisfactory adjustment of the dispute.

He had the fullest assurance that the British Government contemplated a further extension of the same policy by the adoption of a general regulation that American fishermen should be allowed freely to enter all bays of which the mouths were not more than six miles in width."

In May, 1845, Lord Stanley communicated this intention to Lord Falkland, who immediately replied. Then Nova Scotia came forward, and Canada came forward, and the result of their firm remonstrances, based on this constitutional right, was that he receded from the intention to allow the Americans to go within three miles of the shore, and decided to maintain the original contention.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is what I said exactly. I come to this question, and, as I said before, no public officer, in my judgment, no Minister, ever exhibited more zeal or ability in the management of his department than did my hon. friend.

Mr. MITCHELL. Never mind that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. From the time it was organized under his charge he showed the greatest possible discrimination to hold on to all that he had, and to get as much as he could in the interests of Canada. Now, I will draw the attention of my hon. friend and the House to the fact that, actuated by that motive, in 1870, he sent out the following instructions:

"In such capacity your jurisdiction must be strictly confined within the limit of three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks, or har-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER,

bors of Canada, with respect to any action you may take against American fishing vessels and the United States citizens engaged in fishing."

Mr. MITCHELL. Under instructions from England.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. This is before the pressure, as the hon. gentleman will see, but he went on trying to get in the thin end of another wedge, and I commend his attempt. He said:

"Where any of the bays, creeks, or harbors, shall not exceed ten geographical miles in width, you will consider that the line of demarcation extends from headland to headland, either at the entrance of such bay, creek, or harbor, or from and between given points on both sides thereof, at any place nearest the mouth, where the shores are less than ten miles apart; and may exclude foreign fishermen and fishing vessels therefrom, or seize, if found within three marine miles of the coast."

Then he went on to give the jurisdiction and the action that should be taken under it; and the bays from which he instructed his officers to exclude American fishing vessels are those ten miles in width. What followed? We have a despatch from Lord Granville to the Governor General:

"Her Majesty's Government hopes that the United States fishermen will not be for the present prevented from fishing except within three miles from land or in bays which are less than six miles broad at the mouth."

That is the answer to the instructions. My hon. friend, I grant you, was under compulsion; he was, I grant you, under pressure from Her Majesty's Government; but that only makes the case stronger from my standpoint, and my standpoint is that in the position we occupy, dependent upon Her Majesty's Government for that right arm, and strength, and power, which will enforce a regard for the interests of the people of this country, we must pay some deference to Her Majesty's Government. Considering the fostering care which Her Majesty's Government have at all times given the interests of Canada, we are bound to reciprocate by meeting any just claim for consideration from the party which is mainly involved in our contentions. Therefore, I say my hon. friend was right, but he did withdraw that instruction, and he issued in its place the following instructions, as contained in a report of Council:—

"The Council is aware that when the British Government in 1845 opened the Bay of Fundy to American fishermen, as an amicable relaxation of treaty rights, the act was officially regarded as a practical abandonment by American authorities of the British construction of the Convention of 1818. It was immediately followed by a demand for general application to all intends exceeding six miles in width."

So that I say to my hon. friend that I gave his own terms, as sustaining the statement that I made of the demand of the Government of the United States to have access to our waters within three miles of the shore, whether in bays or out of bays.

Mr. MITCHELL. I promised not to interrupt the hon. gentleman, and I will not; but I will simply say that I have a complete answer to that.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No doubt the hon. gentleman is so ingenious that he could answer himself over and over again.

Mr. MITCHELL. He is so careful in his public capacity that he can do it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no fault to find with my hon. friend in his public capacity as a Minister. I have a great deal more fault to find with him in his private capacity, as sitting on the other side of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you think there is much difference between us.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Here is a despatch from Downing Street, dated 6th June 1870:

"Her Majesty's Government are fully aware that no step should be taken which should prejudice the question."

I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that this was not a settled or concluded question, that it was not a question upon which the Governments of Great

Britain and the United States had agreed or on which they had arrived at a common interpretation; and I want to draw my hon. friend's attention to the doubt that Her Majesty's Government had upon the subject. What do they say?

"Her Majesty's Government are fully aware that no steps should be taken which should prejudice the question—what are Canadian waters? Or should admit the right of United States fishermen to fish within those waters except within the limits prescribed by the Convention of 1818."

"But they do not abandon the hope that the question of abstract right may yet be avoided by some arrangement between Canada and the United States, or that the limits may be definitely settled by arbitration or otherwise; and while any expectation of this kind exists, they desire to avoid all occasions of dispute, so far as this is possible, consistently with the substantial protection of the Canadian fisheries. With those objects, they think it advisable that United States fishermen should not be excluded from any waters except within three miles from the shore, or in the unusual case of a bay which is less than six miles wide at its mouth but spreads to a greater width within. It will, of course, be understood and explained to the United States Government that this liberty is conceded temporarily and without prejudice to the right of Great Britain to fall back on her treaty rights, if the prospect of an arrangement lessens, or if the concession is found to interfere practically with the protection of the Canadian fisheries."

That was also a despatch from Lord Granville, June 6th, 1870. Now, under the pressure of this, as my hon. friend has stated, he changed his instructions in reference to the ten miles and put in six miles, and forbade his officers to interfere with the American fishermen, not as in the first instructions he gave, if they were within three miles of the mouth of the bay, but only if they were within three miles of the shore, and he says:

"Until further instructed, therefore, you will not interfere with any American fishermen unless found within three miles of the shore, or within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of a bay or creek, which, though in parts more than six miles wide, is less than six geographical miles in width at its mouth. In the case of any other bay, as Baie des Chaleurs, for example—"

The very bay he excluded them from was more than ten miles wide.

"—you will not interfere with any United States fishing vessel or boat or any American fishermen, unless they are found within three miles of the shore."

Mr. MITCHELL. Under positive instructions from England, against my representations and everything else.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think I have satisfied my hon. friend that, as far as Her Majesty's Government were concerned, while they maintained the abstract right under the treaty, they were unwilling to raise the question of bays, and the result is, as my hon. friend knows, that for the last thirty-four years, certainly since 1854—and I will not go further back than 1854—there has been no practical interference with American fishing vessels unless they were within three miles of the shore, in bays or elsewhere.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will his honor allow me to ask him one question?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the hon. gentleman not to do it now. I was in hopes to finish by 6 o'clock and I am sure the House will sympathise with me in that desire. This Government instead of considering this as a question passed beyond controversy, did what? The hon. gentleman was a member of the Government at the time, and the Government deputed Mr., now Sir Alexander Campbell to go to Lord Kimberley and ask for the appointment of a commission on which England and the United States and Canada would be represented, to settle what was the correct view in reference to the British bays, to settle this very question of delimitation.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, no, not that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. For the purpose of maintaining colonial rights to the fisheries as claimed by England.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will read from a despatch sent by Lord Kimberley:

"Mr. Campbell brought under my consideration the following subjects:—The first was the protection of the Canadian fisheries from encroachments by foreign fishing vessels. On this point I concur with your Ministers, that it would be desirable that the questions which have been so long in dispute with the United States, as to the geographical limits of the exclusive fishing rights of Canada under the Treaty of 1818, should be settled, by a joint British and American commission, on which the Dominion should be represented. Her Majesty's Government will propose to the United States Government the appointment of such a commission."

I give that to the House as the proof that, so far from this being regarded as a matter upon which no question could arise, it was not so treated. Lord Kimberley, in a despatch of the 10th October, 1870, said:

"The object of Her Majesty's Government is, as you will observe, to give effect to the wishes of your Government, by appointing a joint commission, on which Great Britain, the United States and Canada are to be represented, with the object of enquiring what ought to be the geographical limits of the exclusive fisheries of the British North American colonies. In accordance with the understood desire of your advisers, it is proposed that the enquiry should be held in America."

And then there is a memorandum from the Foreign Office giving the reasons for the appointment of that commission, and from that I will read a single sentence:

"The right of Great Britain to exclude American fishermen from waters within three miles of the coast is unambiguous, and, it is believed, uncontested. But there appears to be some doubt what are the waters described as within three miles of bays, creeks, and harbors. When a bay is less than six miles broad, its waters are within the three miles limit, and therefore clearly within the meaning of the treaty; but, when it is more than that breadth, the question arises whether it is a bay of Her Britannic Majesty's dominions."

I hope I have satisfied the House that, so far from the question of delimitation, when we took it up at Washington, being one on which no question could be raised, it was an open question in which Canada and Great Britain on the one side maintained an extreme contention, and the United States Government maintained the very reverse, which was also an extreme contention.

Mr. MITCHELL. Nothing of the kind.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If I have not made it clear to the hon. gentleman, I am sure I have not been so unfortunate with the rest of the House. Now, what more? The hon. gentleman knows that, in the first place, the Government of Canada had agreed to a commission to ascertain what these rights were. Would we agree to a commission to ascertain whether a foot of land in Canadian territory was ours or belonged to some one else? The hon. gentleman knows that we would not. But we did agree to this commission. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) seemed a little while ago to be somewhat restive as to whether there was any doubt at all on this subject. A great many members in this House will recollect that, when the Treaty of Washington had been arranged, that hon. gentleman moved in this House that, before the Halifax Commission should sit, the doubts respecting our geographical limits should first be settled. I am not saying that I did not agree with him, but I say that at that time the question was not raised properly, and I opposed him, and I gave my reasons for so opposing him. If you look at the debates of that date, you will find, in the statements made by my right hon. friend the leader of the Government and those of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, that the desire was expressed that these doubts, which undoubtedly did exist, should be set at rest, but we did not think the time opportune before the sitting of that Halifax Commission. When we changed sides, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) sat on this side of the House, with the hon. member (Mr. Blake) who, I regret to know, is no longer able to lead that side of the House, after having pressed upon us the vital importance of having this question settled before

the Halifax Commission sat, they forgot all about it. When they had to deal with the responsibilities of office, and to discharge the duties which rest upon Ministers of the Crown, they agreed with us that it was not desirable to raise the question before the sitting of the Halifax Commission, and they have allowed it to sleep until now. I am frank to say that the plenipotentiaries now have made concessions on this question.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but did he ever hear of any two nations, or of any two individuals, who had a difficulty or controversy between them, going into an arrangement to have it amicably settled and adjusted without both sides giving way in some degree or other? I think the very spirit and policy of this Commission which was proposed, was to ascertain, to settle and to remove these doubts, and I say, when we met these gentlemen and they proposed to us this ten mile limit, and said: If you give up the extreme contention that no bay, however broad its mouth, can be entered by an American fisherman, we will agree to take the ten mile limit, and when they met us further and said that, in addition to that they would take up and consider the question of any special bays we thought ought not to be open to foreigners, then we took this question up, as we were bound to take it up, and found a solution by mutual concession. Instead of giving into their contention that they could go into the Baie des Chaleurs within three miles of the shore, we made a treaty by which they cannot enter the Baie des Chaleurs at all. And the hon. gentleman knows that the Miramichi Bay, and a number of other bays that we consider of vital importance to be kept free from any kind of intrusion, have been conceded to us. We met them in a spirit of mutual concession. I have no hesitation in saying that I believe that when we parted, and long before we parted, we were animated by the conviction that we owed it to the countries we represented, by mutual concessions, as far as could possibly be done, to find such a solution as would settle these questions that have disturbed the intercourse and threatened the peace of the two greatest English-speaking nations of the world, on the best terms that we could possibly find.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Will the hon. gentleman tell us the meaning of article 5?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will possess his soul in patience for a little while, I will try to do so. What is article 5? If the hon. gentleman has it in his hands, perhaps he will read it.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).—

"Article V.—Nothing in this treaty shall be construed to include within the common waters any such interior portions of any bays, creeks, or harbors as cannot be reached from the sea without passing within the three marine miles mentioned in Article I of the Convention of October 20, 1818."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am obliged to my hon. friend for his question, and I will give him a most explicit and, I am quite sure, a satisfactory answer. I hold the delineation of a bay in my hands. It is imaginary, it is true, but it is none the less just what you may meet with at the mouth of any bay. This bay is fifteen miles from mainland to mainland, and yet under the instructions of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) not to go within three miles of the shore, they could not get into that bay. Why? Because there are islands in the mouth of the bay, and the island carries its three miles of marine jurisdiction stretched around it, the same as the mainland. I will send it over to my hon. friend to show him just what that article means, and the reason why it was necessary, in order to provide for a possible contingency by which a bay being fifteen miles wide, they could not get into it now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

I said: You do not propose by that ten-mile arrangement to enter a bay that you could not enter under the six-mile arrangement, do you? Certainly not. Then I gave them this delineation, and that clause was put in the treaty for the purpose of giving effect to it, and to prevent giving any possible uncertainty. Now, Sir, as I said before, we were met in a broad and liberal spirit, and I think the sentiment that animated us on both sides was that we owed it to each other and to the countries we represented, not to quarrel over points that could be satisfactorily adjusted, and that if it were possible to find a solution that would be equitable to both countries and advantageous to all, it was our duty to find that solution, and to agree upon terms that we could honorably ask Great Britain on the one side, and the United States on the other, and Canada, to accept, as a great improvement upon the existing condition of things. Therefore, as I said, we made the concession, not of any thing that has been enforced practically by Canada, but the abstract right to exclude from bays that were more than six miles wide.

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

After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before passing away entirely from the subject of delimitation, to which I drew the attention of the House for some time, I would like to say that in addition to the doubts which have been admitted on all sides to exist and required to be set at rest, the Government of the United States had a very strong standing ground, a very strong position, in the delimitation which was adopted by what was called the North Sea convention, a convention between Her Britannic Majesty, the German Emperor, the King of Prussia, the King of the Belgians, the King of Denmark, the President of the French Republic, and the King of the Netherlands, regulating the North Sea fisheries. This convention was signed at The Hague on the 6th May, 1882; and if, upon a deliberate review of the bays from which foreign vessels should be excluded, these powers adopted the principle of limiting that exclusion to bays that were less than ten miles in width, you can readily see the strong position the Government of the United States would have in claiming that the delimitation should have some regard to the international policy of these great countries that had been dealing with a precisely similar question. Article 2 of the convention says:

"The fishermen of each country shall enjoy the exclusive right to fish within a distance of three miles from low water mark.

"The three marine miles mentioned in Article I of the Convention of October 20, 1818, shall be measured seaward from low water mark; but at every bay, creek or harbor, not otherwise specially provided for in this treaty, such three marine miles shall be measured seaward from a straight line drawn across the bay, creek or harbor in the part nearest the entrance at the first point where the width does not exceed ten marine miles."

As I have said before, to accept the delimitation, to accept as the jurisdictional waters of Canada from which foreigners shall be excluded, the ten-mile limit as proposed by the Government of the United States, was to stand not only upon the ground that a good deal of doubt and hesitation seem to have been exhibited by Her Majesty's Government and the Government of Canada in dealing with that subject, but they had in addition the precedent of the Hague convention, where all the great powers to which I have referred, after careful examination and deliberation, decided that the fishermen of all countries should be at liberty to come into any waters where the bay was more than ten-miles wide at the mouth. When we accepted this ten mile delimitation, which was all that appears to have been aimed at by any Canadian Government, the extreme limit that any person had proposed as a matter of delimitation, we made it a condition of the acceptance of that restriction that certain bays should be exempt from its operation, and

although I have not furnished hon. gentlemen opposite with a chart on which those delimitations are marked by myself, as I thought it would hardly do to do that, it will be seen by the examination of such representations as have been given on this subject, that the exceptions which the plenipotentiaries of the United States were willing to concede have left us very small ground for complaint, although I frankly state it was a concession made by the plenipotentiaries of Her Majesty for the purpose of arriving at a common ground on which we could solve the difficulties with which this question was surrounded. Our concessions did not stop there. I am quite ready to admit, and I think it might as well be stated in the outset, that the Canadian Government would find it, I would find it, quite as difficult as our friends the plenipotentiaries of the United States would find it, to justify this treaty if it was to be examined in the light of the extreme contentions maintained on both sides previously. I need not inform the House that in diplomatic intercourse it is customary, it is right for the representatives of a Government to state the strongest and most advanced ground that they possibly can sustain in relation to every question, and I would not like, I confess, to be tried before the House by the ground taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The ground they took was quite right; they were authorised by the strict terms of the treaty in taking the strong ground they did; they would have failed in their duty to this House and to this country if, called upon to deal with this question as a matter of diplomatic intercourse and discussion between the Government of the United States and of Canada, they had not taken the extreme contention that the literal terms of the Treaty of 1818 would warrant. They did their duty in adopting that course; but when it comes to a question of conference, to a question of international discussion for the purpose of ascertaining whether between the extreme contention on the one side and the extreme contention on the other, any standing ground may be found on which the two parties may meet and settle a dispute of great international difficulty by mutual concession, the case is entirely altered, and the responsibility resting upon the plenipotentiaries of any country would be very great if they refused to consider fair and reasonable concessions on the one side and to meet them by fair and reasonable concessions on the other. So that I have no hesitation in saying that, dealing with this great question in that spirit, dealing with a question that is of vital importance to the British Empire, of vital importance to the Government of Great Britain, who were constantly threatened with embarrassment and serious difficulties and collision with the great country to the south of us, a question, too, of great magnitude to the United States of America, a question of still greater magnitude, in my judgment, to the people of Canada, one on which we had more at stake and more to lose in a great struggle of that kind than either of the great countries to which I have referred—I say looking at the question in that broad and national spirit, looking at it with a desire to remove the possibility of what I consider would be the greatest misfortune that could happen to the civilised world—a collision between the two great English-speaking nations—looking at it from that broad standpoint, it would have been criminal on my part and on the part of those who represented Her Majesty's Government and the interests of the people of Canada, if they had not endeavored, by making fair and reasonable concessions, to find a common ground that would present a solution of those important and serious questions, that might enable a treaty to be formulated and accepted as a just and equitable settlement upon both sides. As I have said, our concessions did not rest at the delimitation. We come now to the next portion of the treaty, and that is the treatment of American fishermen within our waters. I trust I have explained article 5 to the satisfaction

of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and the other articles immediately following refer to the mode of delimitation and do not require any special remarks from me. Article 9 says:

"Nothing in this treaty shall interrupt or affect the free navigation of the Strait of Canso by fishing vessels of the United States."

I may explain to the House that that was not a surrender of British interests or Canadian interests at the dictation or at the request of the plenipotentiaries of the United States. That clause was inserted in the treaty by ourselves, and for this reason: That the rule for the delimitation which was adopted, the ten-mile rule, would have necessarily excluded, if we took in Chedabucto Bay, which we did take in by making the delimitation, as hon. gentlemen will see, not from one side of the main land of the bay to the other, which would have opened it to the United States, but from the island between; by that delimitation the United States would have been shut out altogether from passing through the Strait of Canso because they could not have gone into Chedabucto Bay, and therefore they asked that Chedabucto Bay should be excluded from the delimitation, which made it an exclusive bay, in order to prevent their being shut out of the navigation of the Straits of Canso. Well, Sir, under those circumstances we met that by providing nothing new. We provided simply that nothing in this treaty should interrupt the free navigation of the Straits of Canso, as previously enjoyed by fishing vessels to which we confined it, and in that way we avoided making an exception of Chedabucto Bay, which is the entrance from the Atlantic side to the Straits of Canso. Article 10 provides:

"That United States fishing vessels entering the bays or harbors referred to in Article I of this treaty shall conform to harbor regulations common to them and to fishing vessels of Canada or Newfoundland."

I do not think that requires any reference on my part because it speaks for itself, and it simply provides that whatever harbor regulations there are in force the fishing vessels shall be obliged to conform to them. Article 10 further provides:

"They need not report, enter, or clear, when putting into such bays or harbors for shelter or repairing damages, nor when putting into the same, outside the limits of established ports of entry, for the purpose of purchasing wood or of obtaining water; except that any such vessel remaining more than twenty-four hours, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, within any such port, or communicating with the shore therein, may be required to report, enter, or clear; and no vessel shall be excused hereby from giving due information to boarding officers."

I may say, Sir, with reference to this, that a great deal was made of the apparent injustice of subjecting fishing vessels obliged to put in for humane purposes, such as vessels in distress and vessels under stress of weather to rigorous restrictions. A great deal was made of the difficulties that were thrown in their way, and the obstructions that were placed apparently by Canada, in the way of their exercising and enjoying those privileges that the Treaty of 1818 clearly and distinctly provided they should enjoy. I think, Sir, that this House and the people of this country will agree with me that it was not undesirable in the interests of good neighborhood, in the interests of the good reputation of Canada for humane and friendly consideration to fishing vessels obliged to put in to our ports for shelter, and especially where they had under the treaty a right to come in under such circumstances, that we should remove any obstructions or hindrances that lay in their way. It was urged, on the other hand, that in the United States our fishing vessels were not treated with the same stringency that those vessels were which under treaty right are permitted to come into our waters for those four purposes, and evidence was placed before the conference to show that in the port of Portland the course pursued was a more liberal course than the stringent regulations which had been used in Canada. The collector of that port who had been collector for 30 years was examined and gave his tes-

timony as to the treatment of the Dominion vessels in the United States waters. He was asked :

"During the time you have been deputy collector, whether or not, there have been numerous cases of Dominion vessels, including vessels engaged in fishing in that port, and if they failed to report, though lying more than twenty-four hours, have penalties been imposed for such failure during the term of your service?"

His answer was, as I remember :

"If there were any instances of Dominion vessels failing to report when lying more than twenty-four hours, their presence has been overlooked by the port officers. I do not recall from memory a single instance when or where a penalty was imposed, and I find no record of any such payments in the accounts of this office."

Under those circumstances we felt that we might fairly allow vessels that had no connection with the shore fishing vessels coming in distress, or vessels coming in under stress of weather to take shelter on our coast, that we might fairly exempt them from reporting for a period of 24 hours provided they did not touch the shore. It was represented that in many cases the previous regulations had involved great hardship and difficulty, that the custom houses were remote from the outlying portions of the harbor where the shelter was obtained, and that to remain long enough to go up to the custom house officer and to make the necessary report would involve a very serious delay and might prevent them getting to sea at all at the time they would desire. I do not conceive that any very great injury to our interests is likely to result where these privileges are only extended to vessels which are not permitted at all to communicate with the shore. The moment they have a communication with the shore, that moment it is incumbent upon them to report, or they are liable to the pains and penalties provided by this Act if they do not do so. I think this House will agree with me and I believe the people of this country will agree with me that it was a wise provision to relieve them of what they found to be a great hardship, and so aid in effecting the removal of a very false impression abroad where people did not understand how stringent the necessity was for guarding our coasts.

"They shall not be liable in such bays or harbors for compulsory pilotage."

It was represented that a fisherman coming in by distress or by stress of weather was compelled to take a pilot or was subject to the charge for a pilot and that this was felt to be very onerous while the fact is that our own fishermen were practically free from any such pilotage regulations and it was therefore a concession to remove the pilotage dues. I admit it was a concession to relieve them from the charge of pilotage. It was a case in which in my judgment "the play was not worth the candle," and the money that would be obtained for pilotage was very small, while it would create a most unpleasant impression abroad if it were understood that while giving them the shelter the treaty compelled us to give them, we took the opportunity to force upon them a charge for pilotage that they did not require and which they thought unnecessary.

Mr. MITCHELL. Are not vessels under a certain size exempted from pilotage, Sir Charles?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Under 80 tons they are exempt. As my hon. friend knows our fishermen are pilots themselves, and they do not require to pay, and this was practically putting their fishermen upon the same footing as our own fishermen in regard to this charge.

Mr. MITCHELL. Certainly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And the same regulation, we were informed, was the practice in the ports of the United States. At all events we believed that that was not a very great concession to make.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is not much.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend is right; it is not much. I think he will quite agree with me it was too small a matter to quarrel over—too small a matter to be a question of a breach between two nations.

Mr. MITCHELL. If you did nothing more than that we would be satisfied.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. At the same time it was a contention, and it was a concession for the purpose of meeting them half way as far as we were able, and which we were glad to be able to do. The article further says :—

"They shall not be liable in such bays or harbors for compulsory pilotage; nor, when therein for the purpose of shelter, of repairing damages, of purchasing wood, or of obtaining water, shall they be liable for harbor dues, tonnage dues, buoy dues, light dues, or other similar dues; but this enumeration shall not permit other charges inconsistent with the enjoyment of the liberties reserved or secured by the Convention of October 20, 1818."

The truth is that although there appears to be a considerable concession in that, it does not amount to much from the fact that we have no light dues. In Newfoundland where they have rather heavy light dues it is a much more serious concession than it is in Canada, but Mr. Winter, the able Attorney General of Newfoundland, whose advice and assistance we had throughout these negotiations, felt that that was a concession which the island of Newfoundland would not object to although they would lose something in the way of light dues. Now, Sir, article 11 provides :

"United States fishing vessels entering the ports, bays and harbors of the eastern and north-eastern coasts of Canada or of the coasts of Newfoundland under stress of weather or other casualty may unload, reload, tranship or sell, subject to customs laws and regulations, all fish on board, when such unloading, transhipment, or sale is made necessary as incidental to repairs, and may replenish outfits, provisions and supplies damaged or lost by disaster; and in case of death or sickness shall be allowed all needful facilities, including the shipping of crews."

I do not think, Sir, I shall have to take much time in satisfying this House that, although this is a very considerable and important concession, and although we were not compelled, in my judgment, under a strict literal interpretation of the Treaty of 1818 to make it, yet it was a wise and judicious concession to make. What would be thought of Canada if an American, or a United States fishing vessel—I do not like to use the word American, because I think it is a term we have as much right to as our neighbors; I prefer to speak of them as the people of the United States, and ourselves as Canadians, and when I speak of the whole continent of America, I do not hesitate to apply the term American to the people of both Canada and the United States—but what would be thought of Canada if a vessel of the United States, loaded with fresh mackerel or fish of any other description, were driven by stress of weather, and perhaps in a sinking condition and compelled to resort to a Canadian port, and if, instead of allowing her to tranship her cargo or sell it on paying the duty and go upon a marine slip for repairs, we said: No, you must throw overboard the whole of your cargo, because we find you are not allowed to bring your fish into Canada?

Mr. MITCHELL. Do you not refuse a vessel that privilege?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I say that under the Treaty of 1818, we could refuse. Under the strict interpretation of that treaty, they had no right to unload their cargo and tranship or sell it; but what I say is that in making this concession—it is an undoubted concession—we were only acting from the dictates of humanity and with a due regard to the credit and reputation of our country all over the world.

Mr. MITCHELL. But I ask the question, did you not refuse it in one case?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, I did not refuse.

Mr. MITCHELL. You would not, I know; you are too warm-hearted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If my hon. friend really wants a frank answer—and he knows how frank I desire to be on all these occasions—I will tell him. We said: Under this treaty you have no right to do it, but we will allow you to do it when the application was made; but, we said it must not be regarded as a precedent, but it is a concession, and in attempting to reach a settlement of these questions there must be concessions on both sides. Article 11 further provides:

"Licenses to purchase in established ports of entry of the aforesaid coasts of Canada or of Newfoundland, for the homeward voyage, such provisions and supplies as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels, shall be granted to United States fishing vessels in such ports promptly upon application and without charge, and such vessels, having obtained licenses in the manner aforesaid, shall also be accorded upon all occasions such facilities for the purchase of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels; but provisions or supplies shall not be obtained by barter, nor purchased for resale or traffic."

That was another concession. There is no doubt at all, Sir, that these were rights which under the strict terms of the Treaty of 1818 they could not demand, nor could they insist upon them being granted; but at the same time I think I am within the judgment of the House on both sides, when I say that in the case of a vessel which is homeward bound and requires provisions or needful supplies to take her home, if, for instance, she has some of her rigging carried away, or some of her salt washed overboard, and is obliged to lose her voyage in going back to a distant port to refit, a provision that she may obtain casual and needful supplies of that kind was demanded in the interests of good neighborhood, and it was not going too far to say that we would allow them to enjoy those advantages. Therefore, Sir, I am glad to believe that article 11 will meet with the hearty approval of the House and the country, and that they will feel that we have only acted with a wise judgment, and with due regard to the best interests of Canada for the sake of removing an international unpleasantness, in putting these provisions into this treaty. Article 12 provides:

"Fishing vessels of Canada and Newfoundland shall have on the Atlantic coasts of the United States all the privileges reserved and secured by this treaty to the United States fishing vessels in the aforesaid waters of Canada and Newfoundland."

I do not pretend that this is accomplishing a great deal, because, as is well known, Canadian fishing vessels do not require to resort to any great extent to the waters of the United States; but at the same time it is a reciprocal arrangement, and it shows that we are not granting anything to the fishermen of the United States that they are not prepared to grant in express terms to the fishermen of Canada. Article 13 provides:

"The Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall make regulations providing for the conspicuous exhibition by every United States fishing vessel, of its official number on each bow; and any such vessel, required by law to have an official number, and failing to comply with such regulations, shall not be entitled to the licenses provided for in this treaty. Such regulations shall be communicated to Her Majesty's Government previously to their taking effect."

The object of that is obvious. Under the arrangements of the Government of the United States every vessel has an official number, and it will save a great deal of trouble if that official number is required to be exhibited in such a conspicuous form that the moment you see the vessel you will know that it is an American fishing vessel. That will enable you to investigate her character and position and everything about her. Although I have seen the Government of the United States very severely criticised for subjecting these vessels to such an indignity, I do not regard it in that light at all. It is purely a matter of business between the two countries for the purpose of facilitating the recognition of vessels, and thus making it much easier to deal with any question that may arise in relation to her;

and as you will know every vessel to which you have given a license, the moment you see a vessel, you will know whether she has a license or not. This measure gives you an opportunity of identifying a vessel, and protecting your fishing grounds much more effectually than you could do without it. Article 14 provides:

"The penalties for unlawfully fishing in the waters, bays, creeks, and harbors, referred to in article 1 of this treaty, may extend to forfeiture of the boat or vessel and appurtenances, and also of the supplies and cargo aboard when the offence was committed; and for preparing in such waters to unlawfully fish therein, penalties shall be fixed by the court, not to exceed those for unlawfully fishing."

That is to say, if you are able to establish a charge against the vessel of unlawfully preparing to fish, the court may in its judgment forfeit the vessel, but a discretion is left with the court, which it had not before, of imposing a comparatively much lighter penalty than the forfeiture of the vessel. I do not think anybody will question the wisdom of dealing with this question as we have done. We have left the penalty for unlawfully fishing to extend to the forfeiture of the vessel and everything appertaining to her. I think the House will agree with me that the penalty for the lighter offence may be lighter, and that the efficiency of the law is likely to be much greater with the lighter penalty than with the extreme ones that existed before.

"And for any other violation of the laws of Great Britain, Canada or Newfoundland relating to the right of fishery in such waters, bays, creeks, or harbors, penalties shall be fixed by the court, not exceeding in all three dollars for every ton of the boat or vessel concerned. The boat or vessel may be holden for such penalties and forfeitures."

That penalty does not apply to unlawful fishing or preparing to fish, but it applies to the lighter offences, such as attempting to purchase bait or anything of that kind. The penalty is reduced to a reasonable one, \$3.00 a ton, but yet sufficient, in my judgment, to secure probably a more prompt and effective administration of the law than would be secured if you made the penalty a great deal higher.

"The proceedings shall be summary and as inexpensive as practicable."

I do not know that anybody but the judges in the courts of Vice-Admiralty could complain of that. The object of every civilised country should be to have the laws administered in as inexpensive and summary a mode as practicable.

"The trial (except on appeal) shall be at the place of detention, unless the judge shall, on request of the defence, order it to be held at some other place adjudged by him more convenient."

That is to say, it is proposed that instead of bringing these cases to the Court of Vice-Admiralty at Halifax, or St. John, N. B., or Quebec, as the case may be, it is proposed that a judge shall be sent to deal with the case in a summary manner, that the trial shall take place immediately at the place where the witnesses are all present and the facts can be ascertained, and thus save the cost and inconvenience occasioned by laying up a vessel for a year or two while awaiting judgment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Such as occurred in the *Adams* case.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There are two sides to that case. The delay did not rest altogether with us, but a very long delay took place at the instance of the owners of the *Adams*.

"Security for costs shall not be required of the defence, except when bail is offered. Reasonable bail shall be accepted. There shall be proper appeals available to the defence only; and the evidence at the trial may be used on appeal."

That is, we do not propose to appeal against the judgments of our own judges, but we allow an appeal to foreigners who are affected by the judgments of our own judges and who have not the same confidence in their judgments that we have. All this is done for the purpose of saving time and costs, thus avoiding endless irritation through delay.

"Judgments of forfeiture shall be reviewed by the Governor General of Canada in Council, or the Governor in Council of Newfoundland, before the same are executed."

Thus in a case in which, for unlawfully fishing or for unlawfully preparing to fish, the judge forfeits the vessel, that decision shall not be carried into execution until the Governor General in Council shall have had the opportunity of deliberately examining the evidence upon which that judgment was founded, so as to remedy the judgment if they think there is any ground for the exercise of greater lenity than the judge has felt himself able to use.

Article 15 is, of course, a contingent article. As I have already informed the House, the plenipotentiaries of the United States stated they were quite unable to put anything in the treaty that would necessarily touch the fiscal policy of their country. They said that to do so would be simply to invite rejection of the treaty, on the ground that they had infringed the jurisdiction which Congress possessed, the United States Congress having, as I have shown the House, adopted, in the most emphatic form, the policy not to allow any changes in their tariff except by the act of Congress itself. We therefore put this in the contingent clause. We provide absolutely for the concessions that have been made with reference to delimitation, and with reference to the treatment of United States fishing vessels, when compelled to resort to our ports in distress or in need of casual supplies or for a homeward voyage. All these were made absolute by the treaty; but when it came to that which is of great value to the United States fishermen, when it came to that which enables the United States fishermen to make Canada a basis of supplies for the purpose of better competing with our own fishermen, we then felt that we had a right to take our stand, and if Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries have not been able to support the extreme contention of the Canadian Government hon. gentlemen will find that, on the other hand, the plenipotentiaries of the United States, who had, as a matter of diplomatic intercourse, taken a very strong ground as to the indefeasible rights of American fishing vessels to obtain, in our ports, as commercial vessels, whatever supplies they required for carrying on their fishing—to be able to purchase bait, to be able to purchase supplies of every kind and to be able to tranship their fish—they will find that our friends on the other side had, in the same way, to concede a great deal as compared with the extreme contention that they had made. Here it is provided, as a just and proper security to the interests of the fishermen of Canada, who have the right, while excluded by heavy duties from the markets of the United States, to such protection as the Treaty of 1818 has provided for them, that whenever the question arises as to Canada being made the basis of supply for the American deep sea fishing vessels—because the question of fishing is not in controversy at all, the Americans having given up the right to catch fish in the inshore waters of Canada—that only can be done for a sufficient *quid pro quo*. We have, therefore, provided in article 15:

"Whenever the United States shall remove the duty from fish-oil, whale-oil, seal oil, and fish of all kinds (except fish preserved in oil), being the produce of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of Canada and of Newfoundland, including Labrador, as well as from the usual and necessary casks, barrels, kegs, cans, and other usual necessary coverings containing the products above mentioned, the like products, being the produce of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of the United States, as well as the usual and necessary coverings of the same, as above described shall be admitted free of duty into the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland."

"And upon such removal of duties, and while the aforesaid articles are allowed to be brought into the United States by British subjects, without duty being reimposed thereon, the privilege of entering the ports, bays and harbors of the aforesaid coasts of Canada and of Newfoundland shall be accorded to United States fishing vessels by annual licenses, free of charge, for the following purposes, namely:

- "1. The purchase of provisions, bait, ice, seines, lines, and all other supplies and outfits;
 - "2. Transhipment of catch, for transport by any means of conveyance;
 - "3. Shipping of crews.
- "Supplies shall not be obtained by barter, but bait may be so obtained. The like privileges shall be continued or given to fishing vessels of

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Canada and of Newfoundland on the Atlantic coasts of the United States."

I think that is a measure which will meet with the hearty approval of the House. I think that will be regarded as a fair and reasonable proposition, that, if fishing vessels of the United States are allowed to make Canada a base for obtaining their supplies and furnishing all the materials necessary for the outfit of a fishing voyage, for the transhipment of their catch, and making our harbors and ports the means of carrying on their industry, the fishermen of Canada, with whom they are in that case better able to compete than they could otherwise, are entitled to have their fish entered free in the ports of the United States. While the plenipotentiaries of the United States were not able to make this an absolute provision, I do not hesitate to say that I look confidently to the period in the not remote future when fish will be made free and the fishermen of the United States will be able to obtain all the advantages in our ports which are here given to them. It will be observed that we have made this much larger in its provisions than either the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 or the Washington Treaty of 1871, inasmuch as we have made it cover many places which were not covered by either of those treaties, and not only that, but we have taken care to guard against what might be called the rather sharp practice, if such a term were admissible in regard to a neighboring country, that, while allowing our fish to come in free, they should impose a duty upon the cans or tins or coverings in which the fish were included. More than that, we have made this cover all the inland waters of Canada, as well as the sea coast, and have made this provision as to the entry of free fish, provided they take advantage of this clause and make Canada the base of their supplies, apply to the fish of British Columbia, that is, to the whole of Canada, the same as it does to the Atlantic coast. I think I have now dealt with the treaty in its entirety as it stands, and I have only to refer to the *modus vivendi* in Schedule B, which provides that, while this treaty is *sub judice*, before it can be ratified by the Senate of the United States, the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of Newfoundland, during two years or pending that ratification, until these privileges to which the American fishermen would be entitled if our fish is made free, those privileges shall be enjoyed by the American fishermen on the payment of \$1.50 per ton. I need not tell you that, on the eve of the ratification of a treaty of this kind by the Senate of the United States, a collision between the fishermen of the two countries or anything which would incite bad blood or become a cause of prejudice would probably prevent the ratification of a treaty which would be otherwise ratified, and to prevent that we offered in this *modus vivendi* for two years the privilege to these United States fishermen of obtaining these various benefits which are provided for in the treaty by the payment of \$1.50 per ton. I do not think this will be regarded as an excessive rate, and I think it will greatly conduce to good neighborhood between the United States and Canada. This *modus vivendi* was accepted by the United States plenipotentiaries in the most kindly spirit. They recommended the President to submit it to the Senate for their information, and I think I may say that it carries on the face of it the approval of the Governments of both countries. Now, having referred to the various provisions of the treaty, I am happy to say that I shall have to detain the House but a few minutes longer, but I would like to draw the attention of the House to what has been accomplished by this treaty. I have told you what position Canada stood in with regard to the United States of America before the initiation of these proceedings. I have told you that we stood face to face with an enactment which had been put on the Statute-book by a unanimous vote of Congress, ratified by the

President, providing for non-intercourse between the United States and Canada. I need not tell you that that Bill meant commercial war, that it meant not only the ordinary suspension of friendly feeling and intercourse between two countries, but that it involved much more than that. If that Bill had been brought into operation by the proclamation of the President of the United States, I have no hesitation in saying that we stood in the relation to that great country of commercial war, and the line is very narrow which separates a commercial war between two countries from an actual war. Speaking a year ago, I pointed out in my remarks, with a view to prevent the possibility of such an Act going into force, all the advantages that in our present position we could avail ourselves of to protect ourselves against such an unfriendly act on the part of the United States. I said then that it would be a mad act. I say so now. No man who knows anything of the intimate commercial relations which exist between Canada and the United States could contemplate such an Act going into operation without feeling that it would tear up from the foundation those intimate social and commercial relations which exist between these two countries, which, in friendly commercial rivalry, are making rapid progress which has attracted the attention of the civilised world. It would produce a condition of things the end of which no man could foresee. If that Act had been adopted, we had no means of looking to any increased commercial intercourse between that great country and the Dominion of Canada. Under those circumstances, it behoved the Government of Canada to adopt any means in its power to avert such a disaster, which, great as it would have been to Canada, would have been still greater to the United States. But it would be a very poor compensation for the injury which we would sustain, to know that we had a companion in misfortune suffering more than we suffered ourselves. We found Congress putting on the Statute book a direction to the President that, on the first United States vessel being seized or harassed, or refused the advantages which they said they were entitled to, he, as the Executive of that country, should put that Non-intercourse Act into force. That was the condition of things when I went down last Easter to see Mr. Bayard at Washington. If you compare the condition of things to-day with the condition of things that existed then, there is no man, I care not how partisan he may be, how unfriendly to this Government he may be, who can judicially look at the position of this question then and now, without coming to the conclusion that we have emerged from midnight darkness into the light of day under the auspices of this treaty. It may be said: Suppose that the treaty is rejected by the United States Senate—a not impossible contingency—I need not tell the House that one of the advantages we enjoy under British institutions, is that we are saved from the extreme and violent antagonisms of party that every fourth year the Presidential election brings about in the United States. Now any man who knows anything of the politics of the United States, knows that however good a measure is, however valuable, however much it commends itself to the judgment of every intelligent statesman in that country, it is a matter almost of honor on the part of the party in opposition to prevent the Government of the day from doing anything that would give them any credit or strengthen their hands in the country; that on the eve of a Presidential election, it is next to impossible to induce a Republican majority in the Senate to sanction anything that a Democratic Administration has carried through, however valuable that may be. But, Sir, take the very worst contingency, suppose this treaty is rejected by the Senate, what then? Will we be relegated back to the position we stood in a year ago? Not at all. If our efforts, by

mutual conciliation, by concessions on both sides, to find a common ground, that we could present to all the parties to this treaty, as an honorable and equitable agreement that might be fairly accepted—if these efforts had failed, if, after three months' negotiations, we had broken up with embittered relations, because we found that it was impracticable to get any common ground of meeting on which the Governments of the two countries could agree, there is no question that matters would have stood in a worse position than that in which they stood when we undertook these negotiations. But, Sir, that is not the position. Let the Senate of the United States to-morrow reject this treaty, I trust they will not do so; I have a hope that there is independent statesmanship enough in the great Republican party of the United States who have the power at their disposal to-day in the United States Senate, to allow that sentiment of patriotism to outweigh the party advantages they might hope to obtain by preventing the present Administration from settling this vexed question—but when they remember that for 70 years, these questions have been agitated which are now disposed of, they may see that if they should come into power themselves at any early date it would be an advantage to have this vexed question between the two great English-speaking nations of the world set at rest, that there may be no renewal of the difficulties which have existed so long a time. But let me take the very worst contingency, that of the rejection of this treaty, and how do we stand? Why, Sir, let me read from a letter of the Secretary of State of the United States, written to the citizens of Boston, who invited him to go there to deliver a speech upon the treaty. In Mr. Bayard's letter, of 26th March, he says:

"I am convinced that the welfare and true interest of our country and a just and wise treatment of the British American population on our northern frontier alike counsel the adoption of the treaty. In its initiation, negotiation and conclusion I can truly say for my associates, and myself, no views but those of a single minded patriotic intent have been allowed place or expression, nor can a trace or suggestion of partisanship be justly alleged. The sole and difficult question to which the treaty relates, the fishery rights, of one nation in the jurisdictional waters of another, began with the first dawn of our recognised independent existence as a nation and ever since has conspicuously presented itself at intervals exciting bitter controversy, and never been satisfactory or pre-eminently disposed of. Meanwhile the surrounding circumstances have importantly changed in advance with rapid and vast growth. The Treaty of 1818 remains unaffected in its terms by seventy years of such material progress and development on this continent, as we of to-day are the witnesses. Unless the Treaty of 1818 shall be wholly abrogated and recurrence necessarily had to the dangerous status that John Quincy Adams so ably but unavailably discussed with the Earl of Bathurst, in 1815, and which had resisted all efforts of negotiation and at Ghent in the year previous, it is manifest that a joint and equitable construction in consonance with their existing relations and mutual needs must be agreed upon between Great Britain and the United States and this, I affirm, is done by the present treaty."

Again he says:

"Conciliation and mutual neighborly concessions have together done their honorable and honest work in this treaty, paved the way for the relations of enmity and mutual advantage."

Now, Sir, I ask you whether all the time, all the trouble expended in this matter is not amply compensated for by the declaration of the Secretary of State of the United States bearing his tribute and his testimony to this Treaty as a fair, equitable and just interpretation of the Treaty of 1818. And what more, Sir? Let me read from the Message of the President of the United States:

"As a result of such negotiations, a treaty has been agreed upon between Her Britannic Majesty and the United States, concluded and signed in this capital, under my direction and authority, on the 15th of this February inst, and which I now have the honor to submit to the Senate, with the recommendation that it shall receive the consent of that body, as provided in the constitution, in order that the ratifications thereof, may be duly exchanged and the treaty carried into effect. The treaty meets my approval, because I believe that it supplies a satisfactory, practical, and final adjustment, upon a basis honorable and just to both parties, of the difficult and vexed question to which it relates. A review of the history of this question will show that all formal attempts to arrive at a common interpretation, satisfactory to both parties, of the first article of the Treaty of October 20, 1818, have been unsuccessful

and with the lapse of time the difficulty and obscurity have only increased.

"Negotiations in 1854, and again in 1871, ended in both cases in temporary reciprocal arrangement of the tariffs of Canada and Newfoundland and of the United States, and of the payment of the money award by the United States. Under which the real questions in difference remain unsettled, in abeyance, and ready to present themselves anew just as soon as the conventional arrangements were abrogated.

"The situation, therefore, remained unimproved by the results of the Treaty of 1871, and a grave condition of affairs, presenting almost identically the same features and causes of complaint by the United States against Canadian action and British default in its correction, confronted us in May, 1886, and has continued until the present time.

"The four purposes for which our fishermen under the Treaty of 1818 were allowed to enter the bays and harbors of Canada and Newfoundland within the belt of three marine miles are placed under a fair and liberal construction, and their enjoyment secured without such conditions and restrictions as in the past have embarrassed and obstructed them so seriously.

"The enforcement of penalties for fishing or preparing to fish within the inshore and exclusive waters of Canada and Newfoundland is to be accomplished under safeguards against oppressive or arbitrary action, thus protecting the defendant fisherman from punishment in advance of trial, delays, and inconvenience and unnecessary expense.

"The hospitality secured for our vessels in all cases of actual distress, with liberty to unload and sell and tranship their cargoes, is full and liberal.

"These provisions will secure the substantial enjoyment of the treaty rights for our fishermen under the Treaty of 1818, for the contention has been steadily made in the correspondence of the Department of State, and by our Minister at London, and by the American negotiators of the present treaty.

"The treaty now submitted to you has been framed in a spirit of liberal equity and reciprocal benefits, in the conviction that mutual advantage and convenience are the only permanent foundation of peace and friendship between States, and that with the adoption of the treaty now placed before the Senate, a beneficial and satisfactory intercourse between the two countries will be established so as to procure perpetual peace and harmony.

"In connection with the treaty herewith submitted I deem it is also my duty to transmit to the Senate a written offer or arrangement, in the nature of a *modus vivendi*, tendered on the conclusion of the treaty on the part of the British plenipotentiaries, to secure kindly and peaceful relations during the period that may be required for the consideration of the treaty by the respective Governments and for the enactment of the necessary legislation to carry its provisions into effect if approved.

"This paper, freely and on their own motion, signed by the British conferees, not only extend advantages to our fishermen, pending the ratification of the treaty, but appears to have been dictated by a friendly and amicable spirit."

I ask you to contrast that language with the position we occupied a year ago in regard to the great Republic to the south of us. Let the Senate reject the treaty to-morrow, and I ask what is the changed position of Canada? Yesterday we stood face to face with a Non-intercourse Bill, sustained by the united action of the Senate and House of Representatives, sustained by almost the whole press, Republican and Democratic, of the United States, sustained with few exceptions by a prejudiced, irritated and exasperated people of 60,000,000 lying on our borders. What, I repeat, is our position to-day? If that treaty were rejected by the Senate to-morrow, we have gained this vantage ground, that we stand in the position of having it declared by the Secretary of State of the United States and by the President of the United States that Canada has been ready to make, and that Her Majesty's Government on behalf of Canada, through her plenipotentiaries, have made an arrangement with the plenipotentiaries of the United States that is fair, just and equitable, and that leaves that country no possible cause of complaint. What is the result? The result will be this: that let a fisherman complain to-morrow of our interpretation of the treaty, of the enforcement of our most extreme construction of the treaty, the answer to him is this: Nobody is to blame for the inconvenience you suffer except the Senate of the United States. Your President, the Executive of your country; the Democratic party from end to end of the United States, declared it was a fair settlement. They represent an undoubted majority, in my judgment, of the people of the United States to-day, and I believe they will represent it to-morrow. We stand in the position that instead of being alone with the whole United States, President, Government and people all against us, all denouncing us as adopting a harsh and barbarous interpretation of an old, antiquated treaty for the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

purpose of forcing reciprocity upon them, we occupy the vantage ground of having these men out of their own mouths declaring that nothing has been wanting on the part of the Government of Her Majesty, or on the part of the Dominion of Canada to place this question on a fair and equitable basis such as might honorably be accepted by the United States. I hold we have accomplished that without injuring in the slightest degree the fisheries of Canada, without injuring Canadian interests to any extent whatever. We have made concessions, as I have said, but we have made them with the avowed object of placing all our people, not only the fishermen, but the agriculturist, the lumberman, every man in this country in a better relation with the United States than he was before. What is the result? As I have said Mr. Bayard told us, the American plenipotentiaries told us that there was but one way of obtaining what we wished. You want greater freedom of commercial intercourse. You want relaxation in our tariff arrangements with respect to natural products in which you are so rich and abundant. There is but one way to obtain it. Let us by common concession be able to meet on common ground and remove this irritating cause of difficulty between the two countries out of the way, and you will find that the policy of this Government, the policy of the President and of the House of Representatives, the policy of the great Democratic party of the United States, will at once take an onward march in the direction you propose, and accomplish steadily that which you would desire, is the only way by which it can ever be attained. Those were not empty words, those were the sober utterances of distinguished statesmen, who pointed to the avowed policy of the Government of the United States as the best evidence of the sincerity of what they said. What has happened already? Already we have action by the financial exponent of the Administration of the United States, I mean Mr. Mills,—the gentleman who in the United States Congress represents the Government of the day, and stands in the position most analogous in the United States to the Finance Minister in this House, the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who propounds the policy of the Administration in the House. How is he selected? The Democratic party sustaining the Government selects a man as Speaker of the House of Representatives, who is in accord with the policy of the Administration for the time being, and Mr. Carlisle, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, nominates the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means and all the members of the committee, and therefore the Chairman of that committee occupies the position of representing the Government in bringing forward such Bills as will represent the views and sentiments of the Democratic party in the United States supporting the Administration. What have we seen? The ink is barely dry upon this treaty before he, as the representative of the Government and Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, brings forward a measure to do what? Why, to make free articles that Canada sends into the United States, and upon which last year \$1,200,000 of duty was paid.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We paid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I ask, Sir, if that is nothing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Who paid?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not intend to insult both the great political parties of this country who have since 1854 and long before maintained that the interests of Canada—the interests of British North America—were intimately bound up in obtaining free intercourse with the United States for our natural products—I do not intend to insult the two great parties in this country by telling them that they were fools, that they did not know what they

were doing. Down to the present hour we have adopted the policy on both sides of the House, and we have pledged ourselves to the people to do everything that lay in our power to obtain a free market for the natural products of our country with the United States, and I say you must answer me the question as to whether that was an act of supreme folly or whether it was wise statesmanship on the part of both parties in this country to adopt that policy, before you ask me such a question as "who pays the duty?" I say that under this Bill which has been introduced and which, I believe, will pass, for it does not require two-thirds of the Senate where the Republican majority is only one in the whole House to pass this Bill, it requires a majority of one only and I am very sanguine that this Bill will pass during the present session. Modified it may be, but I am inclined to think the amendments will be still more in the interests of Canada than as the Bill stands to-day. If this is the case I think we may congratulate ourselves upon securing the free admission of our lumber, upon which was paid during the last year no less than \$1,315,450. On copper ore made free by the Mills' Bill we paid, or there was paid—to make it meet the views of the hon. gentlemen opposite more correctly—\$96,945. On salt \$21,992 duty was paid. This is rendered free by the Mills' Bill. I am sorry to find as I hoped would be the case from the first copy of the Bill that came to me that potatoes were not included amongst vegetables. I am sorry to find there is a doubt, as to whether the term "vegetables not specially enumerated" will not exclude potatoes. In grappling with this policy of making the natural products of the two countries free, you do not expect any person who wants to carry a Bill to put a heavier load upon his shoulders than he is able to carry, lest he may break down and do nothing. You expect him to take it in detail, and as I believe, you will find the policy contained in this Bill of making those natural products of Canada free, carried out until you have perfect freedom of intercourse between the natural products of Canada and the United States of America. Of wool we sent last year 1,319,309 lbs. of one kind, and a variety of other kinds, upon which a duty was paid to the extent of \$183,852. Now as I say on articles of prime importance and interest to Canada the removal of duty by the Mills' Bill amounts to no less than \$1,800,193. You will be glad to hear that I do not intend to detain the House any longer. In discharge of the duties—the very onerous and important duties—of one of Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries at that conference, I have steadily kept in view what in my heart and judgment I believed were the best interests of Canada. In the measure which I have the honor to submit to this House I believe will be found embodied a Bill which it is of the most vital importance to Canada to pass. As it stands to-day the Government of the United States have only my signature to sustain the course that has been taken. I was not there as the representative of the Government of Canada, nor can my signature to the Treaty necessarily imply the approval and support of even the Government of Canada. I occupied on that occasion the position of one of Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries, charged not only with the responsibility of what I owed to Canada, but also the responsibility of my duty to the Empire. I can only say, Sir, that I felt I would best discharge my duty to the Empire by steadily keeping in view the interest of Canada. I believe, Sir, that there is no way in which any public man in this country can promote the interests of the great Empire of which we form a part, better, or as well, as by taking such a course of public action as will build up a great British community on this northern portion of the continent of America. I believe, Sir, that we owe it to the Empire as well as to ourselves, steadily to keep in view every measure that will conduce to the rapid progress of Canada, the development of our

inexhaustible resources and the building up of a great and powerful British Dominion on this side of the Atlantic. I say, Sir, that in the discharge of my duty I have steadily kept that conviction in view, and I believe the course which has been pursued will not only commend itself to the judgment and the support of the great majority in this House, but that the great majority of the people in this country will feel that in the adoption of this treaty we are taking a step that is calculated to conduce to the progress and greatness and best interests of Canada.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, the Government have had the advantage of having the treaty submitted to this House for ratification, by a gentleman who is very well versed in the negotiations by which that treaty was brought about, and the House had the advantage of hearing from an old parliamentary hand in his most eloquent and I may say sophisticated manner the reasons which in his opinion would justify it in assenting to this treaty. The hon. gentleman must have been painfully conscious during his speech—which in many parts was more than usually eloquent even for him—that he was not carrying with him the hearty assent of those who are accustomed to cheer his utterances. The hon. gentleman, Sir, must have painfully felt the absence of those cheers which generally greet the utterance of any policy when propounded by himself, and he must have felt, Sir, that it was only when he indulged in that eloquent peroration which had nothing to do with the treaty whatever, and in which he referred to the consolidation of British power as something antagonistic to the United States that he found a hearty cheer from those behind him. The hon. gentleman's speech may, I think, be fairly divided into four parts. The first part was an historical *resumé* of fishery matters. With a great deal of the history he stated, I have no fault to find; with the omission of a large part of that history I have some fault to find. The second part of his speech, Sir, may be called the laudatory part. The hon. gentlemen paid compliments with a profuse hand to everybody who was associated with him in the construction of this treaty. I have no objection to make to these compliments; I have no reason to doubt that they may have been to a large extent deserved. From the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain down to the meanest associate he had with him, he told the House that there never was such a collection of men congregated together at the negotiation of any treaty. Well, Sir, we are not going to join issue with him on that part of his speech. The hon. gentleman then proceeded to the third part of his speech, and that was his confessions. He confessed to the House that the treaty was not what his party might have been led to expect. He confessed that it was one continuous series of concessions from Canada, without one concession made to Canada by the party with which we were treating. After exhausting his confessions, honest confessions I hope they were, the hon. gentleman then, in the fourth part of his speech, made an appeal for absolution to his followers in the House, basing that appeal on the great benefits that were to flow to the Empire from the ratification of this treaty. Well, Sir, I shall have something to say about parts of the treaty. I was amused, Sir, at the hon. gentleman's statement of the only concession that Canada was going to receive as the result of this treaty. The hon. gentleman told us that as a result of this treaty the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives at Washington had introduced a Tariff Bill, into Congress, which would have the effect of relieving Canadians from the payment of over a million dollars of duties, which they had been accustomed to pay on their natural products sent to the United States. Sir, there are two statements of fact in that allegation of the hon. gentleman to which I wish to take exception. If he had been in this House during the last three

weeks, he would have heard, not one or two, but dozens of his most prominent supporters prove to a demonstration that that duty was not paid by the people of Canada, but by the United States people themselves; and if the arguments that those gentlemen advanced so eloquently and ably are worth anything at all, the result, according to the statement made by the hon. gentleman to-night, is simply to relieve the consumer in the United States from the payment of a million dollars of duties which they have been paying under their tariff. The other exception which I wish to take to in the hon. gentleman's allegation is this: I deny that there is any analogy whatever between the position of the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in the United States and that of the Minister of Finance in this country. The hon. gentleman knows that the two systems of Government are entirely different. He knows that the Minister of Finance in this country speaks as the mouthpiece of the Cabinet, which is chosen to represent the majority in Parliament; and he knows—no one knows better—that the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives may be a gentleman entirely opposed to the policy of the Cabinet; and if the Chairman of that Committee in the present instance supports the policy of the Cleveland Administration, it is an accident, and not a necessity following from their system of Government. But it does not at all follow, because that Tariff Bill has been introduced as a sequence to the treaty, that it is a necessary consequence of the treaty. That tariff was introduced in pursuance of the policy laid down by President Cleveland in his message to Congress, a policy which he advocated in dealing with that enormous surplus which the hon. gentleman stated weighed like an incubus on the people of the United States; and in pursuance of that policy, before the treaty was ever entered into at all, the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee introduced that Tariff Bill. Sir, I hope that Bill will pass in a more enlarged sense even than it has been introduced. I hope that the article the hon. gentleman mentioned will also be inserted in that Bill, and that the people of the Maritime Provinces and Ontario may have the advantage of the free admission of their potatoes as well as their other natural products into the markets of the United States. I hope that the policy they have begun will go on until the policy developed on this side of the House and formulated in the resolution of the hon. member for South Oxford is accepted in its entirety, and then the hon. gentleman will be able to use with some effect the eloquent language he used to-day about prosperity and about the Dominion of Canada becoming a strong arm of a united empire. Now, Sir, it must have struck every hon. gentleman who listened to the speech of the hon. Finance Minister, as a most extraordinary thing, if this policy of conciliation, of compromise, of fair play was to produce the tremendous and beneficial results which he predicted it would produce, that that hon. gentleman, as a member of the Government should be here defending it to-day, when we know that for the past two or three years he has been one of the strongest and most eloquent advocates of a policy directly the contrary. Why, Sir, is it not known that the hon. gentleman is the most prominent member of an Administration whose policy was utterly opposed to the policy of conciliation embodied in that treaty—an Administration, Sir, that adopted a policy which, to use his own words, drove a nation of 65,000,000 of people almost to the verge of war with us—a policy which, to use his own words consolidated for the first time in history, 65,000,000 of people and the entire press in opposition to it—a policy which they proclaimed to be cruel and brutal and ungenerous and unchristian? Yet, two years have not elapsed since the hon. gentleman's colleagues—I am not sure whether he himself did not indulge in the same strain—announced in this House that such was their love of Canadian interests, and their determination to stand by the flag—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

which, after taking off their coats, they waved aloft—that they were not going to bend the knee to the United States by adopting a policy of conciliation, but were going to show the United States that this great Canada of ours would bring them down on their marrow bones. The policy of reciprocity of tariffs was carried one step further, and the manner in which the Government administered the Treaty of 1818, as they construed it, was openly proclaimed to be a defiance of the United States and a determination on their part to make the people of that country conform to their construction of that treaty, whether they would willingly or not. Sir, the old policy has been disavowed to-night, and we have heard the hon. gentleman say with all his power and ability that he was not able to support to-day the policy of the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Minister of Marine. But, Sir, he is responsible for that policy with those hon. gentlemen, and I hold him more responsible than anybody else, and I will tell him why. Because he alone has the power to change the policy of the Government; and if he had chosen one year ago to apply his mind to the work and put down his foot and say that he would not for one be a party to that policy of anti-civilisation, the Government would have been obliged to change it, as they have done since, and adopt the policy of conciliation to-night announced by the hon. gentleman. One month has not passed over our heads since we heard the Government announcing a policy in this House, not of conciliation, but of defiance to the United States, and the hon. gentleman had not returned to his place a day before he made them eat their words and adopt the policy which the Minister of Justice said would be a betrayal of the best interests of Canada. I say if there is a man in the Government who is more responsible than another for this unfortunate policy, which the Government have pursued so persistently for the past two or three years, it is the hon. the Finance Minister himself. Now, the hon. gentleman opened his speech with the expression of the hope that members on this side, in discussing the treaty, would not indulge in any language which might be used by the opponents of the treaty in the United States for the purpose of defeating the Bill. I hope no such language will be used, and, so far as I am concerned, it is not my intention to use such language. But the hon. gentleman himself, under similar circumstances, when it suited his party purposes, did not scruple to use language for which this country suffered very severely afterwards. The hon. gentleman anticipated a charge which he knew would be brought against him, and, referring to the Washington Treaty, he said that when that treaty was passing through this House, he appealed to hon. gentlemen not to make statements which might afterwards be used to our prejudice. But, he said, he was obliged to make such statements, and he did make them to our prejudice. At that time the treaty contained a provision referring to the commission, which afterwards sat at Halifax, the question of settling what damages should be paid to Canada for the fishery concessions she had made to the United States, and the hon. gentleman, in his anxiety to support for the time a Government measure then before the House, did not scruple to make statements discounting, so far as words could, any chance we might have of obtaining an award from the people of the United States. He declared in so many words that the concessions we had received from the United States ought, without the payment of a dollar of damage, to be considered the equivalent of the concessions we had made. While the hon. gentleman was speaking to-night I turned up the speech which he delivered on that occasion. He was preceded by the right hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Government, and I would ask the House to listen to the language which these hon. gentlemen made use of when the Washington Treaty was before the House. The right hon. gentleman said:

"In looking at the treaty from a commercial point of view, and looking at the question whether it is right to accept the articles, we have to consider mainly that interest which is most peculiarly affected. Now, unless I am greatly misinformed, the fishing interests of Nova Scotia, with one or two exceptions for local reasons, are altogether in favor of the treaty. They are so anxious to get free admission for their fish into the American market that they would view with great sorrow any action of this House which would exclude them from that market, and they look forward with increasing confidence to a large development of their trade, and of that great industry; and I say that, that being the case, if it be to the interest of the fishermen and to the advantage of that branch of the national industry, setting aside all other reasons, we ought not willfully to injure that interest. Why, Sir, what is the fact of the case as it stands? The only market for Canadian No. 1 mackerel in the world is the United States. That is our only market, and we are practically excluded from it by the present duty. The consequence of that duty is that our fishermen are at the mercy of the American fishermen—they are made hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Americans; they are obliged to sell their fish at the Americans' own prices. The American fishermen purchase their fish at a nominal value, and control the American market. The great profits of the trade are handed over to the American fishermen or American merchants engaged in the trade, and they profit to the loss of our own industry and our own people."

Sir, the hon. gentleman proved conclusively that the one great desideratum for the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces was the remission of the duty, which they were obliged to pay to the United States, and he said if they got that great concession, everything else did not amount to a row of pins. They should, he said, accept it most willingly and cheerfully, and now the hon. gentleman comes here with a treaty, in which he has not obtained for the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces one single concession, a treaty which leaves them bound to continue paying that duty in the future, as they have had to pay it in the past, and he declares this treaty is a wonderful outcome of ability on his part and on the part of his colleagues. On that occasion what did the hon. the Finance Minister say:

"Instead of the treaty surrendering our fishermen and fisheries to the destructive competition of the foreigner, the result would be—"

The hon. gentleman was a prophet then as he is to-night.

"—that the American fishermen who employed their industry in the waters of Canada would become like the American lumbermen who engaged in that trade in the valley of the Ottawa. They would settle upon Canadian soil, bringing with them their character for enterprise and energy, and would become equally good subjects of Her Majesty and give this country the benefits of their talents, and their enterprise and their capital. Was there anybody who could doubt as to the effect of removing the duty which was now levied of \$3 a barrel on mackerel and \$1 on herring, of taking off this enormous bounty in favor of the American fishermen and leaving our fishermen free and unrestricted access to the best market for them in the world? Was there anyone who could doubt the practical result would be to leave the Canadians, in a very short time, almost without any competition at all."

That was the view the hon. gentleman held in 1872, when he asked this House to assent to the Washington Treaty, and he was prepared to go so far then, to advance party interests, that he declared, in so many words, that we had received in the remission of duty more than an equivalent of the concession we had made, and that we were not entitled to a dollar of award. The Americans were not slow to take advantage of these statements made by two of the most prominent members of the Canadian Cabinet, and in their answer put before the Washington Commission, the most prominent statements are those which I have quoted, made by those hon. gentlemen. The American plenipotentiaries said: These gentlemen tell you, on their responsibility as members of the Canadian Government, that you have got already more than you are entitled to, and how, therefore can you ask for more? Unpatriotic as those hon. gentlemen were on that occasion, much as they did to discount the right of the country to receive a large sum in compensation, I trust their want of patriotism on that occasion will not be emulated by any body on this side. I hope we shall be now, as we have tried, whether successfully or not, for years back to be. The hon. gentleman has talked a good deal about a change of policy. Two years ago we had a policy propounded as the one necessary for the salvation of Canada, a policy diametrically opposed to the one proposed to-day,

Then their policy was one of defiance; to-day their policy is one of conciliation. I do not object to the change, but I say that when the Government of a great country like this change their policy on one of the most important matters which can come before them their duty, as hon. gentlemen, is to step down from their positions and give them to those who are in favor of the new policy and who pronounced in its favor years ago. That would have been an honorable course for them to take. Then the language of the hon. gentlemen would have been received with credit and respect. The hon. gentleman laughs, and he may well laugh, because he has lived to see within the past fortnight one of his principal Ministers declare that policy to be a betrayal of Canada which was adopted a week later and yet accepted by the hon. gentleman who remained in office. I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to a few historical facts which he very carefully omitted from his historical statements. The hon. gentleman gave us a history of the Treaty of 1818, and he stated, and stated very fairly, that the renunciation clause, as it has been called in that treaty, which was signed by the American plenipotentiaries, under which they renounced certain rights or privileges—whichever you like to call them in our waters—was not made without compensation, that they received ample compensation for that renunciation. I am prepared to agree with him in reference to that. I think his statement of the Treaty of 1818 was not inaccurate, but, after passing over the Washington Treaty of 1871, he stepped down to 1885, when a *modus vivendi* was agreed upon for that year; but he forgot to state that, for years before the *modus vivendi* of 1885 was agreed upon, the attention of his Government had been called by the party with which I have the honor to be connected to the serious results which would follow from the cessation of the fishery articles of the Washington Treaty, and that we would be face to face with a state of facts requiring the firmest and the most conciliatory action. In 1883, on the 28th March, when the United States gave a notice abrogating the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty, Lord Derby sent a despatch to the Canadian Government advising them that that notice had been given, calling their attention to it, and asking them to formulate their views on the question. On the 3rd May, 1883, Lord Derby wrote another despatch again calling upon them for their views, but no answer was vouchsafed. The hon. gentleman was adopting the policy of "to-morrow." In the face of complications as grave as those which the Finance Minister has pointed out to-day, in the face of the fact that he must have known the gravity of the position, and that he had received a warning from Lord Derby that it was time to make up his mind, the hon. gentleman, true to his policy of never doing to-day what can be done to-morrow, remained silent. Then, on the 30th January, 1884, Lord Derby again called for the policy of this Government. In the despatch which I have referred to just now, dated the 3rd May, Lord Derby says:

"Her Majesty's Government will be glad if your Ministers will favor them with your view in the matter as soon as they may be in a position to do so."

On the 30th January, 1884, nearly twelve months after the notice had been given, and the attention of the Government had been officially called to the state of the facts, Lord Derby writes to the Marquis of Lansdowne:

"MY LORD,—With reference to my despatches of the 3rd of May, and of the 28th December last, I have the honor to request that you will move your Government to take an early opportunity of placing me in possession of their views as to the course to be pursued in consequence of the approaching termination of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington.

His Lordship is getting slightly more nervous and more anxious, and urges Lord Lansdowne to move his Government to make some declaration of their policy in this matter, but the hon. gentleman remained silent. Nothing is

done, and nearly a whole year goes by, and on the 4th of December, 1884, nearly two years after the notice has been given by the United States abrogating those fishery articles, Lord Derby is compelled to write another despatch, and at last he evokes an answer. In that despatch he says :

"In view of the fact that the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington will expire on the 1st of July next, I have the honor to inform you that Her Majesty's Government are desirous of obtaining, at as early a date as possible, some expression of the views of the Government of the Dominion of Canada as to the course that they may wish pursued in negotiation with the Government of the United States, with the object of arriving at some satisfactory arrangement with that Government, in order to avoid the risks and complications which might arise from the fishery question being left in an unsettled and undecided state. You will therefore be so good as to lay this despatch before your Ministers, and to request them to favor me, at their earliest convenience, with such an expression of their views upon this important subject, as they may be in a position to supply."

The hon. gentleman had let matters slide for nearly two years, he had done nothing, but he had not only been prompted by Lord Derby, but in this House the Opposition had brought the matter to his attention, and in March, 1884, one year after the notice abrogating the fishery articles had been given, and nine months before Lord Derby wrote the despatch to which I have just referred, the Opposition brought this matter up, and used the arguments, not so ably or so eloquently, it is true, but as well as they were able to use them, in favor of peace and of the promotion of goodwill between the two countries which the Finance Minister has urged to-night in support of his treaty. We urged that, in order to meet the state of facts which we would have to meet when the treaty expired, it was necessary to do something, to enter into negotiation with our friends across the border. The resolution which I had myself the honor to move on that occasion was as follows :—

"In view of the notice of the termination of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, given by the United States to the British Government, and the consequent expiration, on the 1st July, 1885, of the reciprocal privileges and exemptions of that Treaty, this House is of opinion that steps should be taken at an early day by the Government of Canada, with the object of bringing about negotiations for a new treaty providing for the citizens of Canada and the United States the reciprocal privileges of fishing and freedom from duties now enjoyed, together with additional reciprocal freedom in the trade relations of the two countries; and that, in any such negotiations, Canada should be directly represented by some one nominated by its Government."

We did not lay down any positive line of action for the hon. gentleman to adopt; we did not say, this you must do, and this you ought to do, but we said, you are coming face to face with serious matters, and it is your duty as First Minister of this country to enter into negotiations with the United States, and to see if you cannot agree to some arrangement which will be profitable and honorable to both countries in order to meet those difficulties. There was another reason. Not only was the Foreign Minister of England urging them to do something, but the President of the United States himself had come down in his message to Congress and opened the door for us to enter, had held out, as it were, the right hand of fellowship to us, and in his message to Congress in the December preceding the March when this resolution was moved by the Opposition, said :

"Notice of the termination of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington was duly given to the British Government, and the reciprocal privileges and exemptions of the treaty will accordingly cease on 1st July, 1885. The fisheries industries, pursued by a numerous class of our citizens on the northern coasts both of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, are worthy of the fostering care of Congress. Whenever brought into competition with the like industries of other countries, our fishermen, as well as our manufactures of fishing appliances and preparers of fish products, have maintained a foremost place. I suggest that Congress create a commission to consider the general question of our rights in the fisheries, and the means of opening to our citizens, under just and enduring conditions, the richly stocked fishing waters and sealing grounds of British North America."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The recognition of the worth and value of our fisheries is embraced in a recommendation to
Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Congress that steps should be taken for the purpose of opening up those fisheries to American citizens, and an invitation was made to the hon. gentleman, if he was disposed to adopt a policy of conciliation, to hold out his hand to the hand of the President of the United States. But what did the hon. gentleman do? The hon. gentleman treated the invitation of the President, and the urgent request of Lord Derby—I will not say with contempt; he is too much of a diplomatist to do that—but certainly with silence; and when he did come to speak it was too late. Just a few months before the treaty expired he found there was not time to enter upon negotiations at all, and he suggested a *modus vivendi*, that free fish should be given to us, and free fishing to them; but the hon. gentleman accompanied that with the declaration that used to be received with such cheers by hon. gentlemen who sit behind him, that he was not going to bow the knee and ask for any favors from the United States or any other person. In a dispatch written by Lord Lansdowne, no doubt at the hon. gentleman's instance, I read :

"In the face of these circumstances my Government does not consider that it would be consistent with the respect which it owes to itself, to appear as a suitor for concessions at the hands of the United States."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Too high and mighty then. The hon. gentleman does not cheer to day. He was not prepared to ask concessions then, he was not prepared even, so high and mighty was he, to stand upon an even plane with the President of the United States, to grasp the hand of friendship which, metaphorically, had been extended across the border to him. O, no, he says, I cannot demean myself by asking any concessions from this great sixty millions of people, but I would suggest a *modus vivendi* to tide over the difficulty for a season. Well, Sir, they did not accept the suggestion, but they accepted a modification of it by which they got free fishing and we did not get free fish, and the hon. gentleman accepted that. That was the history of the transaction, and that was the policy which the hon. gentleman pursued. Sir, I denounced that policy before as inimical to the best interests of Canada, as a policy, under the circumstances, not maintaining our dignity, but derogatory to our dignity. I say it would have been much more dignified on our part if, when the President of the greatest Republic on the face of the earth had made the declaration to his Congress that I have just read, we had come forward in a many way and said: Yes, we recognise the great complications which will ensue when these fishery articles will expire, we recognize the truth of the statement that we possess the richest fishing ground, and the most richly stocked waters in the world, and we are prepared to deal with you as honest men, on an even footing, as one nation with another. But no, Sir, the hon. gentleman lost his opportunity, he let it go by, as he has lost many other opportunities; and to-day he is in the humiliating position of having to swallow a treaty not half as favorable as I have no doubt he could then have obtained. Well, then, when the season of 1885 was at end, what did the hon. gentleman do? Sir, we spoke great words in this building at the time. Hon. gentlemen took their coats off, as it were, and the Canadian flag was swung round their heads, and we heard a great deal of talk here, and a great deal of cheering about a vigorous foreign policy. Why, Sir, they entered upon this foreign policy like Olivier, the Prime Minister of Napoleon III, when he went to war with Germany with a light heart. They were prepared to fight the Americans and if the Americans did not give them what they wanted, they would bring them down to their marrow bones. We will get out our navy, we will man our cutters, we will put our captains on board, we will seize American ships and drive American sailors to desperation, we will soon teach them that we are the great Canadian people. The hon.

gentleman went on at that time, not standing by the construction of the treaty, which, as I said then, and as I repeat now, in itself might be technically correct, but adopting an administration of that treaty which was hurtful and harmful in the extreme, a policy which was arbitrary and capricious; at one moment, in 1885, giving them all they wanted, giving them our fisheries for nothing, and the next year not even admitting American fishermen to enter our harbors without being obliged to enter at the custom house and pay fees. Sir, the Americans did not so much complain of the construction we put upon the treaty in 1866 as of the vexatious and harassing and unnecessary conditions that we attached to the execution of that treaty. That was what was stated by them, and I will read soon a short extract from the declaration made by them after the season was over, bitterly complaining and denouncing our policy as inhospitable, as anti-Christian, as opposed to the principles on which the commercial relations of the two countries had been based for years previous. They say now, as they did then, that the construction we put upon the treaty was not a false construction, but that the manner in which we administered that treaty was calculated to irritate the fishermen themselves, and to destroy any confidence that the people or Government of the United States might have in the good-will and friendship of the Dominion of Canada. Well, Sir, we were not satisfied with the Treaty of 1818, and with the Imperial Acts, and the Canadian Acts, which were passed to put that treaty in force. The hon. gentleman, in pursuance of his vigorous policy, introduced an amendment to the Fishery Act, declaring that any American fishing vessel that entered within the prohibited ports—mark you, that crossed the lines—was liable to seizure and forfeiture. Mind you, from the year 1818 to the year 1886, we had gone on enforcing that treaty in pursuance of the Imperial and Canadian statutes. The hon. gentleman spoke of the vigorous Administration of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). He did not require such an Act as this; he enforced the treaty of 1818 firmly and with vigor; but his Administration was not a capricious one; he laid down certain lines and kept to them. But these gentlemen were not satisfied with the law of the land, and for the purpose—I won't say for the purpose of irritating the Americans still more, because I do not believe that could have been their intention—but carried away with the improper belief in the greatness of this Dominion, in our power to make the great nation to the south of us bend the knee, we passed this Act of 1886, declaring that any vessel that entered into the prohibited waters should be subject to seizure and forfeiture. Well, Sir, that Act did not receive the royal assent at once; it was reserved by the Governor General and received the royal assent on the 26th November, 1886, after the season had closed. And, Sir, we know what the policy of the Government then was. The Finance Minister has taken pains to-night to disavow any sympathy with that policy. I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Justice felt very comfortable when he told them to-night that he could not endorse the lines of action they had laid down. He was not responsible except in an indirect way, I suppose, and he wanted to wash his hands clear of it altogether. That policy was one inimical to the maintenance of good relations between the United States and Canada, and the hon. gentleman is now boiling over with love and affection for his American cousins; and, therefore, not even by implication, would he endorse the reports which were afterwards made Minutes of Council, signed by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and by the hon. Minister of Justice. He washes his hands clear of them, he did as has often been done by a leading member of the Cabinet when one of his juniors does not please him—he sat upon them and disavowed the policy altogether. But these hon. gentlemen have got to take it all the same. Let

us see what that policy was, because it is very important in determining whether we should accept the new policy of the Administration to find out how far that policy differs from the one they recommended to this House a few years ago, and which they said should twelve months ago be accepted as necessary for the maintenance of our dignity. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries made a report to Council in which he laid down the policy of the Government. With much of the report I have no fault to find, and I may say in passing that I do not find fault with the construction they put upon the treaty, that I agree very largely, if not altogether, with the legal arguments by which the Minister of Marine, and especially the Minister of Justice, supported the construction they put upon the treaty. I think in the legal controversy the Minister of Justice had with the other side he came out the victor—that is my opinion; but I complain that they were not satisfied with putting a construction upon the treaty and then carrying out that construction in a firm and reasonable way, but they were determined that the customs law of this country should be dragged in to harass, to irritate, to worry and drive to desperation the American fishermen, as it did drive them to desperation. The hon. gentleman in that report says:

“It is not however the case that the convention of 1818 affected only the inshore fisheries of the British Provinces; it was framed with the object of affording a complete and exclusive definition of the rights and liberties which the fishermen of the United States were thenceforth to enjoy in following their vocation as far as these rights would be affected by facilities for access to the shores or waters of the British Provinces or for intercourse with their people. It is therefore no undue expansion of the scope of that convention to interpret strictly those of its provisions by which such access is denied, except to the vessels requiring it for the purposes specifically described.

“Such an undue expansion would, upon the other hand, certainly take place, if under cover of its provisions, or of any agreements relating to general commercial intercourse which may have since been made, permission were accorded to the United States' fishermen to resort habitually to the harbors of the Dominion, not for sake of seeking safety for their vessels or for avoiding risk of human life, but in order to use those harbors as a general base of operations from which to prosecute and organise with greater advantage to themselves the industry in which they are engaged.”

The hon. gentleman then thought this would amount to a practical repeal of the treaty; that was his opinion then. But the hon. gentleman comes into court to-day and asks us to accept a treaty in which all of these concessions have been made, in which nearly every claim put forward by the United States Government at that time has substantially, to use the words of President Cleveland, been conceded to United States fishermen. They have told us it would be a practical repeal of the treaty and monstrous to allow such a thing. If the Government had voluntarily then done without compulsion, what they have done now at the point of the bayonet and under compulsion, we would have occupied a very much more honorable position and a much stronger position than we do to-day. Then we had the policy of the Government in this connection laid down by the Minister of Justice. In a report which he made in reply to some complaints furnished by the Minister at St. James, Mr. Phelps, the Minister said:

“But that which Mr. Phelps calls ‘literal interpretation’ is by no means so preposterous as he suggests, when the purpose and object of the treaty come to be considered. While it was not desired to interfere with ordinary commercial intercourse between the people of the two countries, the deliberate and declared purpose existed on the part of Great Britain, and the willingness existed on the part of the United States to secure, absolutely and free from the possibility of encroachment, the fisheries of the British possessions in America, to the people of those possessions, excepting as to certain localities in respect to which special provisions were made. To effect this it was not merely necessary that there should be a joint declaration of the right which was to be established, but that means should be taken to preserve that right. For this purpose a distinction was necessarily drawn between United States vessels engaged in commerce and those engaged in fishing. While the former had free access to our coasts the latter were placed under a strict prohibition.

“The purpose was to prevent the fisheries from being poached on, and to preserve them to the subjects of His Britannic Majesty in North America not only for the purpose of fishing within the waters adjacent to the coast, which can under the law of nations be done by any country

but as a base of supplies for the pursuit of fishing in the deep sea. For this purpose it was necessary to keep out foreign fishing vessels, excepting in cases of dire necessity, no matter under what pretext they might desire to come in. The fisheries could not be preserved to our people if every one of the United States fishing vessels that were accustomed to swarm along our coasts could claim the right to enter our harbors, to post a letter or send a telegram or buy a newspaper, to obtain a physician in case of illness or a surgeon in case of accident, to land or bring off a passenger, or even to lend assistance to the inhabitants in fire, flood or pestilence or to buy medicine or to purchase a new rope."

To-day the Minister of Finance comes back from Washington fresh with laurels as assistant to Her Majesty's plenipotentiary and loaded with compliments from that hon. gentleman, he asks us to accept a treaty which concedes everything which he previously said would ruin our fisheries. I think the hon. gentleman might have done this: He might have said that was my policy and I believe in it, and if it turns out that the rest of the Government cannot accept it, I am prepared to step down and out and let another man come in and carry out an opposite policy. I say it is not right for those hon. gentlemen having taken the stand they did, having declared that it was essential for the protection of our fisheries to prevent American fishermen entering our ports even to post a letter or to purchase medicine, now, having adopted a treaty which admits them for all these purposes to change their policy and ask this House to assent to the new policy. Then we had the policy laid down by the Minister of Marine in still stronger language. In a report he made to the Privy Council on 1st February, 1887, he said as follows,—and I wish hon. gentlemen to follow me in the quotations I am making from these reports and to note the fact that these dates are, June, July and 1st February, respectively. The dates will be important in a moment because they will, in connection with the fact I am going to mention, serve to show why these brave gentlemen changed their policy so materially. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says in this Minute, and mark you all those reports were adopted in their entirety by the Government of the hon. gentleman, approved in a Minute of Council and forwarded to the Home Government.

"It is not to be expected that after having earnestly insisted upon the necessity of a strict maintenance of these treaty rights, and upon the respect due by foreign vessels, while in Canadian waters, the municipal legislation by which all vessels resorting to those waters are exuberant, in the absence moreover of any decision of a legal tribunal to show that there has been any straining of the law in those cases in which it has been put in operation, that the Canadian Government will suddenly and without the justification supplied by any new facts or arguments withdraw from a position taken up deliberately and by doing so in effect plead guilty to the whole of the charges of oppression, inhumanity and bad faith, which in language wholly unwarranted by the circumstances of the case, have been made against it by the public men of the United States.

"Such a surrender on the part of Canada would involve the abandonment of a valuable portion of the national inheritance of the Canadian people, who would certainly visit with just reprobation those who were guilty of so serious a neglect of the trusts committed to their charge."

Sir, these are the brave words which the hon. the Minister made use of in the month of February, 1887, but to-night he comes in and he pleads guilty to the charge of oppression, to the charge of inhumanity, and to the charge of bad faith. He surrenders on the part of Canada he abandons the valuable portion of the national inheritance which he said was necessary to our national existence, and the result is if he is a good prophet, he will be visited with just reprobation by those who committed this trust to his hands. Sir, it may be asked what brought about this sudden change of front? Up to February they were hurling defiance at the gentlemen across the border. They said: You tell us that our policy is an inhuman policy, that it is a policy of bad faith, that it is a policy calculated to estrange the two countries. No matter the Minister of Marine says it is a deliberate policy and we would be craven (that is the meaning of his language) if we backed down from the trust which has been committed to our hand and we

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

are going to return that trust unsullied to the hands of those who gave it. Sir, if the hon. gentleman, when he is confronted with a new policy entirely at variance with that which he said was a "deliberate" policy, came before us and said: "I cannot in conscience remain as a member of the Government and I shall let new men carry out that policy—" I would forgive him, I would say it showed a spirit of manly independence. But I cannot conceive how this gentleman, who laid down this policy in the strong language that he embodied in the state paper I have quoted from, should come down and ask us to accept this treaty as a fair and honorable treaty between both parties. Every claim made by the United States has substantially, although not in words, been admitted, and to-day, Sir, the Finance Minister, even with all his ingenuity, was not able to tell this House of one concession—and I watched him from beginning to end—which our American neighbors had made to the great Canadian people. Now, Sir, just at that time, just when the hon. gentleman was nailing his colors to the mast in Canada here, the Minister of the United States at the Court of St. James was formulating in a state paper the complaints which the Americans had against our administration of the law. Sir, I will ask your attention to that for one moment, because unless we see what they complained of, and what the hon. gentleman refused to remedy, we cannot tell whether by this treaty they have conceded all that the Americans claimed or not. I find, Sir, that Mr. Phelps, in a despatch to the Marquis of Salisbury on the 26th of January, 1887, formulated his complaints against the administration of our fishery laws in these terms:

"The United States Government is not able to concur in the favorable view taken by Lord Iddlesleigh of the efforts of the Canadian Government 'to promote a friendly negotiation.' That the conduct of that Government has been directed to obtaining a revision of the existing treaty is not to be doubted. But its efforts have been of such a character as to preclude the prospect of a successful negotiation so long as they continue, and seriously to endanger the friendly relations between the United States and Great Britain.

"Aside from the question as to the right of American vessels to purchase bait in Canadian ports, such a construction has been given to the treaty between the United States and Great Britain as amounts virtually to a declaration of a most complete non-intercourse with American vessels. The usual courtesy between friendly nations has been refused in their case, and in one instance, at least, the ordinary offices of humanity. The treaty of friendship and amity which in return for the very important concessions by the United States to Great Britain reserve to American vessels certain specified privileges, has been construed to preclude them from all other intercourse common to civilized life and to universal maritime usage among nations not at war, as well as from the right to touch and trade accorded to all vessels.

"And quite aside from any question arising upon construction of the treaty, the provisions of the Custom House Acts and Regulations have been systematically enforced against American ships for alleged petty and technical violations of legal requirements in a manner so unreasonable, unfriendly and so unjust as to render the privileges accorded by the treaty practically nugatory.

"It is not for a moment contended by the United States Government that American vessels should be exempt from those reasonable port and Custom House regulations which are in force in countries where such vessels have occasion to visit. If they choose to violate such requirements, the Government will not attempt to screen them from the just and legal consequence.

"But what the United States Government complain in these cases is that the existing regulations have been construed with a technical strictness, and enforced with a severity, in cases of inadvertent and accidental violation where no harm was done, which is both unusual and unnecessary, whereby the voyages of vessels had been broken up and heavy penalties incurred. That the liberal and reasonable construction of these laws that had prevailed for many years, and to which the fishermen have become accustomed, was changed without any notice given. On every opportunity of unnecessary interference with the American fishing vessels to the prejudice and destruction of their business has been availed of."

The hon. gentleman will see that while he complained of the construction of the treaty he did not base the main ground of his complaint upon the severe construction of the treaty by the Dominion Government at all, but he based it upon the systematic enforcement, as he termed it, against American ships of alleged petty and technical violations of the custom house regulations and acts. There is no doubt,

as was afterwards stated by Mr. Bayard in his despatch, that the petty actions, trivial in themselves, against the American fishing vessels which suffered from the attempt to enforce customs regulations against them in every port, did more than anything else that was done by the Government of the day to irritate the American nation, to irritate the American fishermen and to bring about that state of non-intercourse which the hon. gentleman referred to and the Retaliatory Bill which was passed. But, Sir, just at the very time when these hon. gentlemen were declaring that they could not surrender one iota to the Americans, we find that they agreed to give up the whole case altogether. We find that on the 24th day of February, the Secretary of State for the Colonies in England telegraphed to the Governor General of Canada as follows:—

"Her Majesty's Government, while endeavoring to procure this *ad interim* arrangement, feel it right to intimate to you that they are disposed to think, after much consideration of the entire subject, that the best and simplest settlement of the present difficulties might be arrived at if both parties would agree so as to permit the discussion of the more extended commercial arrangements—to revive, for time at least, if not permanently, the condition of things which existed under the Treaty of Washington, fish and fish productions being again reciprocally admitted duty free, and the fishery being once more reciprocally thrown open."

On the 26th February the Government telegraphed in reply:

"Referring to your telegram of the 24th February, Canadian Government is prepared to accept your suggestion of reverting temporarily the condition of things existing under the Treaty of Washington without at present raising the question of indemnity."

Pursuant to their telegram Lord Salisbury made the offer to the American Government, but nothing appears to have come of it. Now, Sir, on the 3rd day of March, just a few weeks after the hon. Minister of Marine had penned the report which I have just read, the United States Government, pressed by the fishermen, and, as the hon. Minister said, by a determined and united people and a united press, and driven to desperation by the way in which Canada had carried out the treaty, introduced the Retaliatory Bill; and that Bill, Sir, altered the whole circumstances of the case. The entire character of our protective service at once changed. Hon. gentlemen then saw that they had been pushing this matter too far. They saw that they could not re-enact in 1887, as they were termed by the United States, the tyrannical acts and the tyrannical construction of the customs laws which they had enforced in 1886. They saw, Sir, that the American Government and people would not submit to dictation. The possible consequences of that Retaliatory Bill were not overdrawn by the hon. Finance Minister when he said it would stop the whole intercourse between the two people, and would be destructive of the trade and commerce of Canada. But while the hon. gentleman put that construction on the Retaliatory Bill to-day, what did he do one short year ago? He was then engaged in backing up the policy of the Minister of Marine which he disavows to-night, and he then told us that that Non-intercourse Bill, as he termed it, would not be an unmixed evil. It would lead, he said, to the development of better intercourse between ourselves. To-day he tells us it would produce a commercial disaster in Canada the end of which no one could foresee. Sir, he was prepared with a light heart to go into the war a year ago; to-day he tells us, and tells us I believe truly, that that Retaliatory Bill, if it came into force, would paralyse the prosperity of Canada; it would put an end to the prosperous intercourse which prevails between us and our neighbors in the United States; and it would hurl the present Government from power—and that I believe was the motive that compelled these hon. gentlemen to retrace their steps and adopt a policy antagonistic to the policy they pursued a year ago. But, Sir, what are we to say? One year ago I heard the

hon. gentleman challenge the Government of the United States to put that Retaliatory Bill into force. We were not afraid of them, he said: It will not be an unmixed evil; we will develop intercourse among ourselves, and good will come out of it in the long run; and the 120 gentlemen who sit behind him cheered the sentiment to the echo. To-day he tells the same gentleman that it would be the greatest disaster that could happen to Canada, and they turn around and cheer that sentiment. Sir, I do not know any sentiment the hon. gentleman could utter with his grave face that his followers behind him would not cheer. Then, Sir, shortly after the hon. gentlemen made that warlike declaration in the House, he saw fit to change his mind. He had a message from Secretary Bayard, and who was the mediator chosen by these two great nations to carry a communication from the Secretary of the United States to the Finance Minister of Canada? Who was the confidential envoy entrusted with the secret minds of those gentlemen? No less a person than Mr. Erastus Wiman, who has been denounced in this House by dozens of hon. gentlemen opposite as an apostate to his country; who is sneered at by the Conservative press throughout this country as a man having a fad. He is the man who above all others is chosen by the Secretary of State of the United States to convey a confidential intimation to the Finance Minister of Canada that it would be well for them to meet and have a confidential talk over this matter. Well, Sir, not only was he chosen by the Secretary of State of the United States, but he was accepted by the Finance Minister of Canada, and the Finance Minister has put the sign manual of his approval on him to-night; and I would venture to say that there is not a man sitting on the benches behind him who will ever hereafter speak of Erastus Wiman except with respect—no more "rasses," and no more "fads." I did not hear the interruption of the hon. Minister of the Interior. But when the hon. gentleman who leads him, who leads the Government, and who can force his policy on them when he likes, tells them that Mr. Erastus Wiman is a man to be trusted, I think the hon. gentleman will accept the statement. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman went to Washington, and he has given us a frank statement of the interchange of views that took place between him and Secretary Bayard. Sir, I never read anything in my life with more pleasure than the communications which passed between those two gentlemen; and if the hon. gentleman would to-day step out from the party that is tram-melling and keeping him from doing what I believe his own heart tells him should be done—if he would come out to-day and formulate in this House the policy which he favored in that letter, he would not only draw from behind him a larger following, but he would receive from this side of the House a most cordial support.

Mr. HICKEY. That is too thin.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) And the hon. gentleman, I venture to say, would be one of the first to follow him. Now, Sir, let me refer to a thing which I endorse most cordially. We know that the policy of conciliation and extended trade relations was first advanced by the hon. Mr. Baird the Secretary of the United States. That hon. gentleman, in some extraordinary way, nominated the Finance Minister as the Commissioner for Canada. Well, I am not going to take objection to the nomination of the hon. gentleman. I am going to take objection to the theory he laid down to-night that the right to negotiate our own commercial treaties would be a suicidal policy, if we had it conceded to us, but I am not going to object, after his having been nominated by the Secretary of State, to that nomination having received the cordial approval of Her Gracious Majesty. I wonder if Mr. Wiman had anything to do with suggesting the hon. gentleman's name? What does Mr. Bayard say:

"I am confident we both seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straight-

forward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I say commercial because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to affect the legislative independence of either country."

Well, the hon. the Minister of Finance to-night quoted with approval that sentiment of Mr. Bayard. Mr. Bayard, he believed was sincere, and Mr. Bayard said there was but one way to procure a just and permanent settlement, and that was by a liberal statesmanlike treatment of the entire commercial relations of the two countries, which did not involve, directly or indirectly our political independence. The hon. gentleman said he believed that Mr. Bayard, in so saying, spoke the truth; but what have his followers been stating for the past three weeks? They have been declaring that Mr. Bayard did not tell the truth, and that a settlement upon a broad, liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries necessarily involved the surrender of our political independence. That is what not only one the hon. gentleman's followers said, but it is what many of them repeated over in a parrot like manner. They have had their answer to-night from the First Minister who tells them they are all wrong, and that the proposition of Secretary Bayard, that a statesmanlike settlement, on a broad, generous basis, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries does not involve, directly or indirectly, the surrender of one atom of our political independence. I hope now that hon. gentlemen opposite will cease shouting their senseless cry of disloyalty and accept the construction put upon the proposition by their own leader the Finance Minister. Well, we had that offer, and I did not catch from the hon. gentleman why it was negotiations were not at once entered upon. I did not hear him state why the matter remained over from May last until the following November, but we do know that while no negotiations were entered into, the entire policy of the Government with regard to the carrying out of our fishery laws was remodelled and changed; there were no more seizures, there were no more alleged breaches of custom laws. There were no more vexatious and harassing seizures and detention of American vessels, and although, formally, the instructions remained as they were before, practically and substantially, they had so entirely changed that they were no longer in force. The hon. gentleman said, and I was sorry to hear him say it, that he was proud Canada had not the right to negotiate her own commercial treaties. He was proud, he said, that we had not the nomination of our own commissioners and plenipotentiaries. Sir, I take issue with him. I submit, without fear of contradiction, that the one arbitration which ever has been held between Canada and United States, which resulted honorably to the people of Canada, in which we got a fair meed of justice, was that arbitration in which we appointed our own Minister. When the Halifax Commissioner was being appointed, it was a matter of history that the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, who led the Government, was pressed very strongly by the Imperial Government to accept the nomination of an English gentleman to be nominated by them, and it is to his credit that he refused to bow to their dictation in that respect, and insisted upon Canada's right to nominate the gentleman who should be appointed to represent her. It was a lucky day for Canada when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) had the pluck and the manliness to assert Canadian dignity and the right of Canada to have a Canadian appointed to represent her on that commission. The hon. gentleman would lead us to imagine that forsooth if this right was conceded to Canada, our interests would be sacrificed, that we would not have the prestige which now attaches to the appointment made by Her Majesty at the dictation of her Minister, whoever he may be. Was that the case in Halifax, when Sir Alexander Galt acted on behalf of the Dominion? Is it not true that every one conceded that the management of the case by the nominee of the Canadian Government reflected the highest credit on his ability, integrity and diplomacy, and on the Government that appointed him? Therefore, the hon. gentleman's statement is not one I can endorse. Before I sit down, I wish to say a few words about the treaty itself. It is a record of surrenders on our part; it is a record of concessions on our part, and I am sorry to say there is no record of any concessions in return on the part of the Americans. Our fishermen have no compensating concessions made to them. The hon. gentleman could not name one. Our fishermen to-day will fish in our waters, access into which has been given the American fishermen, and when the vessels of the two nations bring the results of their season's work to Boston, our fishermen will be handicapped to the extent of two dollars a barrel. I am not going to use on this point my own language, but will quote again the language of the hon. gentleman himself, which I gave in the early part of my remarks, and the language of the First Minister when he said that "under these circumstances Canadian fishermen would become the hewers of wood and drawers of water to the fishermen of the United States." That is the condition in which the hon. gentleman has left them to-day. His treaty is an unconditional surrender on the part of Canada to all that the Americans claim. What is the statement made by the President of the United States himself in respect to this treaty. He says:

"The history of the events in the past two years shows that no feature of Canadian administration was more harassing and injurious than the compulsion upon our fishing vessels to make formal entry and clearance on every occasion of their temporarily seeking shelter in Canadian ports and harbors."

He was not complaining of the construction put upon the treaty, because he admits, and the American Senate consented to admit, that the legal construction put by the Government upon the words of the treaty is correct. But he says:

"You have harassed and injured our fishing vessels by compelling them to make out entries and clearances in your ports."

And this treaty relieves them from all that.

"Such inconvenience is provided against in the proposed treaty and this most frequent and just cause of complaint is removed. The articles permitting our fishermen to obtain provisions and the ordinary supplies of trading vessels on their homeward voyages, and under which they are accorded the further and even more important privilege on all occasions of purchasing such casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels, are of great importance and value. The licenses which are to be granted without charge and on application, in order to enjoy these privileges, are reasonable and proper checks in the hands of local authorities to identify the recipient and prevent abuse, and can form no impediment to those who intend to use them fairly."

"The hospitality secured for our vessels in all cases of actual distress, with liberty to unload and sell and tranship their cargoes, is full and liberal. These provisions will secure the substantial enjoyment of the treaty rights for our fishermen under the Treaty of 1818, for which contention has been steadily made in the correspondence of the Department of State and our Minister at London and by the American negotiators of the present treaty."

If Grover Cleveland is correct in his construction, it has been an unconditional surrender by the Government of Canada to the demands of the people of the United States. I am not, just for the moment, contending that these concessions are unjust in themselves, but I am contending that the men who declared a year ago that they were unjust, and that they could not possibly concede them, and that the concession of them would prove ruinous to Canada, stand to-day in a position the most unenviable that any statesmen can possibly occupy, when they ask us now to accept this treaty, which concedes everything which they said before could not possibly be conceded because it would be ruinous. They should step down and let other men make the concessions. That is their duty, and that is the course any English statesmen would take; but they do not understand that. What does Secretary Bayard say about it? He says:

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

"The United States have secured practically everything we have been contending for. I do not hesitate to say that, if Canada had conceded to the United States fishermen in 1818, one fourth of the rights that are secured for them by this treaty, there would have been no trouble at all. We would not have heard a single complaint, because no grievance would have been felt. Every difficulty that the American fishermen has had to contend with has been removed by this treaty. Generally it can be stated that no fishing ground of any value whatever to American fishermen has been conceded to Canada by this treaty."

That is the view Secretary Bayard takes of it. That view is correct. We stand here to-day giving our assent to a treaty of unconditional surrender on the part of the Canadian people and the Canadian Government. We boasted of what we could do, we talked about reciprocity of tariffs, we spoke about bringing the Americans on their knees to us, we talked about forcing them to do this and to do that; and to-day we are in the humiliating position that we have to concede at the point of the bayonet what it would have been manly and honorable and better for us to have conceded voluntarily two years ago. The hon. gentleman says that, when he went there to Washington, his instructions were not limited, that he was instructed by the Government to obtain as near an approach to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 as he could get, but it is perfectly evident, from the language he made use of in reply to Secretary Bayard, that he was prepared to go much further than that. What does he tell us to-night? He says, I made an offer to the United States Government on the 30th November:

"That with the view of removing all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of a mutual arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada and Newfoundland."

The hon. gentleman did not confine that to natural products. He was challenged by my friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and was told, that means unrestricted reciprocity. What was the answer the Finance Minister made? My offer was unrestricted, and I intended that it should be so. Is that correct? If the hon. gentleman made an offer of unrestricted reciprocity, as he says he did, he should have been in this House for the past three weeks to hear the denunciations heaped upon his unfortunate head by all his followers, to hear their statements that such an offer was disloyal, that it was striking at the foundation of Canadian liberty and undermining the pillars upon which Canadian independence rested. We hear to-day that we have been forestalled in our traitorous designs of having unrestricted reciprocity with the United States by the Finance Minister himself, and yet the hon. the Premier takes him back to his bosom, disloyal as he is, and is perfectly satisfied with him, as long as he succeeds in maintaining the hon. gentleman in power. That is the sum total of their efforts, apparently. But, although the Finance Minister tells us to-night that the offer was an offer of unrestricted reciprocity, that it was unrestricted in its terms, a fortnight has not gone by since a Minister of the Crown stated in reply to a gentleman on this side who put the same construction upon the offer, that it was a mistake, that it was not so. I think that was the Minister who interrupted me who, on page 542 of *Hansard*, made a declaration that Sir Charles Tupper never made an offer of reciprocity unrestricted in its character, and we have the hon. Minister of Finance to-night stating that it was so and that he intended it should be so. There will be some little curiosity on the part of the House and of the country to see those hon. gentlemen reconcile their statements, but, in view of what we have already seen, I have no doubt which policy is going to govern in the long run, if the hon. Minister remains here. The "boys" of the Cabinet, as they were called a little while ago, will have to accept the policy as he dictates it. He is the real leader to-day and the master

of the policy of the Government. That is perfectly evident. Now, the hon. gentleman stated, with reference to the treaty itself, that the delimitation clauses amounted to a concession on the part of Canada to the United States. That is true. They do amount to a concession. We formerly contended for the headland theory, and that has been surrendered by this treaty. I am not going to waste much time on this, but I am sorry that the hon. gentleman made the statement he did to-night to the effect that, for the past forty years, Great Britain has withdrawn its contention in that respect. The British Government never withdrew its contention on that point. Down to 1852—

Mr. MITCHELL. 1854.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am coming to 1854 afterwards, but I am referring to 1852 at present. The British Government down to 1852 consistently and persistently claimed that to be the construction of the treaty, and in 1852 the Secretary of State of the United States, the greatest Secretary they ever had, Webster himself, declared that the contention of the British Government was right and there could be no doubt about it. In a state paper, dated 6th July, 1852, Mr. Webster, Secretary of State, although contending that the wording of the Convention of 1818 was not conformable to the intentions of the United States as one of the contracting parties, says:

"It would appear that by a strict and rigid construction of this article (first article of the Convention of 1818) fishing vessels of the United States are precluded from entering into the bays or harbors of the British Provinces, except for the purposes of shelter, repairing damages and obtaining wood and water. A bay, as is usually understood, is an arm or recess of the sea entering from the ocean between capes or headlands, and the term is applied equally to small and large tracts of water thus situated. It is common to speak of Hudson Bay, or the bay of Biscay, although they are very large tracts of water.

"The British authorities insist that England has no right to draw a line from headland to headland, and to capture every fishermen who may follow their pursuits inside of that line. It was undoubtedly an oversight, in the Convention of 1818, to make so large a concession to England, since the United States had usually considered that those vast inlets, or recesses of the ocean, ought to be opened to American fishermen as freely as the sea itself, to within three miles of the shore."

The Secretary of States there admits that under the proper construction of the treaty, the contention of the British Government was correct. Senator Butler, the same year, adopted the same construction; Mr. Seward adopted the same, and a large number of others.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Everett the same.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, in connection with Lord Aberdeen's correspondence.

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. Seward said on that occasion:

"I cannot assent to the force of the argument of the hon. Senator from Louisiana. I am more prepared to go against it, because I think it is getting pretty late in the day to find the Secretary of State wrong in the technical and legal construction of an instrument. Let us test the argument. The hon. Senator says, that where the Government occupies both sides of the coast, and where the strait through which the waters of the bay flows into the Ocean, is not more than six miles wide, then there is dominion over it.

"Now, then, the Gut of Canso is a most indispensable communication for our fishermen from the Atlantic Ocean to the Northumberland Straits, and to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, for a reason which any one will very readily see by referring to the map; yet the Gut of Canso is only three-quarters of a mile wide. I should be sorry to adopt an argument which Great Britain might turn against us to exclude us from that important passage."

Again I recall the hon. Senator's argument, viz.:

"Two things unite to give a country dominion over an inland sea. The first is, that the land on both sides must be within the dominion of the Government claiming jurisdiction, and then, that the strait is not more than six miles wide; but that if the strait is more than six miles wide, no such jurisdiction can be claimed."

Upon which he commented:

"Now, Sir, this argument seems to me to prove too much. I think it would divest the United States of the harbor of Boston, all the land

around which belongs to Massachusetts or the United States, while the mouth of the bay is six miles wide. It would surrender our dominion over Long Island Sound, a dominion which I think the State of New York and the United States would not willingly give up; it would surrender Delaware Bay; it would surrender, I think, Albermarle Sound, and Chesapeake Bay; and I believe it would surrender the Bay of Monterey, and perhaps the Bay of San Francisco on the Pacific coast."

Sir, not only have we here Her Majesty's Government contending for the extended construction put upon the word "bay," known as the headland's construction, but we have leading men of the United States, such as Mr. Webster and Mr. Seward, assenting to that construction, and enforcing it with arguments which, in the United States Senate, were irresistible, showing that if they do not concede that, they gave up their own chief and principal bays. Now the hon. gentleman quoted from a declaration made by the British Government, made in 1866, but he omitted to quote the preceding sentence which entirely modifies the quotation he made. In 1866 the British Government stated:

"Her Majesty's Government are clearly of opinion that by the Convention of 1818, the United States have renounced the right of fishing, not only within three miles from the Colonial shores, but within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of a British bay or creek. But the question 'What is a British bay or creek?' is one which has been an occasion of difficulty in former times. It is, therefore, at present, the wish of Her Majesty's Government neither to concede, nor for the present, to enforce any rights in this respect which are in their nature open to any serious question."

They re-affirmed the doctrine of the headlands in its fullest sense in 1870, but in view of the pending negotiations for the Washington Treaty, they declined to give their consent to their being enforced at that time. They were willing to make temporary concessions in order, if possible, that the Washington Treaty might be consummated, but they never yielded or conceded for one moment that the arguments they had advanced were unsound. I am sorry the hon. gentleman went out of this way for the purpose of putting into the mouth of the British Government an argument which they never used with reference to this question. Now, Sir, I am not disposed to find a great deal of fault with the articles of this treaty, which refer to the delimitation of our waters. They are concessions, as the hon. gentleman says, from us; there are no concessions to us that I am aware of. The hon. gentleman speaks of certain bays which are excepted. The hon. gentleman knows that some of those bays never had a fisherman in them since the Treaty of 1818 was enacted. Take Egmont Bay for instance. My hon. friend from Prince County (Mr. Yeo) comes from that quarter, and he knows it well, and my hon. friend in front of me knows it well, and they know well that in the memory of living man, an American fisherman has never been seen fishing in Egmont Bay. However, I am not here to cavil, I do not wish to make objection merely for the purpose of objecting. So far as the question of delimiting the waters is concerned, I think the compromise is not one which we should refuse to accept—I do not think we ought to, although we do give up, as the hon. gentleman says, a great deal we once contended for; we concede nine-tenths, I dare say, of what our contention was previously, but I am satisfied. In the matter of these bays we must remember that while they may be very valuable one year, they may not be valuable another. Now, the Bay of Chaleurs at one time was the chief resort for the mackerel that came into the Bay of St. Lawrence. But to-day they do not come to the Bay of Chaleurs, and hardly any fishermen enter that bay. But in a year or two the mackerel may return; therefore the exception made here of reserving the Bay of Chaleurs out of the common waters, may one day prove to be a valuable exception, and I am glad it was made. But I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that article 9 of the treaty should be accepted in the same way. The treaty says:

"Nothing in this treaty shall interrupt or affect the free navigation of the Straits of Canso by fishing vessels of the United States."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

Practically, that amounts to a concession to the United States for all time of the right, mind you, to use the Straits of Canso for fishing purposes. Heretofore they have not enjoyed that right. That is a tremendous concession we have given to them, and when the treaty is once assented to the Straits of Canso become common water to the Americans as well as to the Canadians. I say it is a great and valuable concession which we have made to them, and in return we have got nothing. But, Sir, I want to come to articles 10 and 11. Now, article 10 concedes to the United States that for which we have been contending, and that for which the Minister of Marine and the Government strenuously denied. American fishing vessels can now enter our harbors, they need not report, they need not enter and need not clear at the custom house when they come for shelter or repair, nor when they come in—

"outside the limits of established ports of entry, for the purpose of purchasing wood or obtaining water; except that any such vessel remaining more than 24 hours, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, within any such port, or communicating with the shore therein—"

may be required to report, but they shall not be liable for compulsory pilotage nor for any du s. These are the concessions we make to the Americans. The hon. gentleman says they are reasonable concessions; but if they are reasonable concessions, why did the Government not make them a year ago, why did they bring us to the verge of war with our neighbors across the line by withholding those concessions which to-day he terms reasonable and which he asks us to approve? Why not have conceded them in a frank, honorable and manly way two years ago? If that had been done, the Government would have stood very much higher in the estimation of the people than to-day, and we would have been much nearer obtaining the boon we all desire, freer commercial relations with the United States. Now we come to article 11, a most important article. That article provides:

"United States fishing vessels entering the ports, bays and harbors of the eastern and north-eastern coasts of Canada or of the coasts of Newfoundland under stress of weather or other casualty may unload, reload, tranship or sell, subject to Customs laws and regulations, all fish on board, when such unloading, transhipment, or sale is made necessary as incidental to repairs, and may replenish outfits, provisions and supplies damaged or lost by disaster; and in case of death or sickness shall be allowed all needful facilities, including the shipping of crews."

The practical construction that will be put upon the article will be this: An American captain can come into port, he can declare that he comes in from stress of weather—he is the judge of the matter, you have to accept his statement. He can come in if he loses a jib-boom; he may unload and tranship—the most valuable privilege and that for which the Americans have been contending for years, and which puts them on an equal footing with our fishermen, while our men are handicapped by a duty of \$2 a barrel. Technically you may say that American vessels cannot come in unless under stress of weather or other casualty. How are you to determine it? An American comes in from stress of weather because he has lost a hal-yard, and while it is being repaired he unloads. I do not see how you can prevent it. Practically under this treaty the Americans will ask for and claim and have a right to tranship their fish in the manner they have been demanding for many years. I must confess I fail to apprehend, even after the explanation of the Finance Minister, the meaning of the latter part of the section:

"Licenses to purchase in established ports of entry of the aforesaid coasts of Canada or of Newfoundland, for the homeward voyage, such provisions and supplies as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels, shall be granted to United States fishing vessels in such ports promptly upon application and without charge, and such vessels, having obtained licenses in the manner aforesaid, shall also be accorded upon all occasions such facilities for the purchase of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels; but such provisions or supplies shall not be obtained by barter, nor purchased for resale or traffic."

A man who once obtains a license, which he can obtain gratis, has a right on all occasions afterwards, not only for the homeward voyage, but for any other voyage, to be accorded the same facilities for the purpose of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are given to trading vessels. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the construction of that clause was that it applied only to vessels when on the homeward voyage; but that is not the true construction. Having once obtained the license, they are entitled to use it on all occasions afterwards. I suppose it was assumed to mean for the same season; but I do not know as to that. An American vessel will ask for the license at the first port at which she arrives, and she will be entitled to obtain it and will be entitled afterwards to the same facilities for purchasing supplies as are granted to merchant vessels. What are supplies? Who is going to put a construction upon supplies? The words are "provisions and supplies." Supplies are not, therefore, provisions, because both words are used. The Americans will say this term embraces bait. You will say it does not embrace bait. The treaty you have interpreted was plain and clearly understood, but the interpretation treaty we have now before us is difficult of interpretation and there will be trouble in regard to it from the very start. There are sure to be differences of opinion between the captains of merchant vessels as to the right to purchase bait and the Government which does not wish to furnish it: Supplies must mean something, and it is clear they do not mean provisions, and I do not know what a fishing vessel requires except provisions and bait and things of that kind. It will be found that this treaty has not been carefully worded and is open to different interpretations, and if the broader construction that I think the Americans will claim is conceded to them, you will have given up everything and the subsequent clause which was apparently intended to give the Americans, the right to purchase provisions, bait, ice, seines and transhipment of fish when the duties are removed, will be a dead letter, because they will claim they have a right to all that under article 11. I do not say they have the right, I say the treaty has been so loosely drawn that it will take a dozen Philadelphia lawyers to tell really what it does mean. I have seen half a dozen lawyers considering it, three favoring one interpretation, three another, and I have never yet found two men with the same opinion in regard to it. It is clear that difficulties will arise between Canada and the United States as to the rights to which American fishermen are entitled under section 11. I would say nothing about the *modus vivendi*. If the treaty was good in itself, if it was an honorable and fair treaty, I would not object to a *modus vivendi* being agreed upon for two years such as was offered by the Commissioners from Great Britain and is attached to the treaty here. But there are not only the concessions in the treaty, it appears as if the Government were not able to give the Americans enough, and as soon as they had given all they asked, the Government then said that in good fellowship and with a wish to promote good feeling we propose for the next two years for a nominal sum to give them everything they can possibly ask and all that our fishermen enjoy on our shores. The amount of \$150 a ton is a nominal sum, meaning as it does only \$120 on a fishing vessel of 80 tons. However, I maintain that there will be much difficulty arising from the construction of this treaty and from the interpretation put upon its terms, very much more than on the interpretation of the old treaty. The old treaty was so plain there could hardly be two interpretations placed upon it, and it was its administration that caused complaint to be made in regard to it and the administration of the customs laws to the American fishing vessels which they thought should have not been applied. The upshot of the whole business is, as I have said, that the Americans got all they wanted, as the

President said in his Message, and as Mr. Bayard said in the interview which is published in his organ *The Post*. And we got what? We have listened for three hours to the Minister of Finance. Did he tell us one thing we got, one concession or one promise even from the Americans? We got absolutely nothing and we conceded everything. The hon. gentleman talked about the Americans not wanting to come within the three-mile limit to fish. He knows that, rightly or wrongly, their leading men have been convinced that the fishing privilege within the three-mile limit is valueless. I do not agree with their contention. I noticed to-day in reading a report of the Senate of the United States that upon this point they make a full report to the Senate and to the people of the States. Having examined a large number of witnesses upon the point, they conclude as follows:

"In view of all these facts well known to the great body of the citizens of the United States engaged in fisheries and embracing every variety of interest connected therewith, from the wholesale dealer, vessel owner and outfitter to that portion of the crew who receive the smallest share of the venture, it must be considered as conclusively established that there would be no material value whatever in the grant of the British Government to American fishermen of absolutely free fishing; and in this conclusion it will be seen by a reference to the testimony, that all these interests fully concur."

The reason, therefore, they did not get free fishing was because they did not ask it, and they did not ask it because they thought it was valueless. I think they are mistaken. I think, Sir, and I have always thought after listening to all the evidence given before the Halifax Fishery Commission, that the right to fish within the three-mile limit is a most valuable right in this regard. It may not be so valuable as it once was when the Americans fished with hook and line entirely. They then had to come to the three-mile limit almost entirely to catch fish, but I contend it is valuable still. Why, Sir, if a vessel goes down to the bay of St. Lawrence to catch fish, the exclusion from the three-mile limit may mean the difference between a profitable and an unprofitable voyage. The seventy, or eighty, or a hundred barrels of fish, that might be caught within the three-mile limit, and which by reason of the exclusion they will fail to catch, may mean the profits, and large profits too upon the whole voyage. The cost of going down is the same and those gentlemen may say what they like, but I maintain now and always have maintained that they are wrong in their conclusion and that the fishing privilege within the three mile limit is still a most valuable one, but as I said before they did not get it because they did not ask for it, and they did not ask for it because after considering the report of the evidence they thought it was not worth asking for. When they did ask for it in 1854 and when we gave up our right to the Americans we got reciprocal trade with that country in return. In 1871 when we gave up our right under the Washington Treaty we got not only a remission of the duties upon our fish, but Sir, we got five and a half millions of money compensation paid to us for the concessions we made. In 1888 we gave them up the privileges they have been contending for and we got nothing whatever in return. What I complain of is, that we should never have attempted to harass the Americans with those custom regulations which they complained of as so arbitrary. They complained that we denied them their rights and that we harassed them in the enjoyment of their rights and harassed them by imposing duties upon them that which ought not to have been imposed, and that we threw all the difficulties we possibly could throw in the way of the exercise by them as they said of their rights under the treaty. If we had voluntarily ceded to them these concessions which have been wrung from us under this treaty we would to-day be standing in a proud position. But, Sir, they have obtained everything and we have got nothing in return. I condemn the policy of the Government because it has been an arbitrary policy. Arbitrary in so far as it applied to

those American fishing vessels the Customs Acts and regulations of the Dominion which never should have been applied to them. I condemn it as a capricious policy because, while one year 1885 you gave them the fisheries for nothing, the next year you prosecute and persecute them with all the rigors of the law in the regulations of the custom house and the Marine and Fisheries Department, and now capriciously you turn around and, after telling the people of the country that the concessions they demanded from you would prove ruinous to the fishery interest and could never be conceded without the loss of the whole fisheries, you adopt a treaty which concedes every demand to them and which you now ask the House to assent to. Well, Sir, if this does nothing more than to teach us that our highest and best policy is not to irritate our friends by the retaliatory policy which we have adopted in times gone by, if it does nothing more than to teach us to cultivate the friendly relationship which ought to exist between that great nation and this great nation of Canada, we will not have paid too dearly for our lesson. I fear that while the hon. gentleman remains in power his policy will consist of the same arbitrary and capricious changes which have characterised it in this fishery muddle from beginning to end and which does not deserve any commendation at the hands of this Parliament. The treaty has been agreed upon, and I for one hope that no action will be taken by this Parliament to throw it out. I am willing, Sir, it should be accepted. The right hon. gentleman smiles. I say that many of the concessions he grants to them by treaty should have been granted to them long ago. They should have been granted voluntarily, and if you had done so, I repeat as I said once or twice already, you would not now stand in the humiliating position you are in, whereby your Minister of Marine and the Government have been obliged to eat the brave words they have spoken for seven years past, and the Minister of Finance himself has been obliged to retract and withdraw the war-like words he spoke in reference to the retaliatory policy enacted by the United States, and has had to adopt a policy the very opposite to that which he asked the House to adopt only one short year ago.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I am quite unable to agree with anything that has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I am quite unable to believe that hon. gentleman has been sincere in one utterance that he has made in the course of the speech he addressed to this House. I am further unable to believe that the hon. gentleman was ingenuous, either in the quotations or in the arguments which he presented to this House from the beginning of his speech to the end of it. I am inclined to give the hon. gentleman credit however for a large degree of patriotism, but he was not I am sure speaking to this country at all with regard to this treaty. He knew that this House was so well acquainted with all the negotiations that had taken place with regard to this question, with all the features of the Treaty of 1818, and with the bearing of the customs laws, he knew that the country was so familiar with this question at least those portions of the country in which the fishery question is understood at all, that I am sure he did not intend to insult this House or to insult Canada, by expecting either this House or any portion of Canada to credit the arguments or to believe the statements which he put before this House. But the hon. gentleman evidently had a very patriotic motive and it apparently was this. Since the making of this treaty the hon. gentleman knows that from one end of the United States to the other a cry has gone up, not that the United States plenipotentiaries have been captured by us, but that the interests of the United States have been sacrificed in this treaty. The hon. gentleman knows that from one end of the capitol to the other, where the Congress of the United States is

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

now sitting, the enemies of the Administration, the enemies of this treaty, the enemies of Canada, have been ringing the changes which he has reversed here to-night and asking that Congress should reject this treaty as being too favorable to the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman entertained us for an hour and a half with a series of arguments and statements not one of which we can credit and not one of which I would insult the hon. gentleman by supposing that he believes himself, but he gave them with a view to furnish arguments to the friends of Canada in the United States who desire to see this treaty adopted and ratified there, and who will hear for the first time from the Parliament of Canada that the interests of Canada have been sacrificed by the treaty which this House is now asked to adopt. I do not remember, Sir, any more ludicrous feature in this debate than the hon. gentleman's censure on the speech of the hon. Minister of Finance in vindicating the Treaty of 1871. What did the hon. gentleman say? He said it was exceedingly unpatriotic of the hon. Finance Minister in 1871 to defend the treaty, by showing that British subjects had acquired advantageous concessions under that treaty, which were probably equal to those which had been given to the citizens of the United States, thereby, this said the hon. gentleman, jeopardizing all our chances of getting a large money award from the arbitration at Halifax; and the hon. gentleman still thinks that he made a great point on that question; and he has the courage to ridicule and condemn the hon. Minister of Finance for having defended the Treaty of 1871 in this House. That treaty, recognised as it is now from one end of the country to the other as having been a most beneficial and salutary arrangement, and one that we were pressed to continue on even more liberal terms than we made in 1871, was bitterly opposed by that hon. gentleman's companions, who actually divided this House on the question whether it should be ratified or not; and the hon. Minister of Finance, in defending the Treaty of 1871 by every argument he could address to the House, was speaking not only for the life of his Government but for the life of that treaty itself, which these hon. gentlemen have many times condemned us up and down the country for not having solicited the United States to renew after it had expired. Now, Sir, I want to make one comment, before I go into the hon. gentleman's argument, upon a statement which he put into the mouth of the hon. Minister of Finance, and which was as different from the statement the hon. Minister made as night is from day. The hon. Minister of Finance, referring to the arguments and contentions which had been put forward by my colleague, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and myself with regard to the interpretation of the Treaty of 1818 and with regard to the rights of Canada under that treaty, and referring to what had been adopted eventually as a settlement of the whole question by the treaty, admitted that he had not been able to carry out our full contentions. Who expected that he would? Who ever sat down to make a bargain expecting that he and his adversary would agree to the extreme points they both had made, or expecting to insist on all the arguments that both had put forward? What kind of a treaty would it have been if the strongest contentions of the United States and the strongest contentions of Canada had been struggled for to the bitter end? The hon. Minister of Finance would have come to Canada with no treaty at all, but with that state of hostility which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) professes to deplore, bitterly intensified and every prospect of solving this question, which was producing so much irritation between the two countries, lost, perhaps, forever. The hon. Minister of Finance stated frankly that there were concessions on both sides—that he did not profess that by this Treaty we were carrying out our contentions to the fullest extent; and yet the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) half an

hour afterwards cited the hon. gentleman again and again as having used these words: "that he was not able to support the policy of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries." Now, I ask hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House whether that was a fair quotation of the language of the hon. Minister of Finance; I ask any man within these walls if he thinks the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island, believes it was. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has done me to the honor to refer two or three times to an expression which I made use of in a debate which casually arose not very long ago; and I must ask the indulgence of the House, notwithstanding the rule, in referring to it for a single moment to correct the hon. gentleman's memory. The hon. gentleman has cited me three times, twice to-night and once a little while ago, as having said that if a certain policy were adopted, a policy which was subsequently adopted, it would be a betrayal of the interests of Canada. Now, as that subject is germane to the one under discussion, I may perhaps, without further apology be allowed to state what I did say on that occasion, what I adhere to to-night, and what is not in the least degree inconsistent with the action the Government subsequently took. There had been a discussion between the hon. member for Queen's and myself across the floor as to the true interpretation of a clause of the Act relating to the duties of customs. He and I differed as to whether the clause was compulsory and obligatory on the Government, or whether it was merely optional. The statement I made was not that to put green fruits, seeds, bushes, and plants on the free list would be a betrayal of the interests of Canada, but it was this, that the clause was optional, that it vested a discretion in us, and that for us to admit that it did not vest a discretion in us, but bound us to submit to the dictation of another power, friendly or unfriendly, would be a betrayal of the interests of Canada. Now, the hon. gentleman so far misunderstood the quotation, which he has repeated on no less than three occasions, that he referred to it as an evidence that the hon. Finance Minister could, by attending a single day to his duties, sit on the "boys" of the Cabinet, as he called them, and deliberately reverse a policy which we had pledged ourselves so fully as to say that the adoption of another policy would be a betrayal of the interests of Canada. The House will see from what I did say on that occasion, and what I adhere to now, that there is not the slightest difference of opinion between any member of the Government and myself on that question, or between the opinion I then expressed and the action the Government subsequently took, nor the slightest difference between my opinion on that question then and my opinion on it to-night. Now, the hon. gentleman addressed the House at considerable length for the purpose of showing that in 1884 we should have taken the advice of our friends of the Opposition, and especially that of the hon. gentleman himself; and he went so far as to urge this House to believe that if we had adopted his advice in 1884 and in 1885, we should have obtained a very much better fishery treaty than we have to-night. Now, Sir, I have not been able, as I confess it would have been wise and cautious to do, after the way in which the hon. gentleman has quoted me, to follow him in the record; but I will take his own words. He told us that the motion he made on that occasion was that freedom of fishing and freedom of duties were desirable in the interests of Canada. He seems to think that a treaty on such terms would have been a much better treaty for Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries to send to Canada. For one I do not agree with him. I agree with the statement he made, and the statement the hon. Finance Minister made, that the inshore fisheries of Canada are the most valuable possession which she has to-day. I believe they are not only the most valuable possession she has to-day, but that their wealth is increasing every day that rolls by; and with the increased

preservation which we can give to those fisheries, with the increase of population which is taking place on this continent, and with the depreciation of the fisheries along the shores of the United States every day we meet here and every night we rest in our beds, these great possessions of our country are becoming of greater value. But the hon. gentleman's proposition in 1884 was that this possession, which is of so priceless a character, this possession, the value of which after fifty years shall have rolled around it is impossible for the most sanguine to calculate, should be thrown open forever to the United States for one concession only, the entry of fish free into the United States. The policy of free fish, the administration of the United States now recommend to Congress, not for the priceless benefits of the fisheries of Canada, but in consideration of the circumstances of their own country, and to reduce their surplus and to reduce their revenue. The hon. the Minister of Finance, it is true, has not come back to Canada to tell us that he has given away this inestimable property, our fisheries, for a mere tariff concession, which in all probability will be made in view of the domestic circumstances of the United States, but he is able to say to us: "I have preserved unimpaired the inshore fisheries of Canada and have obtained the assent of the United States to a different valuation of our fishing rights. I have obtained from them another valuation, not that the United States will demand, in return for the admission of our fish free of duty, free fishing on the coasts of Canada, but that free fish may fairly and honorably and properly be conceded by them for the right to tranship cargoes, and the right to go in shore to ship crews and to buy bait and supplies." If that concession on the part of the United States has originated in what the hon. gentleman says it has—the under-valuation by the Gloucester fishermen of our inshore fisheries, so much the better for us. Whatever has led to that opinion, I should much prefer a treaty that proposes to give us the concession of free fish for the transhipment of cargoes and for the right to purchase bait and supplies, to the treaty which the hon. gentleman would have had us make in 1884, by which, for that same concession, we were to give up, not only the right to tranship cargoes and to purchase bait and supplies, but free fishing on the coasts of Canada. Now we are told that the Government policy was a policy of delay and vacillation. Well, if the right hon. the First Minister ever deserved credit for having put off until to-morrow what could be as well and better done to-morrow than to-day, he deserves credit for having declined, in 1884, to make the treaty which the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), invited him to make, and for having obtained, instead, the treaty which is upon the Table to-night. What was it that the President of the United States proposed we should have, as the hon. gentleman read to-night? Why, the hon. gentleman pictured in the most figurative language the president of 60,000,000 people stretching his hand over the border to grasp the hands of 5,000,000? Well, I confess I am utterly unable to grapple with the hon. gentleman's metaphor, but I see, in the quotation he made, that the proposition which the President of the United States then made was different from what is made now, and the difference is material to the interests of Canada. The under-valuation, which the hon. gentleman says was made of the inshore fisheries of Canada, was not in the mind of the President of the United States at all. What the President suggested—not for Canada because he did not stretch his great hands across the border at all, but he sent a message to his own Congress, which was disregarded by his own Congress, and which was not an invitation to the Dominion—what the President suggested was this: that it would be a most desirable thing, in exchange for some small tariff concessions which they were going to make anyhow, that his people should get access to the rich fishing grounds of Canada. I am glad to say it is not too late for us, and I

hope it will never be too late for us, to say that we set too high a price upon the inshore fisheries of Canada to barter them for such a trade concession as the mere admission of fish free of duty into the United States. The fisheries may be overvalued by us and undervalued by the American fishermen; but if the Americans do not want our property, we shall have the pleasure of keeping it to ourselves. Now, the hon. gentleman made a very singular statement with regard to what had produced the Retaliatory Bill, as he called it; and his whole argument at first was that the wicked National Policy, in which he sees the germ of all evils past, present and to come, had driven to exasperation 60,000,000 people, and almost forced them into a state of war. The hon. gentleman and his friends have told us time and again that the irritation produced by the National Policy was no greater than the lighting of a fly upon a lion's mane—that for 5,000,000 to undertake to coerce 60,000,000 was child's play, and yet the hon. gentleman told us to-night, in the most emphatic terms, that the adoption of the National Policy by 5,000,000 had nearly goaded these 60,000,000 into a state of war. He had not progressed very much farther with his speech when he undertook to lay the blame in another quarter, and it was the uncivilised administration of the Treaty of 1818 and of the custom laws that had goaded these people into a state of war. Something had done it. It was sure to be our fault, and it did not much matter what particular act of ours was to blame. Now, I should like to contrast that violent statement, dictated by party feeling against the Government in power, with the calm statement made not long ago with regard to this question by Mr. Bayard, the Secretary of State, whom the hon. gentleman exalts, and deservedly so, as an eminent statesman. Speaking of the Retaliatory Act, the language of Mr. Bayard, addressed to those who desired to put that Act into force, and who desired that claims for damages should be made against the Government of Canada, was, not that the Administration of the Treaty of 1818 by the Dominion of Canada had been uncivilised and had goaded the people into a state of war, but it was this: that the Dominion, having made a fair bargain in 1885 with the President of the United States, one result of which was intended to be the appointment of a commission to consider and settle this whole question, it was the fault of the Senate of the United States, and of that Senate alone, that this question had not received its solution, and that he could no longer lay the blame at the doors of our Government, or lay the blame at the doors of his own Government. Mr. Bayard said:

“More than one year ago I sought to protect our citizens engaged in fishing from results which might attend any possible misunderstanding between the Governments of Great Britain and the United States as to the measure of their mutual rights and privileges in the territorial waters of British North America. After the determination of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, in June last, it seemed to me then, and seems to me now, very hard that differences of opinion between the two Governments should cause loss to honest citizens, whose line of obedience might be thus rendered vague and uncertain, and their property be brought into jeopardy. Influenced by this feeling, I procured a temporary arrangement which secured our fishermen full enjoyment of all Canadian fisheries, free from molestation, during a period which would permit discussion of a just international settlement of the whole fishery question; but other counsels prevailed, and my efforts further to protect fishermen from such trouble as you now suffer were unavailing.”

Every one knows now that the other counsels which prevailed were not the counsels of my hon. friend beside me (the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) and myself. They were not the counsels of the Government of the Dominion, but they were counsels which frustrated the arrangement entered into between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States, in 1885, which arrangement, to use Mr. Bayard's own expression, was intended to “permit the discussion of a just international settlement of the whole fishery question,” but which arrangement the

Mr. THOMPSON.

hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., to-night denounces as a vacillating policy, stringent one day and surrendering everything the next. Now, the hon. gentleman, as he went on, made this extraordinary statement, that it was not our construction of the Treaty of 1818, but its administration, that was complained of by the United States. Indeed, he so far forgot his brief as to state that the Treaty of 1818 was so plain that there could be no difference of opinion on the question. Let me say to the House, on the responsibility I must take, knowing that every document on this subject is in the hands of the House, that it was upon the construction of the Treaty of 1818 that every struggle has been made between the two Governments for the last twenty five years. The question always arose upon the administration of the law, of course, because if we do not administer the law nobody could be offended, and the construction of the treaty could not be called in question. But every time we took a step to administer the law—to keep United States fishermen out of our waters, to prevent them from buying bait and supplies, or to prevent their transshipping cargoes, or anything of that kind, the question came up whether we were justified in that by the true interpretation of the Treaty of 1818. The House must forgive me if I recapitulate some of the arguments, because, after some things we have heard, I must suppose that they have faded from the memory of some, that they have faded for an hour or two at all events. We would imagine that the treaty alluded to the mere question of fishing, and had nothing to do with the exclusion of United States fishermen, except when they came in for the purpose of fishing. Every kind of interpretation was put on that prohibition. It was contended that it must be interpreted in the light of the circumstances, and that a flood of light has been thrown on it by the changes in trade and intercourse between the two countries since 1818, including the repeal of the navigation laws. Then, we were told that the interpretation must bend to the change which has taken place since 1818 by the modification of the commercial policy of Great Britain, especially in regard to the introduction of the bonded system, and that all the changes which from time to time are weaving these two nations together commercially must modify the interpretation of that Treaty of 1818. But I will not weary the House. I will ask the House to look at the letter of Mr. Phelps, the United States Minister in London, on which I had the honor to make a report to His Excellency. I need not read it to you, because you will remember that the hon. gentleman says: “I agree with every statement and every argument contained in the report of the Minister of Justice,” and yet that report, which the hon. gentleman says he concurs in from A to Z, was an argument on the interpretation of the Treaty of 1818, and on nothing else. The hon. gentleman has also stated to the House that it was most improper that the custom laws should have been enforced against United States fishing vessels, in order to aid the carrying out of the Treaty of 1818. If you will remember the hon. gentleman says he concurred with every word in my report, and if you think it worth while to turn up my report, you will find at least two chapters of it devoted to showing, not only that it is our right but that it is our duty to enforce the customs laws in that respect. The hon. gentleman has said that the particular fault he finds with our administration of the law is that it was capricious, and he went so far, at one stage of his argument, as to call it an anti-civilised policy. I have only this to say, and I say it in the presence of gentlemen who have had more years of experience in the consideration of the question than I have had of life, that the records show that the administration of the Treaty of 1818, and of the Customs laws in connection with it, has been steady and consistent from 1818 to 1887, with this exception, that for the last three or four years the treaty has been more

leniently and carefully administered than it was in the earlier years of its existence. The hon. gentleman has evidently forgotten the history of the question, but I may be permitted to remind him that in the very year the treaty was adopted, vessels were seized and condemned merely for entering British American waters, and that year after year—of course I except from the calculation the years during which the Reciprocity Treaty prevailed, and the Washington Treaty prevailed, and the licensing system prevailed at the instance of the Imperial Government, for those were periods when a different system of law was invoked—at any time when this question was governed by the Treaty of 1818, its administration was quite as severe and quite as exacting as it has been during the last three or four years, and even more so. The hon. gentleman said that we put, out of a pure jingo policy, the amendment of 186 upon the Statute-book, by which it was provided that the mere entry of fishing vessels of the United States into Canadian waters was to result in the forfeiture of the vessel; and he said that, for 70 years, the treaty had been carried out and administered rigidly enough, and no such law had been required. It was not required, because what we put on the Statute-book in 1836 was simply what had been uniformly carried out from 1818 to 1886 without such an Act. It was always assumed, even in the courts of law, that the entering by an American fishing vessel in defiance of a treaty would result in the forfeiture of the vessel and the cargo, and we were only putting on the Statute-book in 1836 what had been the view of the law acted on from the earliest times, with the exception that the seizures in earlier times were made by British gunboats and British vessels of war, and that lately they have been made by Canadian revenue cutters. Let me refer the hon. gentleman and those who agree with him as to its being a just matter of complaint that we have enforced the Customs laws against United States vessels, to a consideration of what the Customs laws of the United States are. They require that every vessel entering, whether voluntarily or by stress of weather, the waters of the United States, shall report within 24 hours, and a vessel is liable to a penalty of \$400 if she attempts to depart from those waters without having reported at the Customs. It matters not whether she is a fishing vessel, it matters not whether she has been driven in by a gale, or whether she has been towed in, as an act of mercy, by salvors; she must be reported at the customs, and if she attempts to depart without reporting, she is liable to a penalty of \$400. What will the House think after the criticisms which have been addressed to it with regard to the enforcement of the custom laws, when I tell them that by the decision of the Administration of the United States, within the last two years, fishing vessels resorting to United States ports for supplies have been fined in heavy penalties because they had attempted to depart without reporting at the customs? Yet, notwithstanding that, the hon. gentleman declares that this policy which Canada undertook to adopt, enforcing the customs laws, which we have no power to mitigate, which are binding just as much upon us as they are upon the humblest man in this country, which it was our solemn duty to administer as long as Parliament chose to leave them upon the Statute-book—he declares that in the administration of those customs laws we were guilty of an anti-civilised policy, whilst the 60,000,000 of freemen to whom he refers were guilty of no such act at all in fining humble fishing smacks that attempted to depart without reporting at the customs, when they came in to purchase supplies. I do not make this contrast for the purpose of condemning that act. The necessity which exists in Canada for the enforcement of the customs laws, to prevent illicit trading by such vessels as were entitled to run into every creek and inlet upon our coast for shelter over night, and for provisions and supplies, for wood and water, the necessity for carrying out the revenue laws strictly with regard

to these vessels, is as great in Canada as it is in the United States, and is as fully recognised in the United States in practice as it is in Canada to-day. But it suits the party purposes of a gentleman who wants to make an attack upon the Government, to say that this was an anti-civilised policy calculated to drive 60,000,000 of our neighbors into a state of warfare. Now, the hon. gentleman has declared that all the Americans have contended for has been fully conceded, that this treaty contains not one concession on the part of the United States, and that everything has been conceded on the part of Canada. I venture to disagree with him. I support this treaty, not because it contains no concessions on the part of Canada, but because it contains fair concessions on the part of Canada, and fair and liberal concessions on the part of the United States. Sir, nobody expected, when the Minister of Finance and his fellow plenipotentiaries went to Washington, that he was going to bring back any enormous concessions for the fishermen of Canada. Did any of our fishermen expect it? We were administering the laws strictly in their favor, we were keeping the inshore fisheries for them, we were preventing poaching, we were preventing illicit trading, we were carrying out the law as strictly as we could; and knowing that, they were resting their right upon the Treaty of 1818. It was a familiar expression among them—I allude to the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces—when they saw that they were protected in the enjoyment of their rights to the inshore fisheries, and that consequently they were able to compete on fair terms in the markets of the United States, in spite of the duty, the remark they made, time and again, became almost proverbial, that they wanted no better treaty than they had. The only necessity that existed for a treaty was the fact that our neighbors alongside of us were dissatisfied with the construction which we put upon the Treaty for 1818. They felt that they had a grievance, and it was most desirable, in the interest of harmony, and trade, and peace between the two countries, that this feeling should be at once and forever removed. If we have removed it by making concessions, which have not been injurious to the interests of the fishermen of Canada, I ask if any member of this House will say that the Government was wrong in doing so, or that Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries erred. No, Sir, I say that if we were able by sacrificing anything connected either with the administration of the law, or the construction of the law, which would not prejudice the rights or imperil the industries of the fishermen of Canada, we were bound to do it, in the interests of harmony between the two countries, and it was our duty to do it in view of our relations to the Empire of which we form a part. But will the House reflect upon this, that after the hon. gentleman had spoken for two hours, declaring every ten minutes that this was an entire surrender on the part of Canada, that the treaty was a list of concessions on the part of Canada, he sat down without showing one single instance in which the humblest toiler of the sea would be injured in his pursuits by this treaty? Now, Sir, if this question has been removed from the list of irritating grievances which existed between the two countries, if the relations between the two countries have been put upon such a fair footing that we have the assurance of the Administration of the United States, expressed on the floor of this House through the Finance Minister, that the time is rapidly approaching when trade concessions such as the fishermen desire with regard to free fish, will be granted to them, and in the mean time, after having removed the grievances, we have done the fishermen no wrong, they will have no reason to be dissatisfied with the treaty, with the plenipotentiaries who negotiated it, or with the Parliament that will ratify it. Now, the hon. gentleman referred to a report which I had the honor to make to His Excellency in this connection, in which I ventured to criticise the argument which had

been addressed by Mr. Phelps to Her Majesty's Minister, in which I addressed myself to this argument: That our construction of the treaty was an unreasonable one, because it precluded American fishing vessels entering for trivial purposes, such as for a surgeon in case of sickness or injury, to post a letter, to buy a rope, &c. I endeavored to meet that by the argument that the treaty might as well be repealed if, upon every pretext, no matter how small and frivolous, one of these vessels had a right to enter our waters, notwithstanding the prohibition contained in the treaty, and that the prohibition contained in the treaty amounted to nothing, if it could be frittered away altogether by any master of a fishing smack pretending that he wanted to post a letter. In reference to this argument the hon. gentleman has declared that this treaty has conceded that which I said might as well result in the repeal of the prohibition contained in the Treaty of 1818. Now, what I was arguing against, as the House will remember, if it remembers the paper at all, was this: That for American fishing vessels that are pursuing their advocations along our coasts, to have the right to come in for any such purposes as those trivial purposes that were mentioned, would fritter away the prohibition of the treaty; and what is conceded in the treaty is not that they shall have the right to come in every time they want a physician, every time they want to post a letter, every time they want to buy a piece of rope, but that they shall have the right to come and purchase supplies when they are upon the homeward voyage, and when they have received a license to purchase the article which they desire to purchase for the homeward voyage. And yet the hon. gentleman confounds the things that have been conceded by this treaty, with those which I said might as well result in the repeal of the Treaty of 1818. But, Sir, what is the burden of all his complaint? After declaring that we had surrendered everything and got nothing in return, when the hon. gentleman sought to address himself to the one point that was worthy at all of his attention, if he wanted to discuss the merits of this question, namely, what concession we had given which was injurious to our people, he was compelled to say that the concession we made we ought to have made long ago. Then it comes to this, Sir, that the hon. gentleman, standing upon the floor of this House for nearly two hours in this debate, denounces this Government in unmeasured terms for having made a string of concessions which he thinks we ought to have made long ago. They are not, I admit, the concessions which the hon. gentleman would have made; they are not the concessions which the hon. gentleman rose in this House and asked us to make. No, Sir, the concessions he desired to have made were not those opposed to an anti-civilised policy, but they were free fishing upon our coasts, that was what he wanted to throw into any negotiation which should be made with the United States. But when after 1855, when by what Mr. Bayard admits in the extract I have read to the House to be the generous action of the Canadian Government, we had thrown open our fisheries upon the promise of the President of the United States that he would recommend to Congress the appointment of a commission to settle this whole question, and when the President in good faith made his recommendation to Congress, in terms as broad as promised, and when Congress spurned that recommendation, I should like to know what member of the House would have been able as long and as loudly as the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to have denounced the Government and denounced my colleague in the Department of Marine and Fisheries if we had failed to enforce strictly the Treaty of 1818. Why, Sir, strict as it was and rigid as it was, I very much mistake my recollection if the hon. gentleman did not in the very short period during which he addressed the House upon the subject within the last year or two denounce the protection we had given as not half strict enough and as a

Mr. THOMPSON.

sham, and declare time and time again that he would hold the Government responsible for the want of further protection. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has only one fault to find with us after all, and that is that when we were met by the United States in a conciliatory spirit, when we found they were willing to make concessions and when asked to make concessions ourselves, and having been willing to make what the hon. gentleman thinks we should have made long before—we should have stepped out of office and allowed him and his friends to come in. In this instance, I give the hon. gentleman credit for entire candor. I believe the hon. gentleman was stating the real objection which exists in his mind; but it did not occur to my hon. friend that if we had changed our minds and had been at last willing to make those concessions, which he thought we should have made long before, he, at least to be patriotic and consistent, should have supported us in making them. Now, the hon. gentleman is particular to ask why it was that no concession on the part of the United States was pointed out. Well, Sir, the Minister of Finance put the position very candidly before the House. Ever since this treaty has been negotiated it has certainly not been in the interest of Canada to declare that it was a great boon to this country. I do not assert to-night that it is a great boon to Canada, I assert simply my belief that it is a fair arrangement between the representatives of two honorable nations sitting down to make a peaceful, honorable compromise of their rights; and I say the United States plenipotentiaries met us in the same spirit in which Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries met them, and they have made liberal and fair concessions, which I am not to boast of to-night, which we are not to exult over, which it would be folly to exult over, because they are simply concessions which any honorable negotiators would have made in view of the whole question. Does the hon. gentleman forget that the great strife between the Government of the United States and the Government of Great Britain on this question was on three or four crucial points? Does he forget that our right to prohibit vessels from coming in to buy bait was challenged? Does he forget that it was denied that we had the right to prevent them coming for transshipping cargoes? Does he forget that it was denied that we had the right to prevent them from shipping crews? Does the hon. gentleman forget that these were the crucial points on which the whole controversy turned and that the result of the action of the Canadian Government, the energetic remonstrances of the Canadian Government and the exposition of the rights of Canada by my colleague who sits behind me was that when this matter and these reports were laid before the Crown officers of England we were so fully sustained that Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for the Colonies advised us that there were no two opinions in England on the subject of our rights. In the treaty which the hon. gentleman has been denouncing as a disgraceful surrender there is no miserable carping and quibbling over these rights, there is no attempt to depart from the provisions contained in the Treaty of 1818, there is no pettifogging attempt to evade that treaty, which, while it gave large territorial rights to the United States fishermen, preserved the rights of the British American people. Instead of denying our contentions on the points which I stated, viz, as to the right to purchase those articles, the right to tranship cargo and the right to ship a crew, it has been conceded that those rights are rights which are to be negotiated for and which are to be purchased on fair and equitable terms hereafter by the authorities of the United States. That surely is, if not a concession, at least an adjustment, on terms which are distinctly honorable to the people and the Government of Canada. Let me ask the hon. gentleman to consider whether the principles contained in the delimitation clause are not a fair concession on both sides. I meet his statement as to what our rights in regard

to the headlands were by admitting that the doctrines which he referred to were the doctrines which were found in the text books and in the despatches down to 25 years ago. I admit that it was not contended then that we were limited in our territorial rights as regards bays, to bays merely of the width of ten miles. But the hon. gentleman knows that for upwards of thirty years that prohibition has not been carried out; it was abandoned by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), as well as by his successors in that department, who stated in every instance, that while asserting that they preserve and reserve the right, they in practice could not enforce it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Tell me why?

Mr. THOMPSON. I will tell the hon. gentleman why. When my colleague, the Minister of Finance, made the statement which I am doing but little more than repeating, the hon. member for Northumberland seemed to think that it was intended to cast some imputation on him as to his administration of the Department. Such is not the case. The reason why the hon. gentleman could not enforce the ten-mile limit was that Her Majesty's Government would not permit the Government of Canada to do so.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not denying our right, but State interests prevented them doing so.

Mr. THOMPSON. Declaring that they reserved the right and that it might be pressed at another time, but at that time refusing to allow it to be enforced. Why? The hon. gentleman says for State reasons. The principal cause was that to enforce that doctrine strictly, to the largest extent, would in all probability involve a collision between either Her Majesty's vessels and the fishing vessels of the United States or our revenue cutters and American fishing vessels. When the British Government declined, and perhaps wisely declined, to enforce that doctrine to its fullest extent in the interest of peace and harmony, of course neither the hon. gentleman himself nor any of his successors could venture to take the responsibility of enforcing seizures outside of the three-mile limit and therefore the statement did not impute blame upon the hon. gentleman nor did it in the least degree derogate from the strength of the argument. This right had not existed in practice for the last twenty-five years. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), referred to a despatch of Mr. Everett in which an expression was used slightly favoring the English doctrine as to the headland question.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Mr. Webster, not Everett.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, Mr. Webster. The hon. gentleman cited that from memory to the House in words which I was careful to note.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I read the quotation.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman did read it, but afterwards, in making his argument upon it, he cited it in these words: He said that "Mr. Webster had admitted that to be the proper construction of the treaty." Now, what Mr. Webster says was that "by a strict and rigid construction of this article that result might follow," but he declared in the concluding paragraph that the construction thus put on the treaty "is not conformable to the intention of the contracting parties."

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I read that. The hon. gentleman will permit me to say that the quotation he now makes appears in the first part, that it did not coincide with the intention of the parties and that the intentions of the parties are not expressed as they are intended in that treaty.

Mr. THOMPSON. I shall not say whether the hon. gentleman read it or not. I do not pretend to remember that, but I am glad to know that he is aware that those

words, strongly qualifying the opinion, are in the despatch, and I am sure that after what I have said, if the hon. gentleman undertook to repeat it from memory again, he would not make the statement that Mr. Webster admitted that that was the proper construction of the treaty.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Certainly I would.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman says he would I shall not further attempt to argue with him. I said that with regard to this question of the headlands it was one of the cases in which there was a fair concession upon both sides. We gave up the extreme English contention; correct as I believe it to be, acquiesced in as it is by some eminent American authorities, and we need not quarrel about what Mr. Webster said, for the doctrine is supported by abler jurists than he is, such as Chancellor Kent, Judge Story and other men of that calibre. We need not quarrel about that. The question is how far the English doctrine was carried out in practice. When the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was at the head of the Fishery Department he issued instructions which did not go beyond the ten-mile rule, nor was it necessary. There is no necessity in the protection of the fisheries of Canada that our cruisers should sail far out at sea molesting American vessels in places where mackerel are not caught or rarely if at all. The hon. gentleman defined his restriction to bays not more than ten miles wide, and the instructions, moderate as they were, had subsequently to be modified, and we were instructed only to enforce the exclusion as to bays six miles wide. Now the result of this treaty is that the construction which Canada asked, the construction which Canada proposed to put upon the Treaty of 1818, by the instructions which she desired to have issued but was not able to have enforced under the administration of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is the construction adopted by the plenipotentiaries, only that they have enlarged it so as to give us some bays which are a great deal more than ten miles wide. No one will contend, nor would it be candid, to say that we have triumphed over the American negotiators in that particular.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No. I guess not.

Mr. THOMPSON. It was an arrangement perfectly fair and equitable to both sides and when the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says: "No, I guess not," he wants the House to understand that if he had only had the negotiation of this treaty he would have excluded the American fishing vessels from all bays of heaven knows how wide. Can the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who is so wise on this subject, inform me which of the bays in Canada we ought have drawn the line across?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will tell the hon. gentleman at the proper time.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is a very liberal concession, largely conceding to Canada, not only as to the closing of bays not more than ten miles wide, but as to the closing of the other enumerated bays. For that concession, we make a concession it is true of Bay St. George, but I should like the hon. gentleman to name at his own sweet will and proper time, in what respect it is that this is an unfair concession on the part of Canada or not a reasonable concession on the part of the United States.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I will tell the hon. gentleman to-morrow.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) after an hour and a half at least of a complaint against Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries for having made this long list of concessions and for having given up the headlands and the bays and for giving up everything else in Canada to the Americans, it was amusing to hear the hon. gentle-

man find fault with the plenipotentiaries for having reserved a bay in Prince Edward Island that we did not want at all. He declared that Egmont Bay never had an American fishing vessel in it and that it was preposterous to reserve it. After complaining that we had given up so much it was really a slight consolation to know that there is one thing we had reserved that we ought not to have kept. Now, Sir, as regards the argument which the hon. gentleman made in reference to the Strait of Canso, I do not suppose it will be necessary for me to say very much after the explanation which the Minister of Finance has given. The delimitation which is stipulated for in the first treaty would have had the effect of closing the Strait of Canso. One may reasonably conjecture that Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries were faced by this question: They might well be asked by the United States plenipotentiaries, whether, by the delimitation that was proposed by Her Majesty's Government, let me remind the House as long ago as 1866 and repeated once or twice since in view of settling this headland question and removing it from controversy—whether they could make use of that delimitation to exclude American fishing vessels for the first time from the Strait of Canso? If Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries were faced with that question it would be reasonable they should insert in the treaty a provision with that delimitation, that nothing in the treaty should preclude American fishing vessels from navigating the Strait of Canso? We have heard the hon. gentleman's opinion that that is a concession of a right for all time to come. I think it is not a concession of a right to American fishing vessels, but it is a reservation of whatever claim they may have, notwithstanding anything contained in this treaty. In respect to the Strait of Canso there are no words of grant, no words of concession at all, it is simply a reservation that that treaty shall affect that question and that is all it amounts to. But when the hon. gentleman puts it, not only that it is a concession of a right for all time to come to American fishing vessels but, to use his own words, to all American vessels—and I presume that that was an unintentional exaggeration—when he made that mistake, I felt inclined to ask him, referring back to the rigorous administration of this treaty in its earlier years, when it was much more vigorously enforced than it is now, going back even to the time when there was no Treaty of 1818, but when the war of 1812 was over, and when things were carried with such a high hand against the United States fishing vessels, that they were seized if they came within sixty miles of our coast, what day or hour was the Strait of Canso ever closed against American fishing vessels? The Strait of Canso has always been, and I presume always will be, open to vessels of commerce and vessels of peace, and it is in the interest of Canada that it should be kept so; and while in that respect there is no concession made on the face of the treaty, but simply a declaration that the treaty shall not affect that subject, I should not for one be afraid to commit myself to the larger concession which the hon. gentleman thinks is involved in its being kept open for the passage of fishing vessels for all time to come. But that has not been asked or conceded, for the reason, I presume, that to close the Strait would only be to borrow for the moment and only for the moment, for I will give it back to him, the hon. gentleman's own phrase—a policy of anti-civilisation. The hon. gentleman has said that the freedom from reporting at customs, and the exemption from pilotage dues and harbor dues, are concessions. It is admitted they are; does he say they are unreasonable? No, he says those privileges ought to have been given up long ago; and I should have liked the hon. gentleman, after censuring the Government for its undue strictness in carrying out the law, to inform the House what amount of pilotage and harbor dues were collected in Canada under the Treaty of 1818, or under any other treaty or law, from United States fishing vessels during the last

Mr. THOMPSON.

ten or fifteen years? Now, the hon. gentleman made a singular objection to one section of the treaty which provides that under certain circumstances and on certain conditions American fishing vessels in distress may tranship their cargoes; and the hon. gentleman, although I dare say he had the words of the clause in his mind, and intended to state them correctly, unwittingly stated them very differently from what they were. The hon. gentleman stated that once a person got a license—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I rise to a word of explanation. The hon. gentleman has three times misquoted me; but this time I wish to say I read the words from the Treaty distinctly from the beginning to end as they are.

Mr. THOMPSON. I have not at any time misquoted the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, you have three times, and you put a word in my mouth that I never used—anti-civilisation.

Mr. THOMPSON. I did not misquote the hon. gentleman before, and this time I did not quote him at all; he interrupted me just as I was about to quote him. I do not understand why the hon. gentleman interrupted me, and claim that I was going to misquote him unless he was conscious that he had unwittingly made a mistake in quoting the clause.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman said so.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think so.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) You distinctly said so.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think I did, but it is a matter of no consequence whether the hon. gentleman read the clause or not; that is not the point I was coming to, and the hon. gentleman rose altogether too soon. I was about to give him credit for, perhaps, having read the clause. I said that no doubt he had it distinctly in his mind and intended to state it fairly to the House, but unwittingly had not done so. The hon. gentleman says he read the clause to the House, and I will not contradict it; but the hon. gentleman did base an argument on it afterwards, in which he quoted and did not read the clause, and it is of that quotation that I complain. The quotation and the argument of which I complain is that the language of the treaty is such that if a United States fishing vessel, meeting with so slight a casualty as the loss, I think the hon. gentleman said of a rope yarn, came into our ports, it could tranship its cargo. I will admit that the hon. gentleman read the clause, because he says he did, although I do not remember it. Let me read it:

“Any United States fishing vessel entering the ports, bays and harbors of the eastern and north-eastern coasts of Canada under stress or weather or in consequence of any casualty, may unload, reload, tranship or sell (subject to Customs laws and regulations) all fish on board—”

Not when they have lost a rope yarn, not when they have only to post a letter, or want a physician, or meet with any trifling accident, such as the loss of a spare rope.

“—when such unloading, transhipment or sale is necessary as incidental to repairs.”

I am sure the hon. gentleman in stating the argument on the question which he did, must have misconceived the clause. Now, after this treaty is adopted as I hope it may be, there may at some time be a misconception of the meaning of this clause, and if an American fisherman losing a rope yarn were to come into port and insisting that he had a right to tranship his cargo, we should find him citing the authority of the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. I hope, therefore, he will rise and admit that he gave that opinion hastily.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman want me to state now? With his usual fair play he has stated

that I said that if there was a loss of a rope yarn, the master of the ship would come within the section. In my statement I did not use the word "rope yarn" at all. I said "bowsprit," and an hon. gentleman sitting in front of me suggested "or a rope yarn," and I said "yes, or a rope yarn." He might contend that he was within the section, and he knew nobody who could control his contention, but that was a matter entirely for construction.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman had made the statement before that he has made now, I would not have had so much to say on the subject.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Exactly.

Mr. THOMPSON. I repeat exactly; but the only point in which I must modify what I have said is as to the word "rope yarn." It came from his colleague in front of him, and I thought it was from himself. "Bowsprit" will do me just as well. His contention is correct this far, that if an American fishing vessel having lost her bowsprit comes into our ports she has a right to tranship her cargo if transhipment is necessary as incidental to repairs. I shall not pretend to say the circumstances under which the loss of a bowsprit and the tearing away of a part of the vessel might, under those circumstances, justify the transhipment of a cargo. It is sufficient for me that, by the plain words of the treaty, it must be necessarily incidental to repairs, that the vessel has to unload her cargo, before she can have the right to tranship her cargo, and that from the way in which the hon. gentleman put it, at the suggestion of his colleague in front of him, a rope yarn was just as good as his own argument about the bowsprit. In referring to the latter part of the section—I shall not say whether the hon. gentleman read the section or not, because I do not remember—he contended that United States fishing vessels would have the right to contend for the purchase of bait as well as supplies. But the hon. gentleman might have called our attention to the fact that the treaty says:

"Such supplies and provisions as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels."

And I do not think bait is an article ordinarily sold to trading vessels.

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) I think you were wrong in your quotation; you will have to read that again.

Mr. THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has declared that nobody is to be a judge as to the cases of necessity. Let me ask the hon. gentleman how a treaty can possibly be framed unless it is possible for somebody to ask who is to decide? Surely, in the language of Mr. Bayard, we look to good faith on the part of the two Governments. The United States will certainly expect, and they have the right to expect, that in the administration of this treaty we shall be fair and even generous; and that when a vessel really requires to unload a cargo, in order to repair, we shall not exercise any extremely nice discrimination against her as to the nature of her injuries; but when the hon. gentleman tells us that somebody else has to decide, I say it is always so with every treaty. Let me ask him in relation to the Treaty of 1818, which he admires so much, what tribunal was established to interpret its provisions, and whether we have not been quarrelling over its interpretation for nearly half a century? I have only one remark more to make besides apologising to the House for the great length of their time I have taken. My last remark will be with reference to the hon. gentleman's statement that had we conceded all these points long ago we would have occupied a better position to-day. Well, I do not want to say anything boastful with respect to the protection of the fisheries, and with respect to the vigilance and care with which my colleague has administered his department in that regard; but I claim that great care, vigilance, caution and strict-

ness were required in the administration of the treaty and the custom laws, and have been observed, and necessarily so, for a number of years past. We have been dealing with a class of people who, in the pursuit of an innocent vocation, have little regard for the strict territorial rights of their neighbors, people who, in the pursuit of fishing have as little compunction about crossing an imaginary three-mile line as a sportsman has, in the pursuit of his game, in crossing his neighbor's property. Dealing with people like these, who come up to our shores frequently in large fleets, required, in order that the fisheries of Canada and the revenue be protected, great vigilance and care on the part of the Government. If the Government had not protected the fisheries as they have, with vigilance and even strictness, instead of occupying the proud position we occupy to-day, we should have had no treaty on the Table, we should have had no concessions to make, we should have received no concessions in return, our fishermen would not have fared as well as they have during the past few years, our fisheries would not have been as valuable as they are to-day, and neither the United States nor any other country would have thought it worth their while to go through the solemnities of negotiating and making a treaty in regard to fisheries which the owners thought so little of that they did not take the trouble to administer the laws of their own country for their protection.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.55 a. m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 11th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 97) to amend the Act to incorporate the Board of Management of the Church and Manse Building Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, for Manitoba and the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Daly.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Although I have given notice of motion of this as being a Government notice of motion, I would move, with the consent of the House, that the Government business should take precedence every Thursday, after Questions put by Members. I think I can appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite to assist the Government to carry this resolution. For the last three weeks we have been discussing a very important question, and the Government, in order to expedite the discussion and decision of that question, gave up all their days. I think, therefore, the next six Thursdays might be returned to us as a mere matter of honesty.

Mr. LAURIER. As the last three weeks' discussion has been far more profitable to the Opposition than the Government, we can afford, on that ground, to be generous, and I have no objection to the motion provided it does not apply to to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then you ought to give us next Monday.

Mr. LAURIER. We will not say anything about that now, but deal only with the Thursdays.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD moved :

"That Government business shall have precedence every Thursday, commencing 19th instant, during the present Session, after Questions put by Members."

Motion agreed to.

REFUND OF HAY DUTIES BY THE UNITED STATES.

Mr LAVERGNE asked, Has any action been taken by the Government, or any members thereof, with the view of helping exporters of hay to the United States, to obtain the refund of the duty improperly levied on them by the Customs authorities of the United States; and if so, has any conclusion been reached?

Mr. THOMPSON. That matter is more particularly under the care of the Minister of Finance, but, in his absence, I may state that action has been taken by the Government and some of its members individually with respect to these claims. Representations were made by the Government officially to the Government of the United States with respect to them, and, when some members of the Government visited Washington in the early part of last winter, the Minister of Finance and myself had an interview with the Secretary of the Treasury, in which we endeavored to the best of our ability to press the reasonableness of these claims on the attention of Mr. Fairchild, but the result was that Mr. Fairchild stated that it was entirely out of the power of the Government of the United States, or any of its Departments, to give the relief applied for, principally because the claimants had not availed themselves of the remedies provided by the law of the United States, and had allowed the time to pass by during which they could obtain redress; and consequently, except by an Act of Congress, he could not give them relief. Consequently, recollecting the lapse of time and the number of cases of a like character which would be pressed upon them, he declined to give us any expectation that an application to Congress would be successful. At any rate, the conclusion is that the application must be made to the Congress of the United States by the individuals who have been aggrieved, for an appropriation.

ACCOMMODATION FOR IMMIGRANTS AT REGINA.

Mr. DAVIN asked, Whether the Government is aware that the accommodation for immigrants at Regina is insufficient?

Mr. CARLING. I am very glad indeed to know that a much larger number of immigrants are going into the North-West Territories this spring than anticipated; and as to the question of the hon. member for Assiniboia, I may say that I have caused some enquiries to be made in the matter referred to, and have taken such temporary steps as are likely to be sufficient for present necessities.

POSTMASTER AT ARKONA, LAMBTON COUNTY.

Mr. LISTER asked, Has George M. Everest resigned the postmastership at Arkona, in the County of Lambton, or has he been dismissed? If dismissed, what were the reasons for his dismissal? Were such reasons communicated to him before or since his dismissal? Has a successor been appointed? What is his name?

Mr. McLELAN. Everest has been removed from the postmastership of Arkona for the reason that he had established for some considerable time a business at Forest,

Mr. LAURIER.

to which he gave all his attention, attending there the entire week, as was reported by the inspector, and only visiting Arkona on Saturday night and staying over Sunday, leaving the management of the office in the hands of others, who, the inspector reported, did not discharge the duties very efficiently. Robert Davitt has been appointed in his place.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman has not answered the last part of the question, "Were such reasons communicated to him before or since his dismissal?"

Mr. McLELAN. They were communicated, I understand, before I took charge of the department. There was a complaint against him.

WINTER STEAM NAVIGATION BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is the Government aware that Mr. C. F. Hannington, C.E., of the Central Railway, New Brunswick, is now in Prince Edward Island, with the view of ascertaining the practicability of keeping up winter steam navigation between West Point, P.E.I., and Richibucto, N.B.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries is concerned, I have no knowledge of Mr. Hannington being engaged as intimated.

TIGNISH AND MIMINIGASH BREAKWATERS.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates to repair the Tignish and Miminigash Breakwaters?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to answer the hon. gentleman now. I think he will have to wait until the Supplementary Estimates come down.

ALBERTON HARBOR, P.E.I.

Mr. PERRY asked, Is it the intention of the Government to continue, during the season of 1888, the blasting a rock with the view of deepening the harbor at Alberton, P.E.I.?

Sir HECTOR LANGENIN. I think the hon. gentleman will find the answer in the ordinary Estimates which are before the House.

MAILS BETWEEN FORT MACLEOD AND PINCHER CREEK, N.W.T.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether there is a mail service between Fort Macleod and Pincher Creek, North-West Territory? Is it a daily mail, or what? What is the distance, and who has the contract for carrying the mail? What amount per month or year is paid for the service? Were tenders asked for? In what way, and when published? How many tenders were received? The name of each party tendering, and date of tender?

Mr. McLELAN. There is a mail service between Fort Macleod and Pincher Creek. It is weekly at present, but I have been making enquiries for the last month or two as to the advisability of making it semi-weekly, and perhaps in a short time we may issue advertisements calling for tenders. The distance is 32 miles. Mr. Ives has the contract for carrying the mails at a sum of \$570 a year. Tenders were not asked for, but a temporary arrangement was made by the local inspector without tenders.

RICHARD MONCK.

Mr. LISTER asked, Is Richard Monck in the employ of the Government? If so, in what capacity, and at what salary?

Mr. CARLING. It is rather difficult to answer the question the hon. gentleman has asked, as there may be a number of Richard Moncks in the employ of the Government. If he would particularise the place, we might be able to answer him.

Mr. LISTER. Of Chatham.

Mr. CARLING. Richard Monck, of Chatham, is not in the employ of the Government.

DISMISSAL OF DEBATES TRANSLATORS.

Mr. LAURIER. I now rise to bring up the question of privilege of which I gave notice a few days ago, in reference to the dismissal by you, Mr. Speaker, of some of the officers of the House. The last time it was brought up by me, it was understood that it would be taken up again after the close of the debate on reciprocity, and I think no more fitting opportunity will offer than this. I desire to bring this question before the House in order to test the action by which you have discharged what you considered to be your duty as Speaker of this House, in dismissing and depriving the House of the services of three of the officers whom the House had appointed for its convenience and service. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I regret exceedingly that I feel myself obliged, in the discharge of what I conceive to be my duty, as a member of this House, to bring this matter up. Certainly, I think it is the duty of everyone in this House to endeavor to support the Chair in any decision given by the Chair; but if one finds himself obliged conscientiously to differ from the view which the Chair may have taken, it is only right that an opportunity should at once be given to test the question, to see whether the Speaker, under the circumstances, properly or improperly exercised his duty. In this instance, I must say at once that, in my humble judgment, at least, it seems to me that you have taken an erroneous view of the duty with which you were charged in your position as Speaker. I regret it all the more, because it seems to me that the step which you felt it your duty to take was one of extreme hardship to the officers who were dismissed. The officers who were dismissed from the service of the House were Ernest Tremblay, Rémi Tremblay, and A. E. Poirier. All three were translators of the debates of this House. Mr. Ernest Tremblay was appointed by an order of this House, upon a report of the Debates Committee, in the year 1884; Mr. Rémi Tremblay was appointed in the same manner in the month of February, 1884, and Mr. A. E. Poirier—

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Eudore Poirier.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend knows him better than I do, perhaps—Mr. Eudore Poirier was appointed in the same manner in the month of April, 1884. As to the competence of these men, I do not believe that a word of complaint can be uttered; I believe that it is the opinion of everybody that in the discharge of these duties they were most efficient officers of this House. In fact the complaint which was made against them is not in reference to their services as officers of this House, but the charge is that they went out of their proper sphere of action and grossly insulted some members of this House. The charge was brought forward by my hon. friend, the Secretary of State, in a letter dated the 22nd May, 1887. I will not read it all, but I will read the gist of the facts of which the hon. gentleman complains. After naming the officers, he says:

"These officials acted with indescribable violence at the last electoral campaign; both on the hustings and in the press wrote and spoke in regard to me, things so offensive and calumnious that I could neither speak to them nor salute them in this House, and I say sincerely that their presence within the precincts of this House is for me a nuisance which, it appears to me, no one has a right to subject a member of Parliament."

This charge is corroborated by my hon. friend for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), so far as Mr. Rémi Tremblay is concerned. In a letter a few days later also addressed to you, the hon. member made a particular charge against Mr. Rémi Tremblay. He states in conclusion:

"His presence is distasteful to me, I cannot have any communication with him, and I ask that he be dismissed from the service of the House of Commons."

Upon receipt of these complaints, you, Sir, very properly referred them to the officers themselves for their answer. They sent you their answers, and you afterwards sent the whole correspondence to the chairman of the Debates Committee. The Debates Committee investigated the matter and came to the conclusion that it had better be left in your hands to be dealt with. They reported to the House, but that report never was taken up, it never was even moved in the House. It must be regretted that this report was not considered by the House, because then the whole matter could have been dealt with by the House upon its merits, and the House could have determined at once whether these gentlemen had been guilty of such an offence as warranted their dismissal. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to enter into the merits of the charges which are brought against these officers, except in so far as it may be necessary to the end of the motion which I have placed in your hands, and which simply challenges the jurisdiction which you thought proper to exercise in the matter. This, however, I must say, that the officers are accused of having taken an active part in the last electoral campaign. They do not deny that; in their answer they affirm that they did, indeed, take an active part in the election, but they deny that they were guilty of the calumnious language with which they are charged. Now, I must say at once that it seems somewhat singular, and it is, I think, improper, that officers of this House should be allowed to engage actively in politics. I have no hesitation at all in making that statement, but if these gentlemen declare that they took an active part in the political campaign, they also declare that in doing so they had the sanction of this House. They state that the House had appointed the translators of the debates—I am not yet speaking of the other officers of the House, but of the translators only—with the understanding that they should be allowed to take part, not only in political campaigns, but in active politics in all circumstances. This matter came up incidentally in 1884. At that time it was stated, without contradiction from any quarter, that the translators of the debates were permitted to be engaged in active journalism, and, therefore, to engage in politics. On that occasion the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who was a member of the Debates Committee, spoke. I must say that the matter came up upon the question of increasing the salaries of the translators, and the hon. member for Norfolk stated that he was opposed to an increase of salaries, because the translators were actively engaged as newspaper correspondents. He said:

"I felt myself that there was no justification for granting an advance to the translators, most of whom are here acting as newspaper correspondents, and would be here whether they held translators' situations or not."

So it was openly stated on the floor of the House, in 1884, that the translators of the debates, while being officers of this House, were at the same time actively engaged in political work, and writing for the newspapers with which they were connected. On the same occasion the Secretary of State also spoke as follows:—

"We are not to judge of the political qualifications of the reporters and translators of *Hansard*. We should not call up any unpleasant reminiscences of the past, when the question is a competent officer of the House. The only questions that we should consider in the choice of reporters and translators for *Hansard* are those of knowledge, ability and general qualification."

That was the understood doctrine. It was understood that the translators of the debates, as I shall show hereafter, are engaged for no other purpose but to translate the debates. As soon as the Session is over and they have completed their work, they are free, and it was admitted on that occasion that they could dispose of their time in any manner they chose to employ it, in politics or otherwise. However, I must say that the translators of the debates have largely availed themselves of this permission. The staff, at the opening of the present Session, was composed of eight members: Mr. Beaulieu, the chief; Messrs. Bouchard, Lasalle, Vanasse, Gélinas, E. Tremblay, R. Tremblay and Poirier, the latter three of whom have been dismissed. In regard to Messrs. Beaulieu and Gélinas, I cannot say whether they are engaged in politics or not, as I have not the honor of their acquaintance. In regard to the other three, I know them very well, and every one of them is actively engaged in politics not only during the election, but from the commencement to the end of each year. Mr. Bouchard belongs to the staff of the *Journal de Québec*, an active ministerial organ published in Quebec, and he is chief editor of that journal, I am told. Mr. Lasalle is on the editorial staff of *Le Monde*, an active ministerial organ published in Montreal. Mr. Vanasse is engaged as editor of another ministerial organ published at Soré, *Le Sorélois*. Not only did those gentlemen engage in politics as much as the three translators who have been dismissed, but they have done much more. Those three translators are only charged with having been engaged in politics during the election; the three other translators I have named are engaged in politics from day to day as active editors of newspapers. Moreover, they all actively engaged in elections. Mr. Vanasse took part in the same campaign in which Messrs. Tremblay and Poirier engaged. I find that on a certain occasion in his own paper, *Le Sorélois*, he reported a meeting in which he had encountered Senator Guévremont, by whom he was attacked for trespassing beyond his duties in taking an active part in politics. But Mr. Vanasse reports in his own paper that at that meeting, held on 20th July, 1886, he had answered the Senator as follows:

“Mr. Vanasse repelled victoriously the disloyal attacks of which he had been the object. He explained that he did not, in any way, depend on the Government, that he had been appointed translator by a Committee of the House of Commons, consisting of Reformers and Conservatives, and that the Government could not deprive him of his position, having no control over the office, but that it could only be done by a vote of the House of Commons.”

So that officer of the House declared what was the common opinion entertained at the time, that he was not an officer of the Government but an officer of the House, and that he was at liberty to engage in politics as he was engaged at that time. It seems to me under such circumstances to be beyond doubt that those dismissed officers were led to believe, and had every reason to believe, that they could do on the Liberal side of politics what other translators could do on the Conservative side, and certainly if you are to apply an equal rule you must say that Messrs. Tremblay and Poirier were no more guilty of trespassing against the privileges of this House than were the three translators on the other side of politics who have been retained. But it will be said that, conceding that they could engage in politics, those translators who have been discharged have been guilty of abusive language, and this charge has been brought against them. It may probably be said that there is no fault found with their taking part in politics if they choose to do so, but they must use polite language. Well, Mr. Speaker, it was the House of Commons which gave the translators permission to engage in politics, but the House could scarcely be expected to hope that they never would be guilty of using abusive language.

Mr. LAURIER.

Hon. members must remember that the translators of the debates for three or four months of the year do nothing else but translate the debates of the House; they become saturated with abusive language, and to expect that they would act differently was to suppose they were different flesh and blood from ourselves. I will say this to hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially to the Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who seem to have been rather thin skinned on the occasion in question, that if they find fault with the translators who engage in politics for having been guilty of abusive language, I call upon the man without offence to throw the first stone, and I do not expect it will come from the other side at all events, and perhaps not from this side. Such being the case, when that is the only charge that was brought against them, these facts must be taken into consideration in dealing with the question. The moment you permit a man, whether he be an officer of the House or a member of Parliament, to take part in politics, you may take it as a logical consequence of the permission given that he will commit abuses in the heat of discussion. If you do not want the officers of the House to use abusive language towards members of Parliament, you must prevent them from engaging in politics, and I think this is the only reasonable course to be pursued. I think it was a most unfortunate course on the part of the House to allow any of its officers to engage actively in politics, either on the hustings or in the columns of newspapers. Coming as you do, Mr. Speaker, from the Province of Quebec, and being, I presume, a diligent reader of the ministerial press, you are aware that the offence with which the translators are charged is not confined to them, and if we were to scan the columns of the newspapers edited by Messrs. Bouchard, Vanasse and Lasalle, we would find just as much abuse in their columns as could be found in the columns embodied in the complaint of the Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Bouchard has not been on the *Journal de Québec* for a year.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, he is on *Le Canada*, published in the city of Ottawa, and my hon. friend cannot undertake to say the reverse. At all events, I can say that at the present moment I am led to understand that Bouchard is an active officer of *Le Canada*. He was at that time on the *Journal de Québec* and had been for several years there up to last year. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the report had come before the House, my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) was prepared with an amendment which would have met the justice of the case. My hon. friend was prepared with an amendment stating that the practice which had prevailed of allowing officers of this House to interfere in politics was not a judicious practice, and that it should be put an end to. This would have at once defined the position and shown that the officers of the House were not expected to interfere at all in politics. I think that position would have been a sound one, and a warning would have been given to those officers which would have amply met the justice of the case. Instead of that, Mr. Speaker, the committee made a report and referred the matter to you. If the report had been adopted by the House, of course the matter would have been at an end, and you would have been perfectly justified in exercising your discretion, but I must say this further, that since you came to the conclusion, whether with authority or without authority, to dismiss those officers, it would have been on your part, a simple act of mercy and justice to dismiss them at once and to inform them at once that their services would not have been required. Instead of that you waited until the 25th of February, that is to say, two days after the opening of the Session, when each of those gentlemen received the following letter:—

"Sir,—The Speaker of the House of Commons has instructed me to tell you that your services as translator of the debates of this House will not be required during the ensuing Session.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"A. MACMAHON,

"Secretary."

As I said a moment ago, I think it would have been an act of mercy, since you made your mind up to dismiss them, to dismiss them immediately after the last Session of Parliament, so that these men might do something else for a living. To my own knowledge, Sir, one or two of those men had no other means of livelihood than the office they occupied in this House. It was, it seems to me, a harsh measure at the opening of the Session, when they had come here to discharge their ordinary duties, to dismiss them in this manner. I do not want now to enter into the merits of the case. The question which I bring before the House is as to whether or not, as Speaker of this House, you have the power which you thought you had, to dismiss them. I understand, as I said already, and this point will not be contradicted, that you could not have acted upon the report of the Debates Committee, since that report never was adopted. As I understand, you think you have the power which you have exercised under section 16, chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, that is the Act referring to the House of Commons and which is as follows:—

"If any complaint or representation is at any time made to the Speaker for the time being of the misconduct or unfitness of any clerk, officer, messenger, or other person attendant on the House of Commons, the Speaker may cause an enquiry to be made into the conduct or fitness of such person; and if thereupon it appears to the Speaker that such person has been guilty of misconduct, or is unfit to hold his situation, the Speaker may, if such clerk, officer, messenger, or other person has been appointed by the Crown, suspend him and report such suspension to the Governor General, and if he has not been appointed by the Crown, the Speaker may suspend or remove such person."

I apprehend that is the section on which you think you had the right. All I have to say with regard to this question is simply this, that the officers of this House who are therein contemplated are not the translators of the debates. The translators of the debates do not come within the purview of this Act. The officers here contemplated are the officers appointed for the service of this House by yourself, and all the officers for the regular service of the House are either appointed by the Crown or by yourself, Mr. Speaker. As far as my knowledge goes, the Clerk of the House is the only officer who is appointed by the Crown. All the other officers, the assistant clerk for instance, are appointed by Mr. Speaker. In England the officers are appointed by the Crown, but this was not always so. It is only since 1856 they are appointed by the Crown, and previous to that they were appointed by the Clerk of the House. In 1856 a Bill was brought in specially with a view of taking that power from the Clerk of the House in the British House of Commons and vesting it in the Crown. Mr. Wilson, who had charge of the Bill in the House of Commons, said:

"He would now move for leave to bring in a Bill to regulate certain offices of the House of Commons. The object of the proposed Bill was: First, to vest in the Crown for the future the appointment of the Assistant and Second Assistant Clerk at the table, instead of having the appointment of those officers vested in the First Clerk, as at present; and secondly, to repeal that clause of the Act which provided that the salary of the Second Assistant Clerk should be charged on the Consolidated Fund."

So that the power was taken by the Crown to appoint those officers who previously had been appointed by the Clerk. I think the power of appointing officers of this House should also have belonged properly to the Clerk, but by a series of measures coming in succession one after the other, all those appointments have been vested in the Speaker, and rule 102 of the House expressly lays it down:

"Before filling any vacancy in the service of the House by the Speaker, enquiry shall be made touching the necessity for the continuance of such office."

So that the Speaker is expressly assured that the power of appointing officers of this House is completely vested in him. I understand very well that under such circumstances the power to appoint is vested in the Speaker, and that the Speaker is responsible to the House of the proper discharge of their duties by those officers. If you have any reason to believe that one of those officers, you yourself have appointed, does not properly discharge his duty, I apprehend that under such circumstances, and no one will contradict it, you have the power of removal. The power of appointing always implies the power of removal, but the power of removal cannot be exercised until there is the power to appoint. That is the point I wish to come to. I submit to the House that you have no authority to remove those officers, because they are not officers appointed by yourself. They are officers appointed by the House of Commons for its special convenience. The House has only one officer appointed by the Crown—that is the Clerk, and the officers should be appointed by the Clerk, I think, when we consider the propriety of the case, because he is primarily responsible for the discharge of the business of this House. We have allowed a different practice to prevail, and transferred from the Clerk to the Speaker the power to appoint, and, therefore those officers appointed by the Speaker he has power to remove. As to the Clerk for instance, the Speaker has no power of removal. In the year 1874 we organised a new service for the House, that is to say, the translation of the debates. And we provided certain rules which have always guided us since that time, and which, in my opinion, are of such a nature as to put the question beyond a doubt that these officers are directly amenable to no other authority than the authority of the House, without the interference of the Speaker. In 1874 the House adopted the following resolution:—

"That a Select Standing Committee of not more than five members shall be appointed next Session, and each Session thereafter, to make rules and regulations, and manage generally all matters connected with the reporting and publishing of the *Hansard*."

That is the standing rule, under which the debates of this House have always been taken and translated. In the Session of 1883 the House adopted the following resolution:—

"Resolved, That the contract system for the translation of the official report of the Debates of this House be done away with after this Session, and that four Translators be appointed permanently, to be under the control of the Committee, one to be chief, none of whom shall be employed in any other manner by the House except in connection with the Debates."

These words are pregnant of meaning; the officers to be appointed are to be kept under the control of the Debates Committee of the House, and they are to discharge certain duties and no other duties; they are to be employed in the translating of the debates and nothing else. Now, no one will pretend that these officers are in the same category as the officers you yourself, Sir, choose to appoint. If you appoint an officer, according to the Act, you have the power of removal and suspension; you can take him from one office and put him in another; the officer at the Table of the House you can take from the Table and place in another position; but would it be pretended that you have power to take a translator of the debates, appointed by this House, and give him another position? Evidently no, because the rule expressly says that he shall be employed as a translator of the debates and in no other manner. It seems to me that the point is clear beyond a doubt that the translators belong to a new category of officers, and that they do not come within the precincts of the Act under which you have presumed to act. Let me call attention to clause 17 of that Act:

"The Clerk of the House of Commons shall subscribe and take before the Speaker the oath of allegiance, and all other officers, clerks and messengers of the House of Commons shall subscribe and take before the Clerk of the House of Commons; and the Clerk of the House of Commons shall keep a register of all such oaths."

Now, this is an oath which is required of all officers appointed by you, but this oath is not required from the translators.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What of that?

Mr. LAURIER. Therefore these translators are not subject to this Act, and if they are not, the Speaker had no authority over them.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Can the hon. gentleman tell me if the official reporters are bound to take the oath of allegiance?

Mr. LAURIER. The official reporters stand in a completely different position from the official translators, because the reporters have been made permanent officers of the House and they cannot engage in any other work; their services are at the disposal of the Government after the Session, and their appointment expressly says so; but the translators are appointed to translate the debates and nothing else, and no one knows better than the hon. gentleman, who is chairman of the Debates Committee, that it was always understood that during a part of the Session they could engage in any other work they chose to engage in. Therefore there is no parallel between the two classes of officers. I think I have given a good answer to the Prime Minister that since these officers are not obliged to take the oath of allegiance, they do not come within the precincts of this Act. Your power, Mr. Speaker, is a statutory power, and if you have power to remove these officers under the Act, they should also take the oath of allegiance under the Act; but if they are not bound to take the oath of allegiance, they do not come within the precincts of the Act for one thing, and they could not come within its precincts for another thing. These reasons, in my judgment at least, make it clear that in acting as you have done, you have trespassed beyond the duties assigned to you by the House. I have endeavored to discuss this question without any acrimony; I have put it simply on the ground that the Speaker has exceeded his powers, and therefore I beg to move:

That in the Session of 1874 this House adopted certain resolutions, providing for the reporting of the Debates of this House, and that it was amongst other things, enacted:

1. "That a Select Standing Committee of not more than (5) five members shall be appointed next Session, and each Session thereafter, to make rules and regulations and manage generally all matters connected with the reporting and publishing of the *Hansard*."

2. That the said Committee, under the authority of the said resolutions, has been regularly appointed ever since, at the beginning of every Session.

3. That the said Committee, with the sanction of the House for all its proceedings, in every instance, has managed generally all matters connected with the reporting and publishing of the Debates.

4. That on the 5th April, 1883, the said Committee reported to this House as follows:—

"Resolved, That the contract system for the translation of the official report of the Debates of this House be done away with after this Session, and that (4) four Translators be appointed permanently, to be under the control of the Committee, one to be chief at a salary of \$1,000, and (3) three at salaries of \$800 each, none of whom shall be employed in any other manner by the House except in connection with the Debates," and that the report was concurred in by this House.

5. That on the 27th April, during the same Session, the said committee made the following report:

(1.) "That in accordance with the terms and conditions of their second report (to wit, the above report) the following gentlemen be appointed Translators of the official reports of the Debates of this House, viz.:—A. Gélinas, as Chief Translator, and N. H. Beaulieu, J. B. Vanasse and Ernest Tremblay, as Assistant Translators."

6. That on the 8th February, 1884, the Committee reported "the appointment of Rémi Tremblay, at a salary of \$800, as Translator from the French language into the English, and from the English language into the French, as may be necessary," and that the said report was concurred in by this House.

7. That on the 1st April, during the same Session, the said Committee made the following report:—

(1.) "That Mr. A. E. Poirier be appointed as an additional Translator, and that his appointment date from the commencement of next Session."

(2.) "That, commencing with next Session, the salaries of the Translators be as follows:—

Mr. LAURIER.

"A. Gélinas, Chief Translator, \$1,200; N. H. Beaulieu, Assistant Translator; E. Tremblay, Assistant Translator; B. Tremblay, Assistant Translator; J. B. Vanasse, Assistant Translator; J. Bouchard, Assistant Translator; J. Lasalle, Assistant Translator; A. E. Poirier, Assistant Translator, \$1,000 each; and that in addition to the work of translation, the Chief Translator be required to make the Index," and that the said report was concurred in by this House.

8. That at the beginning of the present Session, to wit, on the 23rd February last, Mr. Speaker dismissed the said Rémi Tremblay, E. Tremblay and A. E. Poirier from their offices of Translators of the Debates of this House.

9. Resolved, That while professing great respect for the view which Mr. Speaker has taken of his authority in the premises, this House emphatically records its opinion that the publishing and translating of the Debates, and of everything connected therewith, belong exclusively to the House itself, and that the same is to be exclusively exercised, with the sanction of the House in every instance, through the said Committee; and that under the circumstances the action of Mr. Speaker is an invasion of the undoubted rights and privileges of this House, and is therefore not binding.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am sure my hon. friend will not charge me with improperly imputing motives to him when I say that his remarks have convinced me that friendship can carry a man very far. Were it not for that feeling, I am sure my hon. friend would, if he did not regret, at all events would not care about having put on record, the opinions he has just expressed concerning the discipline and dignity of the House and the dignity of the hon. members of this House. I do not wish to enter at all into the merits of this question. I am one of those who complained to you, Mr. Speaker, of the improper conduct of certain officers of this House, and I asked for their dismissal. I did not do so from any feeling of revenge or spite, because I hardly know two of the gentlemen in question, and the third has given me no reason at all to entertain any resentment or desire for revenge against him. But there is one thing for which I have an immense amount of regard, and that is the dignity of this House, and my own. My opinion is that this House should not be regulated, as regards its interior economy, on a different principle from any other House where good company meets, and where discipline, obedience, and a proper sense of respect and decency are required of those in its service. For these reasons I have asked you, Sir, to dismiss these three officers. I shall not repeat the expressions which have been used on the hustings and in the press by those employés. That would be entering into the discussion of a matter to which it is always unpleasant to refer, and I may dispense with doing so, because the parties accused have not denied that they have said and done what has been reported of them, but have tried to cover themselves under the privilege which my hon. friend has been endeavoring to explain to the House. I am sure the hon. gentleman will "take nothing by his motion." The expression of opinion has been too often given in this House in similar cases connected with parties in the service of this House, to allow the principle to prevail that if the conduct with which these officers are reproached is one that deserves punishment, that the punishment should not be dealt out by you, Mr. Speaker. As the motion is one questioning your jurisdiction, Sir, I shall restrict myself within the limits of that question. My hon. friend said that it was a great hardship these three men were not dismissed last Session or at the end of last Session, so as not to force them to come here again at the beginning of this Session, and lose their time as they have been losing it. I must for a moment allude to that. I may say you have been guilty, Mr. Speaker, guilty of an over confidence, guilty of believing that these three men would have the decency to understand their position, and have self-respect enough, after the charge made against them last Session, after the report which was made by the Committee of *Hansard* last year, to stay at home this Session, more especially as they stated on the hustings they were ready to do so, and were ready to pay for what they called their patriotism. They stated frequently on the hustings and in the press that they were jeopardizing their position, and

exposing themselves to lose the bread they were earning at the hands of this House, but that nevertheless, they were ready to make that sacrifice on the altar of their country. Their altar has been very much diminished since they made those declarations in public. You, Sir, presumed perhaps too much in thinking those men would feel it was due to their self-respect to remain at home, and you had to dismiss them at the beginning of the Session. I have stated that the presence of these men parading the corridors, canvassing members, officers and messengers of this House, has been a cause of annoyance both to myself and to other hon. members of this House, and not only have they been parading the corridors, but they have been exhibiting their sparring qualities besides, because one of them was guilty of committing an assault in the translators' office a day or two ago. These men belong to the press; they know, as my hon. friend says they do, the procedure of the House, and they should know that when there is a debate in the House regarding one of its members, that member has the decency to absent himself during the debate. But while the debate with regard to dismissing them is taking place, these gentlemen have not the decency to absent themselves from the House. It is a strange theory expounded by my hon. friend to say that by statute the action of this House is limited to the regular and permanent officers of the staff. According to the statute, you, Mr. Speaker, and the Clerk of this House have entrusted to your care the discipline of the officers of this House; and in cases of misconduct on the part of officers appointed by the Crown, you have the right to suspend them, and in other cases you have the right to dismiss them for misconduct. There is no distinction made for special officers as the *Hansard* translators, and although my hon. friend has thought proper to make one there can be none. According to his argument, those gentlemen engaged as translators of the *Hansard* would have the privilege which members of this House have not. You have the right to punish members of this House, but, according to the hon. gentleman, you have not the right to punish those translators. More than that, the committee, under whose control my hon. friend pretends those officers were, declared that it was for you, Mr. Speaker, to deal with them. The committee has declared it has no control over the translators, except as regards the work of translation, and that as to their behaviour in or out of the House, that is a matter with which the Speaker of the House must deal. Because these men are employed only during the Session, they have, outside of the Session, a right to be as abusive, impertinent and scandalous towards members of this House as they choose. Does the hon. gentleman pretend that a civil servant, whose duty is to attend his office from 9 o'clock to 4.30 in the evening, may, when his work is over, insult or strike his employer without the latter having the right to dismiss him? Does the hon. gentleman pretend that once a civil servant has done his duty during office hours, he has the right to be a blackguard after office hours? That contention will not hold water. The statute says that you and the Clerk of the House have the control of the officers of this House, and that you may suspend, dismiss or punish them. You have done it, and you have done it rightly, and I am sure that in doing it you have done a thing that every member of this House will say you were right in doing. I do not think that we should make any distinction between parties, and I have no hesitation in saying that, if any translator or any other official had met the hon. gentleman opposite on the hustings and had said that he was "a thief, a liar, a traitor, the slave of dangerous sects," and so on, and if the hon. gentleman was complaining of it, I would be the first to rise and say: Dismiss that man. Whether the member attacked had the name of Laurier or Chapleau, it would make no difference, and my hon. friends have neither the right to deny or to suspect what I say, for I say it with full deliberation and frank-

ness. I do not think I have anything to add on this question. As I stated, we are a Legislative Assembly, and we cannot as a Legislative Assembly take care ourselves of the behavior and the discipline of the officers of the House. That is done by a delegation, which is given by all the precedents, by all the traditions, and by something better than traditions, by good sense and reason, to the chief officer of this House, to the president of this House, to the man who, sitting in the chair, is obliged to take care not only of the officers outside of the House, but of the members themselves during the sitting. I say that under the circumstances you have acted rightly. You may have acted late, but you have acted rightly in rendering the decision which you have rendered. There can be no long argument upon this. I think it imposes itself upon the mind and the good sense of every hon. member that, having in your hands the conduct of the discipline of all officers of the House, you have done that which the Constitution and common sense give you the right to do, in dismissing these men for an offence deserving the punishment you have inflicted in dismissing them. I do not want to look at this from any point of sentiment on my part, but I would not remain an hour in this House if the servants of the House were allowed the right to blackguard me either in this House or outside of it. I maintain that you have a perfect right to say to any such officer: if you are guilty of slanderous language towards any member of this House you are dismissed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the question which is now under the attention of the House is one of very great importance, and one that the House ought to approach in a judicial spirit. If we are disposed to lay down a rule with regard to conduct of the officers of this House, it is important that the rule should be applied with the utmost fairness and that we should not have one measure of justice for those who happen to be Liberal in their sentiments, and another and a different one for those who belong to the party which has the majority in the House. In the consideration of this question, we have first to consider the nature of the offence, whether it is one that should be brought under the attention of the House at all, and, if so, who or what is the proper party to deal with the offence. In the first place, until the House is prepared to adopt a general rule which it is disposed to apply with perfect impartiality to all those who are engaged as translators, it was as much open, in my opinion, to those parties to engage in political warfare as it was open to those who still remain members of that board of translators. Then, I think it is also obvious that you, Mr. Speaker, had no power to deal with those parties; that if those parties committed any offence which made it proper to dismiss them from the service of this House, a motion should be made by the hon. gentleman or by some other member who thought he had good ground of complaint, in the House, and the dismissal should have come from the House and not from you. It is clear that these translators do not fall within the class of officers placed under your control. They are outside of the officers provided for by the statute. They are appointed by the House of its own motion and of its own inherent authority, and are supposed to remain in the service of the House until they are removed by a resolution of the House. It does not matter what men may say outside of the House. What is said outside of the House is not a matter of privilege that an hon. gentleman can bring before the House, unless it be something said with reference to his conduct as a member of the House. I think that was very clearly laid down when a certain member of the House of Commons in England complained of observations which had been made by another member, Dr. Kenealy, who said:

"Do you think a man would make a good representative who has put a false witness into the box who would give false testimony?"

That was brought to the attention of the House, and Mr. Gladstone said it was not a question with which the House had any right to deal, but it was a question, if any wrong had been committed, which was to be dealt with by the courts. The same view was taken by Mr. Lowe, who said :

"There is no occasion for interference by the House. It is a matter of slander, and the hon. gentleman has his remedy before the ordinary tribunals of the country."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Kenealy was not a servant of the House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says that Dr. Kenealy was a member of the House. I say it does not matter. If the hon. gentleman has any wrong done him, if he has any charge made against him, it is not for the House to anticipate that and say whether it is well or ill-founded. It is for the hon. gentleman to vindicate himself before the ordinary tribunals of the country in the same way as any other party. Mr. Disraeli, speaking on the same subject, went further, and pointed out that the observation applied to the servants of the House as well as to its members :

"It is no part of the business of the House to make such a question a question of privilege. A personal attack must be made in the House and against a member in his capacity as member to justify the House in dealing with the matter at all."

I want to know whether the First Minister takes exception to that rule, and, when these gentlemen dealt with this hon. gentleman, when, not only was he not a member of the House, but when there was no House at all, upon the platform, whether he thinks he has a right to come here and complain of their conduct and snuff them out for saying what several of the hon. gentleman's supporters have said of him. I have in my hand several observations made in reference to the hon. gentleman, not by the translators, but by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), who said things of the hon. gentleman and of the First Minister quite as severe as anything said by these translators who were dismissed from office, either with regard to the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) or the hon. the Secretary of State. I want to know why the Secretary of State has not brought this up as a matter of privilege, and proposed to the House that the hon. gentleman, having made charges which were atrocious slanders against the First Minister, is unworthy of a seat in this House. I say that he has just as good a right to propose that motion and with just as much propriety, as any observations which the hon. gentleman has made. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman complains "meeting these men in the corridors," he says, "is offensive to me." Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman has to meet them in the street; are they offensive there? Have they not as good a right to come here as any other citizens of the country? Is the hon. gentleman going to have some extra-judicial tribunal created to try men for imaginary offences against his sentiments and feelings for which the ordinary law of the country makes no provision? Well, Sir, let me say that the First Minister has put in the Library here a librarian. Did he never say anything offensive to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House? Why, Sir, I remember that from the time I went on the press in 1882, until that gentleman retired from the chief editorial staff of the *Mail*, there were but two or three newspapers of the daily *Mail* that were published, that did not contain a personal attack on myself. There was scarcely a paper that did not contain attacks upon almost every hon. gentleman on this side of the House who has been for any time in Parliament. Did the hon. gentleman consult our feelings? Did he consider whether this party whom he appointed Librarian was or was not agreeable to us? Was that the view the hon. gentleman laid down? Are those hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House of finer intellectual and moral fibre, of finer sensibilities, than hon. members on this side of the House? Are they the only

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

parties who have any sentiments or feelings that are to be taken into consideration? We remember what St. Clair's wife in Uncle Tom's Cabin is represented as saying of the colored population, "We know that they are not much to be considered in the matter; they are not constituted as we are; they have not the sentiments and feelings which we have, and of course you cannot reason from them to us." And I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks that he cannot reason from the Tory side of the House to the Liberal side, and that what is absolutely necessary to protect the dignity, and the freedom, and the rights of the hon. gentlemen on that side, are wholly inapplicable to hon. gentlemen on this side. That is the position taken by the hon. gentleman, and that is the position taken by his colleague the Secretary of State. Now, Sir, let me read for the edification of the First Minister and the Secretary of State, some observations that have been made by those translators who remain—there are five of them. Have they been less considerate of the feelings of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House than those whom the First Minister and the Secretary of State have called upon you arbitrarily and unconstitutionally to dismiss? I say, Sir, that we find that the whole eight must go, upon the rule laid down by the Secretary of State. Now, let me call attention to some observations which were made in the organ of the Secretary of State, in the *Presse* of November 24, 1885.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I deny the right of the hon. gentleman to say that the *Presse* was my organ. It has not been, and is not.

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec East). Is not now?

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman denies that it is his organ. At all events, the observations which I am about to read are the words of the translators who are still under the ægis of the hon. gentleman's protection.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That paper was the violent adversary of the Government at that time.

Mr. MILLS. It says :

"We hope Sir John does not impersonate the English-speaking people, because it would be very sad for them if it were so. Our English-speaking countrymen would be in a pitiable state if they had no other representative besides this moral ruin."

This moral ruin, the hon. gentleman who leads the Government, and those hon. gentlemen on that side. It says :

"For a long time back we have been suffering in silence, in consequence of the tyranny of an old infatuated chief who considers the country as his own property, and who leads us according to his caprices, without ever taking any notice of our desires and of our feelings."

Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman does not seem to have been as sensitive as his colleague, and he is not prepared to measure out to the translators that remain and are now friendly to the Administration, that vengeance, that punishment, which he proposes to measure out to those who were known to belong to the Liberal party. Then it further says :

"We want no more of the old schemer whom we have for a long time considered as a statesman, but who juggles with men and measures as a conjuror juggles with nutmegs."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I tell the hon. gentleman that that paper was then a most violent adversary of the Government, and the extracts which he reads are merely a copy of the speeches of some hon. members on the other side of the House. I tell him that paper was not and is not my organ, and he has no right to say so. He is not in order in saying so, and he is not a gentleman if he does.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman's language shows that he is in very much the same position as these translators. The hon. gentleman's notion of what is gentlemanly, after all, does not exactly accord with the notions of hon. gentlemen on this side of this House. I am

inclined to think that if he would practice a little more courtesy, he would have a little better ground to complain of the want of courtesy of those whom he is pursuing with his vengeance, and upon whom he is making Mr. Speaker the instrument for the purpose of wreaking that impotent vengeance which has characterised his conduct in this matter. Then, Sir, on the 26th November, 1885, Mr. Desjardins is reported in the *Presse* as having said, among other things—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is wandering a little from the scope of the resolution as it appears, and as it was explained by the hon. mover. I think we must—

Mr. MILLS. I am merely saying, Mr. Speaker—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Chair, chair.

Mr. MILLS. I am speaking to the point of order. I am saying that the hon. gentleman's own supporters have used, of himself and his colleagues, language which he complains of in the translators; and if I can show that these hon. gentleman are accepting that support and are cordially with those writers, I think I am showing that they have no case against these translators.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The scope of the resolution, as I understand it, applies to jurisdiction. The question is, whether jurisdiction rests in the House or with the Speaker. It is so stated in the resolution, and was so explained, as I understood it, by the hon. mover. I feel it my duty to make a gentle suggestion in the way of checking a debate which will become, if continued, quite discursive, and might be offensive if it involved recrimination.

Mr. MILLS. I do not so understand the resolution as you have it. I understand there are before the House two questions in this resolution, and I ask the liberty to state them. I understand that one proposition is that these gentlemen have committed no offence, therefore they ought not to be removed by anybody. I understand the second proposition is that if they had committed any offence, the Speaker is not the proper party to deal with them. Now, Sir, I think I am at liberty to discuss both those propositions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to a point of order. The course which the hon. gentleman is about to take is one which is clearly out of order, is irrelevant, and has no reference to this motion. The motion is that the Speaker has exceeded his jurisdiction in dismissing the three men. The hon. gentleman holds that the Speaker did exceed his jurisdiction, that he had no right to act as he did act, that his discretion was improperly exercised, because members of Parliament and others, not employees of the House, had used strong language towards others. It is certainly quite irregular, just the same as if a charge was brought against a man for stating that a certain man was a thief and he replied that he did so because other men had called him a thief. It is certainly quite out of order.

Mr. MULOCK. The Secretary of State in the commencement of his speech declared that he took the position he did out of regard to his own dignity and the dignity of this House, and he proceeded, if I understood what he said and if I understand the English language, to denounce the translators, because of their conduct during a certain campaign. Did anyone call the Secretary of State to order then? Did the Speaker call the Secretary of State to order?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Secretary of State was justified in going beyond the mere question of jurisdiction to the real merits of the case, then surely some one on this side of

the House is entitled to answer the remarks of the Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman either did not listen or did not understand what I said. I stated most pointedly, and the House will not have forgotten it, that I would not repeat even a single expression used because I wished to remain within the merits of the case, and I proceeded to say that Mr. Speaker acted wisely. The hon. gentleman said in his argument that the Speaker had exceeded his privilege in assuming powers that belonged to the House. I refrained from dealing with the question beyond mentioning the conduct of the officers during the last few days. It is unfair for the hon. gentleman to say that I stated the whole case and discussed the whole question; I did not do so, but I restrained myself within the limits.

Mr. MULOCK. I should like to ask the Secretary of State if he did not in, the course of his argument, contend that it was necessary for him to take this particular course in order to show his regard for his own dignity and the dignity of this House? Then did he not make an innuendo against the conduct of those gentlemen? It was not the action of the Speaker of which he was complaining, it was not his action that he was denouncing. The point in his argument in support of the course taken with regard to the conduct of the translators was that he was justified in taking a certain course. He made a certain charge, which it is proposed that we on this side of the House shall not answer.

Mr. LAURIER. There is much more in the language of the Secretary of State when he replied to me than he now admits. What was the upshot of his argument? He passed rather lightly over the question of law. He did not say the Speaker had acted rightly in dismissing the officers, he justified the action of the Speaker on its merits, and he said once or twice that the Speaker had done right. What was the gist of his charge? It was that they were blackguards and he would not submit to the infamy of having to meet blackguards in this House. What does this involve? The hon. gentleman is showing that this House is full of blackguards. If the hon. gentleman had confined himself to the mere question of law, I could have understood it. My hon. friend would not then have the privilege now of going into anything outside; but I appeal to the sense of fairness of the House that the Secretary of State having failed to confine himself to the question of jurisdiction, but having entered into the merits of the case and said that he took action because he would not submit to meeting blackguards here, we have a right to reply and discuss the whole question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I was about to make an observation on the question of order. The whole speech of the Secretary of State was in justification, not of the legal conduct of the Speaker, but of the merits of the case and the right of the Speaker to dismiss men who had acted so improperly. I was undertaking to show, in the first place, that a number of members of Parliament supporting the Government and on terms of friendship with them had made similar statements, and, in the second place, to show that the five remaining translators used exactly as offensive language as did those whom the hon. gentleman proposed to dismiss. I want to know, and I have a right to know, whether this House is to have one rule of conduct and one measure of punishment for one class of officers, and a different measure for those who are of a different way of political thinking? I think that is perfectly germane to the discussion. This whole case is before the House on the resolution, and I submit, if you undertake to confine the discussion simply to the proposition whether the Speaker has the legal power to dismiss those officers without reference to the propriety of his conduct, a gross injustice

will be done by such a ruling. It would be a rule to stifle debate in this House.

Mr. CASEY. A word in regard to the point of order. The Secretary of State said he did not bring before the House the whole case connected with the conduct of the translators. The hon. gentleman did bring it before the House and it is here in printed form on the desk of every member. The whole question of the conduct of the translators, the language used by them and the complaints made by the Secretary of State and by his very sensitive friend, the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), is before every hon. member. The whole case is fully before the House, and if, as it appeared, the case in regard to its merits and its details, has been brought before the House by the Secretary himself, he is the very last man who has a right to complain when we propose to enter into the merits of the case. I think, after the discussion and after calling your attention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the fact that the whole case is before the House, the very language used as a ground for dismissing them, you will find it your duty to rule that it is as much open to us to discuss the merits of the case, as it was to the Secretary of State.

Mr. DAVIES. Before the point of order is passed upon I desire to call attention to the fact that in addition to the complaints of the Secretary of State having been laid before the House, the reasons which influenced the Speaker in coming to his conclusion have also been presented to the House by the Speaker himself. The papers are now before us, and this is a discussion on the papers and the reasons which influenced the Speaker in his actions. Those papers will be found as an appendix to the Votes and Proceedings, and they commence with a letter by the Secretary of State, in which he charges that those translators were using language which I need not repeat, language offensive to himself and to his dignity and to his honor, and for having used that language he wishes them to be dismissed by the proper authority. The Speaker calls the attention of the translators to the charges, and we have the reply. We have also a letter from the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) making complaint against those translators, complaining in regard to certain language used by them on the hustings, and finally we have the following conclusion of the Speaker:

"HOUSE OF COMMONS, SPEAKER'S CHAMBERS,
"22nd February, 1888.

"At a meeting of the Commissioners of the Board of Internal Economy of the House of Commons, called for this day at three, were present:—

"The Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, G.C.B.;

"Hon. Sir Hector Langevin;

"Hon. J. C. Costigan, and

"The Hon. the Speaker of the House of Commons, Chairman.

"The consideration of the Board is called to the complaints made during last Session by the Hon. Mr. Chapleau, member for Terrebonne, and Mr. Ives, member for Richmond and Wolfe, against Messrs. A. E. Poirier, E. Tremblay and B. Tremblay, the three employed by this Honorable House as translators of the debates. The latter are charged of having, before and during the last general elections used in public prints and on the hustings, towards the former and their friends, very offensive language, and to have made themselves obnoxious by their meddling actively in politics. The letters of Messrs. Chapleau and Ives, and the answers to the same by Messrs. Poirier and Tremblay having been read,

"This Committee have come to the conclusion that it is not in the public interest that the said A. E. Poirier, Ernest Tremblay and Rémi Tremblay should continue to be employed on the staff of the *Hansard*, and urge the Honorable Mr. Speaker to notify these three persons that their employment is at an end.

"And the Committee adjourned to the call of the Speaker.

"J. ALDRIC OULMET, *Speaker*.

"A true copy.

"J. ALDRIC OULMET, *Speaker*."

So that the Speaker has acted upon the complaint made by the hon. the Secretary of State, and that complaint consists simply of the fact that those gentlemen have used expressions at public meetings which he considers to be offensive to himself and to his dignity. He may be right or he may be wrong, but how can we come to a conclusion without

discussing it and seeing whether the language which those gentlemen used ought to justify the Speaker in acting as he did. The matter must be discussed in this House or else we must vote blindly on the complaint made by the Secretary of State. There are two points before the House. One, the power of the Speaker under any circumstances to dismiss, and that is a purely legal proposition—the other is assuming he has the power—and the Secretary of State goes entirely on that supposition—whether he has exercised it properly. My hon. friend is at present engaged in a discussion of that question and he is showing that some associates in the Government, or, I believe, in this House, with whom the Secretary of State is at present in the most cordial relations, have used the same language towards him, the same language which is given as a reason for the dismissal of those men; and the Secretary of State is not obliged to cut in the corridors men who used similar language towards him as those men who have been dismissed. We have the statement of those facts before us and those complaints which have been made. The Speaker has acted on those complaints and has taken action because of language which my hon. friend is proving was used by other members of this House towards the Secretary of State. I think the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is in order and is treating on a matter germane to the subject.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is quite true, as my hon. friend has said, that the whole record is on the Table of the House, of the complaints, charges and the language which has been made the subject of the resolution. But the question is not what appears in the Votes and Proceedings of this House, but what is contained in the resolution which the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has thought proper to invite the attention of the House to. This resolution is not a resolution containing the two propositions: first, that the Speaker has no authority, and secondly, if he has authority it is not a proper case for its exercise. Let me call the attention of the House to what this resolution is:

"That while professing great respect for the view which Mr. Speaker has taken of his authority in the premises, this House emphatically records its opinion that the publishing and translating of the debates, and of everything connected therewith, belong exclusively to the House itself, and that the same is to be exclusively exercised, with the sanction of the House in every instance, through the said committee; and that under the circumstances the action of Mr. Speaker is an invasion of the undoubted rights and privileges of this House, and is therefore not binding."

Now I submit that while it is true, as the hon. member has said, that on those documents another resolution might have been propounded which would, therefore, have opened up a very much wider discussion, the one point which the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has invited us to consider, is whether the Speaker had authority or not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Let me just say this, I intend to close my speech with an amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, and I will read it to you:

"And that in the opinion of this House the language used was not more violent than that used by the other translators."

I am going on to show that I have a right to move that amendment, and to show it is true.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the hon. gentleman has a right to move that amendment, but when the amendment is brought before the House we will discuss that. The point of order was raised by myself. The question is: Are these men employees in the service of this House in such a degree as to be under the supervision of the Speaker, and whether the Speaker has the authority to dismiss those men as being employees of this House? The hon. gentleman endeavored to show that these men were justified—while being employees and being servants of this House, because other people, who are not servants

of this House, but who are members of this House, and other persons connected with the press, who are not servants of this House, have used violent language against the same individual as those employees of the House did. The two cases are not parallel at all, and the argument is not relevant. It may be true that a member of this Parliament has used strong language against another member of this Parliament, but that must be between themselves. It may be true that a newspaper has maligned, or at all events attacked, any member of this House, or the whole House; but that is another question. The simple question here is this: Whether these persons, being employees, are subject to the supervision of the Speaker, and, if so, had the Speaker authority to dismiss them? The fact that other people not under this authority possibly used violent language, is no justification for those servants of the House using such language. You, Sir, were quite correct, in my opinion, and you would have been wanting in your duty if you did not stop the hon. gentleman in the line of argument that he told us he was going to pursue.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I think this much is quite clear, that the remarks made by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) were directly invited by the language used by the hon. the Secretary of State; and it has always been our custom here when an hon. gentleman opens up a subject, as the Secretary of State did, to allow the gentleman who replies to him equal latitude. If there is any offender in the matter I submit that the Secretary of State was the original offender, and not my hon. friend. Now, Sir, it is perfectly well known to everybody in this House that this debate having commenced, the language used by the other translators in the press is perfectly sure to be introduced. Everyone knows that that will be the case, and the hon. the First Minister knows it very well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a different point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I speak of the practice and not of the strict rule, and I say it will be utterly impossible to keep that question out of the debate, and therefore it appears to me that there is very little use in spending the time of this House on a point of this kind, especially when, as I say, it was a gentleman on the other side first provoked this discussion, because he undoubtedly did make use of reflections upon those translators. Among other things the Secretary of State asked us "if an employee in his department who did his work well for seven or eight hours was after that time to meet him in common society and insult him, would he be obliged to put up with it?" He has brought the whole question into the arena himself, and that led to the language of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills).

Mr. EDGAR. The point of order was not raised under the motion of the hon. the leader of the Opposition. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has stated in his place in the House that before he sat down he intended to move an amendment which opened up the merits of the question. I submit you cannot ignore the statement of the hon. member, that he proposed to put himself fully and thoroughly in order before he closed his speech which is going on still; for this is merely an intervening discussion. I am not proposing to argue technically how far he can go on the original motion, but when the hon. member stands up in this House and says he proposes to move an amendment that will put him in order, it is the practice of Parliament to accept that statement, and when he goes further and tells the House and the Speaker absolutely the language of that motion which he proposed to move in amendment, I think that ought to settle the question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman ought to remember that you, Mr. Speaker, called the hon.

member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) to order, because he proposed to quote language used by members of Parliament against other members of Parliament. The hon. gentleman was about to quote the language of one member of this House against other members of this House, and the fact that the hon. gentleman has made a motion with reference to the other translators has no reference to the line of argument of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. First Minister did not, I think, follow very closely what I was saying. The hon. Secretary of State declared that these men were blackguards, and he gave his reasons for saying so. I say that the language which has made these men unfit to be in the corridors of this House was matched by language equally violent used against the Government by hon. members of this House whom the hon. gentleman did not dare to characterise as blackguards, and whom he every day meets on grounds of friendship.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have no reason to change the opinion which I formerly expressed. The issue before the House is a very restricted one, which by no means opens up the whole question that might have been opened up on the information before the House. But I conceived, and I think properly conceived, that it was not the intention of the mover to open up every question that might be opened up, for he stated in the most distinct words, if I rightly understood him, although I was not at the moment in the Chair, that his intention was to confine his remarks strictly to the bald question which was before the House. My attention was not called to any aspect of the debate that might have been questioned; but I will simply say that unless it is the wish of the hon. members to open up this broad question in its every aspect, I think they would do well to sustain the Chair in endeavoring to restrict it as nearly as possible to the lines laid down by the observations of the mover of the resolution and also by the exact phraseology of the resolution.

Mr. LAURIER. While bowing to your ruling, I wish to make this one remark. In opening this discussion I endeavored to avoid everything in the shape of crimination. I wished to confine it to the question of the authority of the Speaker, and nothing else. No one can pretend that the Secretary of State confined himself to that question, because he went on to say that the Speaker was right, that he wanted to vindicate his character, and so forth.

Mr. IVES. I rise to a point of order. This is a discussion of the Speaker's ruling, and is clearly out of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LAURIER. Under such circumstances I presume that the range of the question was enlarged by the hon. Secretary of State. But I bow to your ruling.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman forgets one thing. I said that I was the complainant, and I said I was bound to make the complaint for such and such reasons. I quite admit that I went outside of the argument, but I said that due consideration must be given to the person who made the complaint. I said I would not discuss the merits of the decision, but I stated in ending my remarks that the Speaker having the right of discipline of his officers, had rightly done what he had done. I admit that I was not within the argument in saying that, and if I had been called to order I would have said that I only made the remark because I was the complainant in this case.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When the hon. gentleman addressed the House, and he did it without any interruption from the Chair, he said that the language used by these translators was calumnious language, such as no member of this House had a right to be subjected to—language which he would have been quite ready to resent if it had

been used against any other member as against the hon. gentleman himself. That was the rule laid down by the hon. gentleman. I undertook to show that the Speaker was not the proper party to deal with these officers, that they did not fall within the class of officers placed under the control of the Speaker by the statute, and further, that if the House thought the conduct of these officers was improper and such as ought to be taken notice of, the House itself ought to lay down some rule which should apply not merely to these parties, but to all other offenders equally as to them. Now, Sir, I have already informed you that I intended to make a motion, and I shall do that, because it is of the first consequence that neither the Secretary of State nor any other hon. gentleman on that side, simply because he is in a majority, should single out those who are personally offensive to them, and pass by those who have been equally offensive to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that these parties are under the law of the land; they are entitled to the protection of the law; and the hon. Secretary of State has called upon the Speaker, and the Speaker, in my judgment, has improperly yielded to the importunities of the Secretary of State, and subjected these parties to punishment which their colleagues on the translating staff have not been subjected to, although equally offenders with themselves. It is perfectly obvious to every one who has observed the discussions in the press that all those engaged as translators arrayed themselves for a time against the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Those who belong to the party of the hon. gentlemen and whose offence consisted merely of a temporary aberration from the support of the Government are passed by and are retained in the service; and although they have violently attacked in the press hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and subjected them to unfair criticism, they are nevertheless retained in the public service, while those honestly opposed to hon. gentlemen opposite are singled out for vengeance. It is quite enough for the hon. Secretary of State and the hon. gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches to use the power they possess for the purpose of punishing those in their immediate service whom they control; but I submit that they have no right to come into this House and subject the officers of this House, who are as much officers of hon. gentlemen in Opposition as they are of those who sit on the Treasury benches, to punishment because they are not political allies of these hon. gentlemen. If these men had calumniated or vilified any hon. gentleman who sits on this side of the House, their conduct would not only have been condoned, but in all probability they would have been rewarded. We have a right to think that, Sir, because when a gentleman who was sworn to discharge his duties honestly, neglected his oath of office and failed to gazette those who were returned to Parliament in accordance with the law, he was promoted and rewarded for his infamy with an addition to his salary, while those men who are honest in their convictions are singled out by the Secretary of State for his vengeance and the vengeance of the Government. Now, Sir, when I look at what some of these gentlemen have said in the public press who are still retained in the public service, I can see that subsequent repentance goes a long way with the Secretary of State and the Minister of Militia. One of these translators that are retained has said:

"It is a contest with Orangeism which we must undertake, and it behooves us to find the means of defeating this, the lowest of all clans."

Another has said:

"The Orange monster did not want to miss the mark this time. Like the serpent which crawls in the shade, it has hidden itself under the guise of justice to ensure the attainment of its purpose."

The same person says at a later period:

"A. P. Caron, the Queen's—"

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

I shall not fill the blank,—

"and a Canadian renegade, Sir John, the accursed traitor to his friends and faithful to the Orangemen, Chapleau the public thief, brother to the hangman who hanged Riel."

Now, these are the expressions used by the organs of these gentlemen, who the hon. gentleman thinks, are fit associates, who, he thinks, may be retained in the public service, while those gentlemen who have written and spoken courteously are dismissed from the public service because they belonged to this side of the House. Does the hon. gentleman suppose for one moment that he can make anyone believe that he is actuated by those high considerations of public justice which he has mentioned in his speech? Does he suppose that anyone will believe he wishes to act fairly with regard to the officers of this House, when he retained those who used these expressions and dismissed those who used expressions much more courteous, much less violent than those I have read to the House? The hon. gentleman, as I have said, think it is beneath the dignity of the House to retain such parties in the service; he considers it beneath his dignity to permit them to be retained, if it is possible to secure their removal. If that be his opinion, why does he not extend the proposition for punishment a little further? Why does he retain the other five, after he has dismissed those three, or ask the Speaker to do so, illegally and improperly? Does the hon. gentleman suppose such conduct can be misunderstood? Sir, I am ready, at any moment, to say that those who are engaged in the permanent service of the House shall cease to be connected with the political parties on one side or the other, but I deny altogether the right of the hon. gentleman to decide that no Reformer shall be a translator, but that every Conservative, no matter how vile and abusive, no matter how calumnious he may be in his expressions, shall be retained in the service. Against such a proposition I enter my protest, and when the hon. gentleman comes down with a motion to put the translators on a proper footing in this respect, I will be prepared to support it; but I am not prepared to allow the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches to single out those of one political party and subject them to persecution and punishment, while those of the other political party are allowed to go free. I have said that, in my opinion, the hon. gentleman has applied to the wrong party for the punishment of these gentlemen. The statute, which the leader of the Opposition read, refers to two classes of officers which the Speaker controls. Those translators are officers outside of that statute altogether. They are officers appointed for a special purpose, and placed, not under the control of the Speaker or of the Crown, but under the control of this House, and if the hon. gentleman had any complaint to make against them, that complaint should have been made in this House, and a motion should have been made for the removal of those officers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I say yes. The whole policy of their appointment, the resolution with regard to them, everything shows they are not under the control of the Speaker, and were not intended to be under his control. That being the case, I am prepared to support the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition, but I would in addition move in amendment that the following words be added:—

"And that, even if Mr. Speaker had jurisdiction in this matter, his action was not warranted by the circumstances of the case, and that, in the opinion of this House, the language used by these translators was not more violent than that used by other translators who have not been dismissed."

Mr. IVES. It would seem to me that the motion of the hon. gentleman, who has just resumed his seat, is in the nature of a motion of want of confidence in the hon. gentleman who moved the original motion. The hon. the leader of

the Opposition preferred, and, I think, wisely preferred, that the discussion should be restrained within the limits of the legal question as to the jurisdiction of the Speaker. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition evidently had carefully read the report which has been laid upon the Table of the House, and he thought, no doubt, so far as the French translators are concerned, that discretion would be the better part of valor, and that it was not wise to invite a general discussion. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has thought better of it, and has opened up the whole question. I do not propose, however, to refer at any very great length to the facts of this case, as they are sufficiently disclosed by the report which has been printed and is in the hands of all hon. members. I shall, however, make a slight reference to the conduct of one of those gentlemen, namely, Mr. Rémi Tremblay. First, however, I propose for a few moments to direct your attention to the law and to a few precedents which we find in the Journals on this subject. The hon. gentleman from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) read the statute which the Speaker took as his warrant for his action in this matter, and it seems to me that the words of the statute plainly cover the case. They are as follows:—

"If any complaint or representation is at any time made to the Speaker for the time being of the misconduct or unfitness of any clerk, officer or messenger, or other person, attendant of the House of Commons, the Speaker may cause an enquiry to be made into the conduct or fitness of such person; and if thereupon it appears to the Speaker such person has been guilty of misconduct or is unfit to hold his situation, the Speaker may, if such clerk, officer, messenger or other person has been appointed by the Crown, suspend him and report such suspension to the Governor General, and if he has not been appointed by the Crown, the Speaker may suspend or remove such person."

I ask you, how could language be more general than that: "Any clerk, officer or messenger or other person attendant on the House of Commons." One would certainly presume that if there had been any intention to make a distinction between officers appointed by the Speaker and officers appointed by the Crown and officers appointed by the Committee of the House, that distinction would have been expressed in the statute. I find that Mr. Bourinot, the able and learned clerk of this House, had evidently formed the opinion that this clause in the statute, 31 Vic., cap. 27, sec. 9, applied to a case like this. Because, in the valuable work upon "Parliamentary Procedure and Practice," at page 174 we find this:

"Under the Act providing for the internal economy of the House, the Speaker may, after enquiry, suspend or remove any clerk, officer or messenger who has not been appointed by the Crown; but, in the case of an officer so appointed, he may suspend him and report the fact to the Governor General."

Then we find a note referring us to 31 Vic., chap. 27, sec. 9, which is the very section of the Revised Statutes which I have read. Then, on page 193, continuing the same subject, Mr. Bourinot gives us a case which occurred in 1873, where the Speaker dismissed an officer of the House, Mr. Elie Tassé:

"In 1873, Mr. Elie Tassé, one of the translators in the service of the House—"

Precisely the same sort of officer as the three gentlemen whose cases are now being discussed,—

"was brought to the Bar and examined as to his connection with an article in the *Courier d'Outaouais*, reflecting on certain members. He admitted he was the writer, and subsequently the Speaker informed the House that Mr. Tassé was dismissed."

Mr. LAURIER. He was appointed by the Speaker himself.

Mr. IVES. He was not appointed by the Speaker. This was in 1873.

Mr. LAURIER. He was appointed by the Speaker.

Mr. IVES. He was appointed by the Speaker of that date.

"In the same Session the House resolved that an article in the *St. John Freeman*, of which Mr. Anglin, a member, was editor, was a libel on the House and certain members thereof; but no ulterior proceedings were taken as in the O'Connell case of 1838."

Now, on turning to the Journals of 1873, I find that Mr. Tassé, a translator, was called before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A translator?

Mr. IVES. Yes, precisely the same office as this, and, on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Dorion, of Napierville, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Holton, it was

"Ordered, that paragraphs 9 and 11 of an article in the newspaper *Courier d'Outaouais*, published at Ottawa, on the 4th day of April instant, and headed 'La masque est levé,' be now read by the clerk of the House; and the said paragraphs were read, as follow."

And reference is made to a Mr. Tremblay, who was a member of the House, and Mr. Prévost, who was also a member of the House, and, on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Dorion, seconded by Mr. Mackenzie, it was:

"Ordered, that the Sergeant-at-Arms having reported that Elie Tassé, of the city of Ottawa, was not to be found within the precincts of the House, Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant, summoning the said Elie Tassé to appear at the Bar of this House at half-past seven o'clock p.m. this day."

On the following page of the Journals, page 134, I find:

"The Order of the House of this day for the attendance at the Bar of this House of Elie Tassé being read, the Sergeant-at-Arms reported that, in obedience to the Order of the House, Mr. Tassé was in attendance"

Mr. Tassé was then examined. He said he was not the proprietor of the newspaper, but he admitted that he was the responsible editor, although he did not admit that he wrote the article, and as a matter of fact I believe he did not write it, but the fact was proved that he was the responsible editor of the paper. Mr. Tassé was then directed to withdraw. Now, in this case you have a translator, precisely the same officer as those whose case we are considering, performing the same functions to the House in 1873 that these gentlemen performed to the House in 1887, called before the Bar of the House, brought within the jurisdiction of the House, the House itself establishing the fact upon which the Speaker and not the House subsequently acted, and yet, having this translator before it who was performing exactly the same duties and occupying the same position that these men did, the House did not dismiss this man, but simply established the fact, and the Speaker dismissed him and afterwards reported that he had dismissed him. Now, I find, in the 2nd volume of the *Hansard* of 1878, that a discussion occurred in Committee of Supply on the item Miscellaneous Printing, where it was stated that a certain extra clerk in the employment of the House had been guilty of writing an article abusing a member of the House. Several gentlemen spoke with reference to the matter, Mr. Mackenzie said:

"That the Committee [that is the Internal Economy Committee] had nothing to do with the employment of these persons, except to fill up any vacancies that might occur. This was entirely under the control of Mr. Speaker and the clerk of the House. He understood that the Auditor went over all the items of payment."

And Mr. Cartwright said:

"That a sessional clerk had, over his own signature, reflected in a letter on a member of the House, and he was informed that the moment that this fact was brought under the notice of Mr. Speaker, he at once dismissed the offending official"

Mr. McDougall, of South Renfrew, said he thought this was an extremely proper course to take under such circumstances. I find also that, in 1876, and this is rather to the point as to the fitness of these men and the propriety of their dismissal, an engagement was made by the Chairman of the Debates Committee of Mr. DeCelles, who is now one of the joint librarians of the House, and was then one of the editors of a newspaper in the Province of Quebec, and employed him to take charge of the translation of the Debates

of the House. Mr. DeCelles came to Ottawa to perform the duties of that office, and to his surprise there was a good deal of disturbance created by the hon. gentlemen who then sat on this side of the House. They thought it was not proper that Mr. DeCelles who was a Bleu should have this office, and the point was raised in the House, and Mr. Young who I think was the Chairman of the Debates Committee at that time, said, speaking in answer to Mr. Kirkpatrick :

"I will tell the hon. gentleman. The gentleman in question is an active writer, employed on the staff of a leading French paper, while the feeling existing between political parties in the Province of Quebec is very bitter, and certain members felt that it would not be fair that the translation of the Debates of this House should be entrusted to a gentleman who is in such bitter opposition to them. That is the only reason."

That was the only reason why that arrangement was not carried out. As I said, in rising, the statute is perfectly general in its terms, and I think the onus of proof would be upon the hon. gentlemen opposite who assert it, when they claim that these translators do not fall within that meaning of the clause of the statute. We find the statute to be general in its terms, we find no provision for the dismissal of these translators or any other translators by the committee. We find that the committee in this case reported they had no authority to act, and we find Mr. Speaker basing his action upon the general and plain terms of the statute, and he acts in accordance with precedents which you find in the Journals of the House, in accordance with the uniform line of precedents; and therefore I say that so far as the legal position is concerned, the motion of the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition cannot prevail. The Speaker clearly acted within his legal right in taking the course that he did take. Now, we come to the other point. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition says that a different rule should be applied to translators than that which is applied to other public servants. Well, I cannot see the distinction. These men are paid a salary for their whole time. They are paid, certainly, all they can get in any other walk or avocation of life. They are at the call of the Chairman of the Debates Committee at any time, and if called upon would be obliged to come here and devote their time and service to the country. Their whole time is paid for, and whether it is or not, they certainly do not fall under any other rule in their conduct from that which prevails with regard to other civil servants. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that these men ought to be excused, because other translators had entertained the idea that they had a right to abuse members of Parliament and to say things that they would not be permitted to say if they were other public servants than translators. Sir, it is no argument in favor of these men that others have done wrong, because others have transgressed decency, propriety and law, it is no reason why the Speaker should be condemned for having acted on this statute when he was satisfied that these men had transgressed decency, propriety and law. Why, Sir, if others have done it, they have not been complained of; and the Speaker, under this section of the Act, is not authorised to act except complaint is made. I might fairly add, if this section of the statute referred only to appointees of the Speaker himself, why should it require that in all cases a representation should be made to him by some other person. If the Speaker knows that a civil servant has been guilty of misconduct, surely he might dismiss him without any complaint from any one, but the general terms of the statute, and the fact that representation has to be made in order to bring about an enquiry, establish conclusively, to my mind, that it covers the case of these translators. But hon. gentlemen say that the other five translators have been just as guilty as these three. Have hon. gentlemen opposite taken the responsibility of making any complaint against any one of these other five? Have they any right to say, until they do so, that the

Mr. Ives.

Speaker would not act impartially with reference to any complaint that might be made? Have they any right to say that the Secretary of State, or any other gentleman on this side of the House, who has a responsibility in such matters, would urge the House to take any action upon the question of the Speaker's conduct in the matter, in any different sense from that which he has taken in this case? Until a complaint is made, until a representation is made, until the matter is called to the attention of the Speaker, until the Speaker is called upon to act, or until hon. gentlemen on this side refuse to sustain the Speaker because he proposes to dismiss a Conservative translator, the arguments of the hon. gentleman have no weight. The hon. gentleman, who last spoke, had a great deal to say about the other translators having been guilty of the same offence, and how did the hon. gentleman prove it? He proved it, not by reading anything that these other translators had written or had said, not by stating anything that these other translators had written or said, but by reading, or he was supposed to read, from *La Presse*, with which not one single translator in the House, so far as I know, had any connection. *La Presse* was not a Government organ, was not the organ of the Secretary of State, but it was most violent in its abuse of the Government; also was *Le Monde*. If the other translators had written the articles of which the hon. gentleman read extracts, that might be a reason why we should be found fault with on this side of the House for not representing their case to the Speaker, because, certainly, if they were the authors of articles such as that from which extracts were read, they would deserve dismissal. I say there is nothing in the statement of the hon. gentleman, there is nothing in the context of what he read that would lead us to suppose that the translators referred to in his motion, had anything to do with the articles from which he read extracts. Now, the principle is perfectly clear, so far as ordinary civil servants are concerned. I, myself, have heard on the floor of this House, an agreement between the leader on this side and the leader on that side, that civil servants deserve dismissal if they take an active part in political discussions; I heard it agreed between Mr. Blake and the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, not more than two or three years ago—I think immediately after the last general election—that all civil servants had a perfect right to vote for either party, or either candidate, freely and without being interfered with, but when they went further than that, when they took it upon themselves actually to canvass, actively to assist in furthering the election of one candidate against another, they were endangering their position, and that if the Government saw fit to dismiss them they would be perfectly justified in doing so. That was Mr. Blake's statement of his view of the position of civil servants, and in that view the leader of the Government concurred. Now, Mr. Speaker, these translators, at least so far as Rémi Tremblay is concerned, went much further than that. In the contest in Richmond and Wolfe, Mr. Rémi Tremblay was one of the delegates to the original convention to choose a candidate to oppose me, and for weeks, and I may say with safety for months, before the polling day, he was actively engaged, not only in his own municipality, but in various parts of the county, holding and addressing meetings, canvassing, and using his influence in organising an opposition. Why, only to give you an idea of how far his interference in the election went, I may say that, on one occasion, shortly before polling day, I called a meeting at a certain place. I went there with the local member and another friend, thinking that I was going to have the meeting to myself, that I was going to have an opportunity of addressing my friends and my constituents generally; but I found Rémi Tremblay there. He was alone, but Rémi Tremblay was fully equal to the occasion. He presented himself as the representative of my opponent, and

he claimed not only the right to speak at my meeting, but to occupy as much time as I and my two friends occupied, he to speak turn and turn about with the three speakers on my side. It so happened that the particular parish where we were at the time was more or less benighted, more or less devoted to the politics of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I thought it wise to concede the point to the translator of the House, Rémi Tremblay. The result was that I was allowed fifteen minutes, Rémi Tremblay took fifteen minutes, the local member was allowed fifteen minutes, and Rémi Tremblay followed in another fifteen minutes; then my other friend spoke, and Rémi Tremblay spoke again, and as a matter of great favor to me I was allowed five minutes to close my own meeting.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Did you object to the arrangement then?

Mr. IVES. I can only say I had the pleasure of hearing Rémi Tremblay in these three speeches, and I have moderately stated his language in the complaint I have placed in the hands of Mr. Speaker. There was one thing that particularly struck me upon that occasion in what Rémi Tremblay said. He told the people that Sir Hector Langevin, Hon. Mr. Chapleau and Sir Adolphe Caron were traitors, that they had sold their compatriots, that they had abandoned their religion, and that they had deserted their countrymen for the sake of the salaries they derived as Ministers of the Crown. He said: "Now, look at me; I am a translator, I am employed by this Government, and I will be dismissed for the action I am now taking; but, so warmly do I feel upon this Riel question, so anxious am I to prevent Orangemen from controlling this country, that I am throwing away my position, my bread and butter—and he told us how many children he had and how dependent they were upon him—and it is only my patriotism which impels me to take this course." I thought it was too bad to deprive Rémi Tremblay of the goal to which he had aspired, and if he has aspired to the honors of martyrdom he ought to have them, and I may say I told him I would complain to the Speaker. I think I was justified in taking that course. Rémi Tremblay was an elector in the county; he had a perfect right to vote, and I would not have found any fault if he had made lots of Rouges, in fact he did so—he is a good electioneer and is not to be despised as an opponent: he did well and made me lots of trouble. I would not have found fault if he had confined himself to his own parish, but he held meetings throughout the constituency and took a prominent part and used the language to which I have referred, and I think I am justified in complaining. If any of the other translators have transgressed, the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey), who seems to be somewhat excited at the present moment, has only to make complaint, and I believe the Speaker, as the judicial officer of this House, will act fairly and justly in the matter. I have no doubt he would, but it is not proper that we should condemn the Speaker for acting under the plain words of the statute on a case that came within those terms, on the ground that other people have offended in the same direction.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it is to be deplored that in a case like this, where one of the prosecutors is the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), he should have so little regard for the proprieties of this House as to endeavor to clinch the judgment which he says he has secured against a person who is absent from this House. I think the circumstances ought to have suggested to the hon. member that at all events he should have pursued the dignified course of being neutral, and have allowed the House to exercise its own independent judgment. Instead of doing so he comes forward to-day as a witness making allegations of fact, I will not say controvertible or not, but making allegations for the purpose of prejudicing the case

or justifying what has been done, claiming an opportunity of making *ex parte* statements to the prejudice of the accused. Is that the generous, the just, the honorable, the gentlemanly course that ought to characterise any hon. gentleman in this House? The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) says that the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition at one time laid down a policy on this question, that they came to an agreement across the floor that all civil servants who took part in elections did so at the peril of dismissal, and I think he went further—I am not going to say he did if he did not—and said they would earn for themselves dismissal. I think if the leader of the Opposition admitted such a proposition during the last three years, it was the duty of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe to have read the identical words of the leader of the Opposition before he made a statement of that kind. However that may be, my own impression about the position of the civil servant is this: I do not approve of a civil servant taking an active part in politics. I do not approve of the language used in this particular case, such language as I see in the record in the Votes and Proceedings—I do not think any reasonable person will approve of that course, but I hold that there is a great difference to be drawn between the case of a civil servant whose whole time is given to the Government and that of a person employed temporarily who receives only a partial remuneration, not sufficient to enable him to live except by making exertions outside. When owing to the limited employment obtained here a person is compelled to seek employment outside, you thereby relegate him to the full status of an ordinary citizen, untrammelled by his temporary or partial employment in this House. I do not propose at this moment to take up the point of law, but to touch on a point referred to by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). He says in his complaint against Rémi Tremblay—and all my remarks will apply to Rémi Tremblay—that his employment in this House is distasteful to the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. When did the hon. gentleman come to that conclusion? If I take the evidence supplied by himself I come to the conclusion that it was on 30th May, 1887. The acts complained of took place at the general election in 1887. They were all over on 22nd February, 1887, and for three months, from 22nd February to 30th May, there was not one word of complaint by the hon. gentleman. During the last days of the Session he made complaint—then too late to have the matter laid before the House—to the Speaker privately, and he made complaint at such a late date that any man would assume that if during the three months the hon. gentleman was not offended it was rather late on 30th May to find out and state for the first time that his royal highness has been offended by what took place some months before. What is the hon. gentleman's position? His colleague in the Local House is Mr. Picard. I hold in my hand a letter written by Mr. Picard in which he asks Mr. Tremblay to take the very course he did take, in which he asked him to aid by voice, vote and conduct, public and private, to turn out the present Ministry and all their supporters. Mr. Picard, by this document which I hold in my hand, a public document—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. MULOCK. I have not time to read it; but the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe must have known, as a public man, that Mr. Picard not only invited but declared before heaven that it was the duty of Rémi Tremblay to take the course he did, and he aided and abetted in the election of Mr. Picard, and Mr. Picard aided and abetted in the election of the member for Richmond and Wolfe. The hon. gentleman is certainly of a very forgiving and Christian character. He was indignant at first. After the battle was over, and the possible contestation in the court was

over, he became very fierce. He found he had been insulted some months before and he suddenly changed his views. His principles changed, and if I might paraphrase

"A merciful Providence fashioned him hollower,
On purpose he might his principles swallow,"

Mr. Picard speaking to those who were getting up a meeting at Weedon to offer up prayers for the repose of the soul of Louis Riel, says :

"I would have been truly happy to find myself with you and particularly on that day to express my opinion before the people of Weedon who always supported me so loyally, and to show them once more that their representative in the Local House does not fear to blame his leaders when they do wrong, and to even repudiate them when they commit too serious faults. I consider, gentlemen, that the crime of the execution of Louis Riel should be interpreted by all true French Canadians as being an outrage and a humiliation thrown in their face by the Government of Sir John. It is for this reason that the whole of the French Canadian people should rise as one man in a union of heart and action to prove by means of the press and public demonstrations that they resented the injury and the outrage done them by the execution of Riel."

Mr. IVES. Let me ask if that letter was addressed to Tremblay, and if it is in French or in English?

Mr. MULLOCK. This letter is in English, it is a translation by Mr. Picard to the electors of Richmond and Wolfe.

Mr. IVES. I understood you to say it was addressed to Rémi Tremblay.

Mr. MULLOCK. It is not addressed to Rémi Tremblay, but does not the hon. gentleman understand that he is one of the French Canadian people? Is the hon. gentleman so obtuse that he does not understand the status of the French Canadian people, he who is offended by Rémi Tremblay opposing him and who endorses the action of Picard and invites him to promote his election. I say, under those circumstances, no man in his senses would have attached any importance whatever to the utterances of any person who would say that the conduct of Mr. Tremblay was offensive to him and his presence as an employé of this House distasteful. I will not discuss the question any longer than simply to make those observations. With reference to the legal point, I have no intention to touch upon it. If this matter had been stated candidly and impartially, if the member for Richmond and Wolfe had stated: I endorsed Mr. Tremblay's action at one time, now I go back on it, then he would have made a full and candid statement. He did not do so and now he takes the opportunity in an unmanly manner of asking for the dismissal of a man whose conduct he previously endorsed.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 53) to make further provision respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Bill (No. 25) to confirm the chapter of incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

Bill (No. 23) to reduce the Capital Stock of "La Banque Nationale."—(Mr. Bryson.)

Bill (No. 11) to empower the Merchants Marine Insurance Company of Canada to relinquish its Charter and to provide for the winding up of its affairs.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 51) respecting the Federal Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Montreal Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

Mr. MULLOCK.

Bill (No. 74) to amend the Act to incorporate the Kin-cardine and Teeswater Railway Company.—(Mr. Rowand.)

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Renfrew.)

Bill (No. 22) to incorporate the Eastern Assurance Company.—(Mr. Macdougald.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company.—(Mr. Fisher.)

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the International Convention for the Preservation of Submarine Cables.—(Mr. Thompson.)

DISMISSAL OF FRENCH TRANSLATORS.

House resumed debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Laurier, and amendment of Mr. Mills.

Mr. MULLOCK. Before recess, I called the attention of the House to the conduct of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) in order to show that, in my judgment, there was no sincerity in his assertion that he felt in any way aggrieved by the conduct of, at least, one of the translators. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will give you the published record which ought to have been known by the hon. member, being a statement of one of the witnesses on whom he relies on this case, namely Mr. Picard, his colleague in the Local Legislature. One of the papers filed by the hon. gentleman with the Speaker, is a statutory declaration by Mr. Picard whom the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe adopts as his witness in this case. The hon. member objects to the utterances of Mr. Tremblay, and he takes his place on the platform beside Mr. Picard, he promotes the election of Mr. Picard, and Mr. Picard promotes the election of the present member for Richmond and Wolfe in this House. Now, what are the principles of Mr. Picard and those of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives)? The letter I was quoting before the House rose is as follows:—

"To the organisers of the religious and patriotic demonstration at Weedon, on the occasion of the *requiem* services for the repose of the soul of Louis Riel:

"GENTLEMEN,—I regret exceedingly to find myself on account of sickness in the impossibility to be at Weedon to assist at the *requiem* services which you are having celebrated for the repose of Riel who died a martyr for having loved too much his fellow-countrymen, the Half-breeds of the North-West, and who had labored constitutionally to aid them to obtain the redress of grave injustices which the several Governments at Ottawa since 1834 had allowed to be committed against them."

Those were the views of Mr. Picard, those were the views that the present member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) endorsed, and they were the views expressed by the translator whose conduct is complained of by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. The writer goes on to say:

"In any case, if I am not with you in person, tell the friends who sympathise with the cause of Riel (I am sure all the people of Weedon are unanimous) that I will be with them in heart and spirit. I would have been truly happy to find myself with you, and particularly on that day, to express my opinion before the people of Weedon who always supported me so loyally, and to show them once more that their representative in the Local House does not fear to blame his leaders when they do wrong and to even repudiate them when they commit too serious faults. I consider, gentlemen, that the crime of the execution of Louis Riel should be interpreted by all true hearted French Canadians as being an outrage and a humiliation thrown in their face by the Government of Sir John.

Those were the sentiments the present member endorsed when he wanted to get the votes of the people of Richmond and Wolfe. Those were sentiments repudiated by him when he got installed in his seat. The writer goes on to say:

"It is for this reason that the whole French Canadian people should rise as one man in a union of heart and action to prove by means of the press and public demonstration that they resented the injury and the outrage done them by the execution of Riél."

How is this to be done? This invitation points out the way. The present complainant knows about this invitation. It is to be done as follows:—

"To succeed effectually in this great National movement, let us be energetic, but also, let us be moderate and prudent, and above all, let us be persevering in following the idea which gave birth to this patriotic movement."

"Let Liberals and Conservatives join together to form in a frank and honest manner a great National party."

What for? To secure the defeat of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe? Yes.

"To overthrow the Government of Sir John Macdonald."

The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) actually invites to the platform a gentleman to support him whose policy and object in life was to overthrow the Government of Sir John Macdonald.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A very laudable purpose.

Mr. MULOCK. There are different ways of accomplishing a laudable purpose. In this particular case you will observe the gentleman who was asking the support of another gentleman to defeat the Cabinet, afterwards objected to the principles involved. He goes on to say:

"I conclude by wishing you success and by telling you that if we French Canadians are united, that if we work all together hand in hand, we shall soon rise from the painful position in which we are placed to-day because we shall certainly have to aid us the help and alliance of all good English citizens."

Including of course the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). No doubt he presented his case in that way.

"Of all those who desire as we do, to see peace, concord and harmony, reign between the divers races which compose this Dominion; the latter are yet numerous enough to make us hope for a decided triumph before long. That is my hope."

These were the sentiments which Mr. Picard endorsed, and they do not appear to be such as to prevent the present complainant taking his place on the platform beside him, and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), took advantage of Mr. Picard's influence, vote and support; and yet after the contest is all over this hon. gentleman finds out some months afterwards that his dignity has been offended. Let us take the utterance of the hon. member to-day. Where does he draw a line as to what a person under those circumstances can do? He says he finds no fault with his constituent, Rémi Tremblay, for speaking in his own parish. This gentleman, I suppose, was a resident of one of the parishes in that riding. He says he would not have been offended if Mr. Tremblay had confined his operations to the parish in which he was a voter, but when he goes beyond that line Mr. Tremblay deserves to be thrown on a heartless world without a position. Will the hon. gentleman explain how it would be perfectly proper and consistent for Mr. Tremblay to use all his influence to obtain a certain result inside of certain geographical boundaries, and not to do it on the other side of the boundaries so as to defeat the election of the present complainant? I fail to see the consistency, and therefore I take it that the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) is not sincere in his complaint.

Mr. IVES. If you are going to take that statement I desire you to quote it correctly. I said that although I did not approve of his taking any part in the election further than voting, yet I would not have taken any action against him if he had confined himself to his own parish.

Mr. MULOCK. That is what I say. It would not have offended the hon. member if Mr. Tremblay had confined

himself to one township, but it happened that he went to some other township. Does not that prove want of sincerity on the part of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives)? Does it not prove that the Speaker, having heard the admission made by the hon. gentleman, should attach no importance to the statement made in the letter of the present member that the presence of Rémi Tremblay was distasteful to him by reason of Mr. Tremblay's conduct during the election? I think this discussion has resolved itself into one point. It appears to me that the Government are at the bottom of this transaction. It cannot happen except through the influence of the Government, and it is part and parcel of a certain policy, which I believe is the only settled policy the Administration has, and that is to remove from office by force every man who will not vote for them, to crush all who cannot crush them. We know that the Government's railway policy was fixed until it was changed, but it has been changed a good many times. They have had a fixed policy of loyalty, they were not going to discriminate, but they did; they had a fixed policy in regard to the tariff and were not going to have reciprocity, but last night I understand the First Minister said he had offered unrestricted reciprocity.

Mr. SPROULE. Question.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is always calling question. I only wish that the great naturalist, Mr. Darwin, had lived long enough to settle his theory about the missing link. I do not intend to go into the policy of the Government except on this one point of dismissals, and I see the hand of the Government at the bottom of this, the same as we see the hand of the Government at the bottom of the dismissal of those three Irishmen in Montreal the other day. I am not going to discuss why they were dismissed. Everybody knows why they were dismissed. They had made themselves distasteful not by speaking but by simply exercising their right to vote. Those three Irishmen simply voted against the Government and they were dismissed, and here we have this time dismissed Frenchmen. What are those hon. gentlemen doing now? They were once declaiming against a war of race and creed but they have adopted a different policy. They are now declaring a war of race and creed against representatives of two of the large elements in this country. I thought that every true Canadian welcomed to Canada a man of any nationality if he became a good citizen and helped to promote the welfare of the country. I thought the shamrock was entitled to a place here in Canada, I thought it was entitled to take root here and grow. I thought that the *fleur de lis* was entitled to a place in the Canadian nationality, but hon. gentlemen now for some reason and on account of some influences behind appear to have laid down as their policy what I may put in one sentence: "No Irish need apply." No man shall have a position in this Administration unless he bends the knee to Baal, and unless he submits to be a faithful servant and follower of the Administration here. Now, if that be the policy let it be known, let it be declared, let us know exactly where we stand, and let it be a part of their fixed policy, but do not adopt such a sham as is presented in this case by the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), declaring that as it happened his supersensitiveness in spite of his better nature, has compelled him to express, four months after the offence, that he has been deeply wounded in his feelings by a person who at that time was a free and independent elector and it must be remembered that the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) was only a private citizen then, too. Under those circumstances I deplore the action of the Administration, for they are responsible for it and they will be held responsible for it. The member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) I presume, has dug his own grave by this

little transaction, the same as the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) has dug his grave by this arrangement with regard to his own constituents. But whether those gentlemen have dug their own political graves or not, the merits of the complaint made by the member for Richmond and Wolfe do not, in my opinion, justify the action of Mr. Speaker. Do not mistake me as for one moment endorsing the utterances of the gentlemen in question. I have read, and I have read with regret, some of the extracts from their speeches, but in view of the circumstances prevailing at the time, in view of the inflamed state of the public mind at that time, in view of the action of leading members of this House at that time, and in view of the necessity of forgetting if you can a blot on the history of Canada, of forgetting all those sad circumstances of 1885, it would have been wiser in the public interest and more generous on the part of the strong to the weak that this matter had been allowed to pass by in silence. Being of this opinion, I disapprove of the action of the Speaker, I condemn the Administration for it, and as to the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) I think he has made a grave mistake, and one which he will regret.

Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency). (Translation.) Those who have spoken before me, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, treated the question of privilege coming up at present, and I fancy that they have done so triumphantly, proving to the satisfaction of the House that the Speaker had exceeded the powers conferred on him by the rules of the House in dismissing the gentlemen whose case now engages our attention. I think that the hon. the Secretary of State will be the first to repent the step he is taking in this matter. Everybody is aware that, for years past, he has had an active part in the political affairs of the country, and it is well known, chiefly in the Province of Quebec, that he went over almost all the counties of the Province delivering rude blows and receiving as rude in return. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the Secretary of State has always entertained the feelings which he expressed to-day. He has not always been so touchy as he would have us believe that he is in the present case. To establish this, I may quote a few lines of a speech delivered by him in this House, on the 12th April, 1884. This is what he said in reference to the above, which he received:

"I never looked for general approbation. In the numerous and bitter encounters of which our Province has been the arena, one had to expect as many blows as he gave. I had my share of wounds, but those that hurt me most came from my friends. I have had the evil fortune of being struck in my own camp. I mourned over this division and do so still. But, I state here that despite these attacks, despite the lawful resentments which they aroused, I never found room in my heart for bitterness and resentment. Having never acted from passion, I can speak without gall, and it is with the wish and trust that I may bring my adversaries to juster feelings in my regard, that I have entered so minutely into the railway policy which has been used against me as a weapon of hostility."

I believe that if the hon. the Secretary of State had practised to-day the principles he laid down in 1884, in the speech just referred to, he would have acted much more wisely than he has done. I do not mean to treat this question from a constitutional standpoint. I shall confine myself to a few words on its merits. I hold that, even if Messrs. Tremblay and Poirier took part in electoral contests, and busied themselves with politics, they were only making use of a right enjoyed by this House and by the hon. the Secretary of State himself, as I shall presently show. But before coming to that, it may be better to summarise briefly the charges against Messrs. Tremblay and Poirier by the hon. the Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). These charges are:—That Messrs. Tremblay and Poirier went through the last electoral campaign with unprecedented violence both on the hustings and in the press. That Mr. Ernest Tremblay, in a pamphlet addressed to the

Mr. MULLOCK.

Secretary of State, indited in reference to the latter such offensive and calumnious things that he (the Secretary) could neither talk nor bow to him in the House and he adds, "I sincerely say that his presence in this House is to me such a nuisance as I hold no one has any right to have any member put up with." Such are the charges against the three persons who are now on trial. To understand their case better, I think it is necessary to ascertain how these offences are chosen. It is by a special committee of the House, to whom the faithful reports and the correct translations of the Debates are entrusted. And to show how jealous the House is of the privileges allotted to this committee and of the importance attached to it, I may cite the following words from Mr. Blake when alterations were proposed therein last year. He said:

"I believe there is no committee where the perfect knowledge of the duties of the permanent staff, and of the work in general, is more important than in that of the Debates; and, for my part, according to my right to the choice of the members of this committee, I hold that those of the members who have acted in a satisfactory manner should not be removed from the committee."

If the opinion was, at that time, that it is important not to change the members of the committee because, on account of their experience in the past, they are in a better position than any others to see that the Debates are faithfully reported and translated, I maintain it is equally important not to change, without the most convincing reasons, and the gravest grounds, the translators of the Debates, as the purpose is now to do, I venture to say, from mere whim. The chief objection is that these gentlemen meddled in politics. Well, Mr. Speaker, they did so mingle. But, as I just said, they had a right to do it. And even if they had not the right, the really guilty ones are those who declared in this House that, when they got the position, the translators of the Debates were not hindered from taking part in political contests, writing in the papers, and exercising all the rights of citizens. I shall cite extracts from speeches delivered in this House by several members, and notably by the hon. the Secretary of State. In 1884 Mr. Bergin said:

"We felt it was not the duty of the committee to inquire into a man's politics, but into his qualifications, and that politics had nothing whatever to do with a man's qualifications as a servant of this House."

The hon. the Secretary of State having said on the same occasion:

"We are not to judge of the political qualifications of the reporters and translators of *Hansard*. We should not call up any unpleasant reminiscences of the past, when the question is a competent officer of the House. The only questions that we should consider in the choice of reporters and translators for *Hansard*, are those of knowledge, ability and general qualification."

The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) spoke as below, when the question of an increase of salaries for the translators came up. One reason against it was that outside the Sessions, they could write for the papers and engage in politics. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said:

"I felt myself that there was no justification for granting an advance to the translators, most of whom are here acting as newspaper correspondents and would be here whether they held translators' situations or not."

This is the opinion of several members of the House. The hon. the Secretary of State himself said that when translators were appointed, there was no need to search into their political views, but that their qualification as translators should alone be taken into account. Now, on this score, no one will challenge the qualifications of these three gentlemen, nor pretend that Messrs. Tremblay and Poirier are not model translators, doing their work with extraordinary despatch. A couple of times already, since the beginning of the Session, members have complained that the translation was quite lagging, while last year, by comparison of dates, it is easy to see that the translation was per-

formed rapidly and was not backward as at present. I make these remarks to show that, on the score of qualification, no one has found fault with the gentlemen, and no one has charged them with not faithfully fulfilling their duty. The only reproach is that they mingled in politics. I have already said that members of this House admit the right of the translators taking a hand in politics and exercising their civic rights, and I will now add that the Conservative press, entrusted with the praise of the Government from one end of the year to the other, has established the principle which, in my mind, ought to guide the majority of this House and prevent it from doing the injustice which it will be called upon to sanction. Take for instance, *La Minerve* of the 15th July, 1884, and the hon. the Secretary of State, who repudiates *La Presse* as his organ, will not disown *La Minerve*:

"The position of translator of the Debates prevents none of the members of that body from meddling in politics and writing in the papers outside of the Sessions."

On the 12th July, 1886, *Le Monde*, the organ of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, said:

"As to the question of right, *La Minerve* has since decided it."

And *Le Monde* quotes *La Minerve* as above, approving of the passage, and using it against a paragraph to the contrary which had slipped into *La Minerve*. *Le Monde* adds:

"We repeat that our colleague was mistaken on this point, and that evil-minded persons took advantage of the absence of the regular editors to insert that erroneous note."

Replying also to *La Minerve*, *La Presse*' of the 20th July, 1886, said:

"*La Minerve* is rather ungracious in reproaching the translators of the Debates for exercising a right which is recognised by the House."

Then again, Mr. Vanasse, editor of *Le Sorelois*, if I mistake not, and also one of the translators of the Debates of this House, wrote in his paper on the 20th July, 1886:

"Mr. Vanasse repelled with spirit the unjust attacks levelled against him. He explained that he in no wise depended on the Government; that he had been appointed translator by a committee of the House of Commons, composed of Liberals and Conservatives, and that the Government could not dismiss him, as they had no business in the office, and that a vote of the House of Commons was required to compass that."

It will be seen from the above extract that this translator took upon himself to teach the Speaker his powers. He declares positively that the Speaker has no right to dismiss translators, but that this belongs only to the House. The same paper adds:

"Mr. Vanasse spoke a second time. Then Mr. Ernest Tremblay, of St. Hyacinthe—not the same who took part in the meeting in this city, Saturday last—held forth in behalf of the Liberal cause. If we do not always approve Mr. Tremblay's political opinions, there is one thing in him that we do approve, and which we make it a pleasure and a duty to state, that is, his courteous method of debate. The polite language employed yesterday by Mr. Tremblay contrasted strangely with the wild words, the coarse and trifling expressions of the young demagogue Lemieux, and the audience showed conclusively that it could quite distinguish between a well-bred man and a loafer."

These are the terms, Mr. Speaker, in which a Conservative paper, *Le Sorelois*, appreciates Mr. Tremblay. The difference is palpable between the views of the *Sorelois* and the manner in which the hon. the Secretary of State treats Mr. Tremblay to-day, when he used the word "blackguard" in presence of the House. And now, Sir, if translators dabbling in politics must absolutely be put out of doors, we should have no two weights nor two measures. We state that among the translators is a Mr. Lasalle, and I am told that that gentleman is secretary of the Conservative Association of Montreal. That gentleman went to the trouble of crossing the river and penetrating into the county of Chambly to work against my friend, the member for that county (Mr. Prétontaine). If it be a heinous crime for Messrs. Tremblay and Poirier to have opposed the election of the member for Richmond and Wolfe, and that of the hon.

the Secretary of State in Terrebonne, is not the offence of Mr. Lasalle as great for his action in Chambly? Mr. Vanasse edits *Le Sorelois*, as I have said. At the last general elections he went through the whole campaign against the candidate of the National party, Dr. Ladouceur. Then, there is the case of Mr. Beaulieu. This gentleman, who presides over the translator's office, was for several years editor of *La Minerve*. During the last general elections, after vainly searching through the county of St. Johns for a candidate willing to sacrifice himself on the altar of his country against the hon. Mr. Marchand, a choice was finally made in the person of Mr. Philippe Pelletier, lawyer, of Montreal. To give him a standing in that county, and that it might be said Mr. Pelletier had a stake in St. Johns, Mr. Beaulieu took him into partnership. I mention these things not by way of reproach, or to deny their rights of acting as they did, because they have this right, sanctioned by the press and the majority of members of this House on both sides of politics. I now come to Mr. Poirier's case. His circumstances differ somewhat from those of the Messrs. Tremblay of whom one wrote verses, and the other, a political pamphlet. As to Mr. Poirier I know of nothing against him except the charge of the hon. the Secretary of State. He is accused only of having spoken at political meetings and of having insulted the Secretary of State. Shall we judge him without hearing? Mr. Poirier formally denies the accusation brought against him. We have, on the one hand, the affirmation of the hon. the Secretary of State—for whom I entertain all possible respect—and, on the other, the formal and emphatic denial of Mr. Poirier, in whom I have equal confidence. Here is his letter in reply to the Speaker of the House:

"If I thought I could be agreeable to you, Mr. Speaker, in giving you detailed explanations, in a reply to your letter, I should hasten to do so. But of what use? I am amenable to the special committee of the House, known under the name of Debates Committee, and I am in a position to prove to that committee—if it did me the honor of a summons—that I have done nothing to justify the demand of the House for my dismissal."

"This is, however, what I may reply to the hon. the Secretary of State:—

"I took part in politics during the recess after the last Session, and spoke at several public meetings, but in so doing I exercised a right recognised to our body by the chief French organs of the Government; a right which several of the members of this House and of the Senate invited me to exercise; a right which my Conservative colleagues in the *Hansard* exercised as I did; a right which the hon. the Secretary of State himself seemed to recognise till lately, seeing that he waited till the 22nd March, 1887, to complain of me, and that he has taken no account of my share in the contests preceding the recess which elapsed after the last Session."

Here we are in presence of an affirmation and a denial. Well, Sir, as the House constitutes itself a tribunal to-day, and is called to pass judgment on this gentleman, will it do so without hearing him? Mr. Poirier declares that the charges against him are false and lying, and he demands to be heard before the Debates Committee. May we refuse him this simple act of justice? Would a single member render judgment without hearing the interested party? I heard the hon. the Secretary of State this afternoon. He said it was true that he had gone out of the constitutional question, and entered on the merits of the question, but he added that he was the plaintiff in the case. Well, if there is a plaintiff, there are also defendants; if an accuser, there are accused likewise. If he be allowed to come on the floor of this House and lodge charges against these three gentlemen; if he be allowed to abuse them as he did this afternoon, it strikes me that, in justice, these young men should be permitted to defend themselves, and we should hear their defence against the charges brought against them. Reference was made this afternoon to the case of Mr. Elie Tassé. That has no analogy with this. In the first place, Mr. Tassé was not in the employ of the House, but simply in that of the Government, and the abuse complained of as appearing in *La Minerve* was written during the course of

the Session, that is, while Mr. Tassé was paid to devote all his time to the labors of the House. Mr. Tassé took it upon himself to write to the papers and insult certain members who were here attending to their parliamentary duties. It follows that Mr. Tassé's case had absolutely no similarity with that which now occupies our attention. Much ado has been made about Mr. Tremblay's pamphlet. The great offence of the latter gentleman is having written a pamphlet which has proved extremely displeasing to the hon. the Secretary of State. And yet, who provided this pamphlet? The hon. the Secretary of State himself. It will be remembered that, in consequence of Riel's execution, there was considerable excitement in the Province of Quebec; everybody was carried away; a great number of members sitting in this House then shared with us the opinions which we still entertain. It is a matter of recollection that there are gentlemen at present in this House, who, with us, condemned Riel's execution, but who have since left the National party which was against that execution. These men were opposed to the execution, but as soon as it was over they felt released from their obligations and returned to the Government. Mr. Tremblay's pamphlet was written simply as a reply to a manifest of the hon. the Secretary of State to the electors of the County of Terrebonne published in the papers and made a subject of public discussion. In the exercise of his right as a citizen and a journalist, Mr. Tremblay undertook a commentary on the Secretary of State's manifest to the Terrebonne electorate. If any member of the House will go to the pains of reading this pamphlet, he will find that it is written in quite a loyal spirit toward the Secretary of State. Certain passages of the hon. Minister's manifest are discussed, and these discussed passages are quoted, and I fancy I could challenge anyone to find in Mr. Tremblay's whole production a single expression abusive of the hon. the Secretary of State. The most violent parts of the pamphlet are precisely the writings of men who, to-day, support the Government, and the speeches of those who now back up the Cabinet. As an instance, we have the speech of the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) who said in the County of Lévis, if I mistake not, that Sir John had begun his course by the light of the burning Parliament House at Montreal and would close it at the Regina scaffold. We have also the speeches and writings of the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Vanasse). Then there is the letter, the famous letter which the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) addressed to the National party at Montreal. Unluckily he forgot all about having written this letter, the other day, in L'Assomption County. We had to stick it under his nose to refresh his memory. I shall cite a few passages from this pamphlet, to show its spirit. The language is bold, but courteous and parliamentary withal. If I demonstrate that this language would be allowed in the House, I do not see how anyone can complain of it outside of the House, and reproach Mr. Tremblay with having said such outrageous things against the hon. Minister as to render his presence intolerable in this House. The following is an extract from a Conservative paper, cited on Mr. Tremblay's 5th page:—

"But this Ohapleau is not a man, they now say. He is a jackal, a hyena, for only wild beasts unearth their prey to devour it. This is the exaggeration of language to which you have driven your sycophants, the excess of words which I hesitate to repeat, because opposed to all violence."

Even Mr. Tremblay finds the language too strong.

"And do not fancy that it is by a rhetorical trick that I transmit to you this expression of sentiments held in your regard. It is in the ranks of your own people that you are upbraided with having recommended the trial of a man who had borne the punishment of the sentence pronounced against him, and who can no longer be asked, according to the rubric, if he has anything to say for himself before the law takes its course. For, Mr. Taché says, in a work just published, 'Why is the iniquitous course played over again of beginning anew the trial of the
Mr. LANGELIER (Montmorency).

unfortunate man executed before the public, by citing the evidence of Reverend Fathers André and Tourmond, who, sworn before the court, gave evidence whose natural conclusion was surely not the scaffold. Even the generous and loving soul of Mgr. Grandin has been tortured by imputing to him a part in the matter, unworthy of his position and heart. And all this is done, it is audaciously asserted, to cause the triumph of truth.'"

This is not their language, but it is Mgr. Taché's. On page 7 Mr. Tremblay adds:

"You will notice, of course, that it is not I that speak thus. It is your own followers, now separated from you, whose sentiments I refer to your appreciation."

Mr. Tremblay takes the pains, at every turn, to inform the hon. Secretary of State that his language, severe and offensive as it is, is not his own, but comes from lips that formerly intoned his praises. On page 12, after citing five Conservative papers, the writer says:

"This specimen of the recent departure of your friends should suffice to show you that the tyrannical exigencies of party spirit have no longer any hold on those whom the execution of the Apostle of the rights of the Half-breeds has awakened from their torpor and that they condemn the general conduct of the Government, without caring for the previous opposition which they bestowed upon it. I shall take the liberty to examine your manifest, point by point, and submit to the ordeal of my criticism, but, before beginning, I beg to remind you that Riel's execution has been called, in all political meetings and by nearly all the papers of the Province, a political murder and a juridical assassination, a horrible crime for which the Macdonald Government, as constituted at the time of the execution, must be held constitutionally responsible. Messrs. Trudel, Desjardins, Bourbeau, Girouard, Vanasse, Armand, Bellerose, Bergeron, Conservative Senators and members, were of this mind and declared that they were abominably deceived by you and your colleagues. Messrs. Amyot, Tarte, Garneau, Faucher de St. Maurice, and other ministerial leaders, made similar statements.

At page 18 of the same pamphlet occurs the following:—

"Mr. Girouard, Conservative member for Jacques Cartier, said: 'The Government odiously deceived us. I state it openly, and will no longer support the Government.'"

Mr. Girouard has changed his mind since then:

"It is not because he is a French Canadian that Mr. Girouard withdraws his confidence from the Government, but because, in his view, the Cabinet are odious deceivers. The hon. Senator Trudel, whose opposition to all show of rebellion is well known, approves what has just been said. Mr. Lafontaine, late Minister of Justice, adheres to the same movement. Mr. Desjardins, Conservative member for Hochelaga, says: 'The Ministers kept us in continual deceit.' It is not of the English members that he speaks. He speaks of you and your two French colleagues in the Administration. And he closed by exclaiming: 'The career of Sir John, which began in 1849 with the reflection of the burning of the Parliament House at Montreal, will close behind Riel's scaffold.'"

These are the hardest words in the whole pamphlet. In a meeting held at Bienville, Lévis county, in 1887, Mr. Tarte, the distinguished writer and editor of *Le Canadien*, spoke thus:

"In 1837 we had on our side Englishmen and Frenchmen from France. By remaining within the bounds of the Constitution we shall have the majority of thoughtful Englishmen with us. We have already the Irish with their warm hearts and blood, but we are no longer with the Tories, and I will give you incontestable facts that justify us a thousand times in severing our connection. In 1869 Sir John—an eminent man, but as tricky as he is distinguished—called Mgr. Taché from Rome, and why? To fool the Métis, at the risk of ruining the prelate in the minds of Catholics. Under Sir John, furthermore, the half-breeds have been treated as pariahs. Another insult is Sir John's letter to his son, in which he, one of the councillors of her Majesty the Queen of England, appealed to the volunteers of Winnipeg and Ontario to crush French Canadians."

And what are Mr. Tremblay's comments?

"They call him a cheat because he is a cheat, and it is this spirit of deceit and not his nationality which draws down that of hostility on his head."

I shall now cite, from the pamphlet, the words of the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol):

"We have adopted this resolution, gentlemen, because honor and justice require it. We did not ask the commutation of Riel's punishment solely because he was French, but because he did not deserve death, and in no country of the world are political delinquents executed. This is Sir John's unpardonable mistake as the reason why we desert him.

"We do not seek a war of races, we ask only one thing—to respect our race as we respect other races. Square justice for all on Canadian

soil . . . They who asked for Riel's head must soon bow their own before the indignant protest of all that is honorable not only among French Canadians, but among all citizens of the Dominion, irrespective of race."

I will quote now the words of a man whose principles are well known—the Hon. Mr. Malhiot, the former Conservative leader in the Quebec Legislature:—

"I always followed the Conservative standard, but to-day I do not hesitate in denouncing the men who are responsible for the crime against which we protest. I do not hesitate taking part in the movement for the overthrow of the Government that are Riel's hangmen; this is our present business. When that Government shall have been cut off, it will be time to find out what new material will go to make the new organisation. We shall see what new alliances, better than those of the past, should be made with the parties in Ontario. Too long has the Province of Quebec been the footstool of our allies in other provinces. It is time to seek fresh alliances."

Now, we find in the pamphlet of Mr. Tremblay, the resolutions adopted at the Champ de Mars, where a large number of Conservative senators and members were gathered: The first and second resolutions are as follows:—

"Resolved, 1. That in thus causing Riel's execution on the 16th November, instant, Sir John A. Macdonald's Government committed an act of inhumanity and cruelty unworthy of a civilised nation, and deserves the condemnation of all the friends of right and justice, without difference of race or creed:

2. That the sanction given by Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Adolphe Caron and Hon. Joseph A. Chapleau to this odious execution, constitutes an act of national treason and specially deserves the reprobation of all the citizens of this province."

These again are among the strongest expressions found in the pamphlet. They are not Mr. Tremblay's, but come from Conservative journalists and speakers. We have just seen what a number of members of this House thought on the subject. Let us learn what *La Minerve*, known as an ancient Conservative organ, said on the day following Riel's execution:

"So deep is the repugnance inspired by the very idea of Riel's execution that, up to the last moment yesterday, we looked for a commutation of the terrible sentence. The hopes of a whole race are swept away, and the spotless purity of our national escutcheon is no longer intact. Twenty years could not elapse without the stain of blood on the great book of Canadian Confederation. And it is very early to lose our verginal beauty. No wonder that our people were excited to the pitch of noisy manifestations in token of their wrath. The time for supplications is past. That of recriminations does not suit us. The era of inflexible determination, followed up by practical results, is alone satisfactory. The events of yesterday will furnish a new page to our history."

The same paper wrote on the day of the execution:

"We betray no secret in saying that accounts will have to be rendered at the next Session. Sir John will be judged like the rest. If, as we believe, the Orange party are at the back of this unpolitic act, there will be a definite settlement between that party and ourselves, unless the decision comes on at once, which we should not regret. If the Government have been driven by this wretched clique which lives wholly on hate, they must abide by the consequence."

Let us hear now what the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Vanasse) said on the subject:

"I protest against the execution of Louis Riel. I will no longer support the Government, which does not deserve the confidence of right-thinking men. Sir John will carry to the grave the blot that sticks to his name. As for me, I am prepared to resign, if my constituents do not approve my course."

The hon. member has not resigned that I know of. He did not appeal to his constituents, but, on the contrary, as his votes show, he has rallied under the Government flag, and may be accounted one of the most faithful friends and valorous henchmen of the Administration. And *Le Quotidien*, a paper published at Lévis, the organ, I had almost said, of my hon. friend the member for Lévis, as the paper ironically calls him (Mr. Guay):

"The voice of humanity was not heard. Right and force triumph, it is true, but the hands of justice are reeking with blood. And if to-day we have no further motive for saving the life of the unfortunate Riel, we can avenge his memory, and save the integrity of the national honor."

Le Nord, published at St. Jérôme, spoke in the same terms, and closed thus:

"We denounce the Macdonald Government and demand its downfall."

Another Conservative journal, *Le Courrier du Canada*, the organ of the hon. the Minister of Public Works at Quebec, and edited by his son-in-law, had the following:—

"Yesterday we wrote: That is a day of mourning for Canada wherein we see the building of a political scaffold. We might have added that, for the Province of Quebec particularly, this date of the 16th November is funereal. At Montreal, Quebec, in all the populous centres, the news of the execution was received with expressions of compassion and anger. Most certainly Quebec expected an act of clemency. She was disappointed, and hence the excitement."

The *Journal de Québec* said in its turn:

"The Regina tragedy gives rise to a problem hard of solution, but which is not beyond human wisdom."

And another paper, *Le Nouvelliste*, at that period the organ of the hon. the Minister of Militia (Sir Adolphe Caron), added this:

"But the rage of the Orange Tiger was unsated.

"Now it is satisfied.

"The French Catholic element has paid its tribute to the hatred of the Sectarians.

"The Conservative party of the Province of Quebec has received the reward of the political alliance which enabled that ministry, despised in its own province, to share with it the honors of power.

"Our delegation has the sentiment of patriotism and of national honor. It possesses the confidence of the people. Let it consult wisely and act with prudence, and it can reckon on the support of the whole province in all that it may undertake to maintain its standing and ensure profitable alliances. It is useless to blind ourselves to the fact that Orangeism which has always been a disturbing element in the Conservative party, has dug an abyss between us."

I fancy, Mr. Speaker, that I have produced extracts enough from this pamphlet to show that the language complained of so bitterly, was not that of the author, but, on the contrary, that of Conservatives, cited and edited for the purposes of criticism. Now, honestly, had not Mr. Tremblay the right as a citizen to discuss the hon. the Secretary of States manifest, a document which was public property and which appeared in the papers? Had he not the right to interpret after his own fashion, and to cite the words and the writings of men who, before Riel's execution, had supported the Government, and who have since returned under the paternal roof? There is another point that ought to strike the members of this House. As we are ready to pass sentence on these gentlemen; as the majority are inclined to expel them without hearing, I will tell the hon. the Secretary of State that he is wanting in justice toward them. In his manifest to the electors of Terrebonne county, he complains of having been condemned without being heard. This is what he says, among other things:

"Much as I respect the national feeling which gives rise to the present movement, I also deplore the cause of the uprising and mourn over the sad results that may flow from it. The first proof that the cause is bad is that a spirit of injustice seems to control it. Old and tried servants of the country are suspected, accused and condemned—without being heard, and even before they have spoken.

Since the hon. the Secretary of State, in this case, complained of being condemned unheard, regarding this as an injustice, how can he change front to-day, and ask the House to condemn these three young men, who have had no opportunity of being heard? He wants them condemned before they have a chance of appearing before the Debates Committee, or before the House. It strikes me that he ought to be more generous and magnanimous, and apply the principle which he claimed for himself, when arraigned before his constituents. Another strange circumstance is that this pamphlet was written in December, 1885, and it is only at this Session of 1888 that these gentlemen feel that they have been insulted. This reminds me of the story of the German who went to the theatre and witnessed a very amusing farce. Three weeks after, when at home with his wife, he suddenly broke into a peal of laughter. The wife asked the ground of his amusement. He replied that he was recalling the comedy he had

heard three weeks before, and that it was so funny that he could not help laughing when he thought of it. These gentlemen are worse than the German, for it took them three years to find out that they had been insulted in their honor, and before laying their complaint before the House. There is another fact to be outlined, Mr. Speaker. The hon. the Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) state that they were insulted in their character as members of Parliament. I deny that when this pamphlet was published, they were not members, but only citizens going back to their counties for re-election, and, consequently, Mr. Tremblay had the right to discuss public questions, the same as all other citizens, each from the standpoint of his party. The above reason cannot, therefore, be urged. When these gentlemen come and tell us that they were members of Parliament, I say that they were not such at that period. They were simply citizens courting public favor and exposed, like all those who appeal to the people, to have their political behaviour overhauled. And there was nothing fairer than to criticise the hon. the Secretary of State's circular to his people. Then, since the alleged offence was committed, there was a dissolution of Parliament, and there was one Session last year. Yet these gentlemen had not yet realised that they had been insulted. But, in the Session of 1888, probably because other claimants came along wanting the place of our three friends, they found out that they had been deeply wounded in their honor, and that these three young men should be thrown out on the street, after assuring them in the past that they could take part in political contests, and write in the papers, without jeopardizing their position. That is the crying injustice, Mr. Speaker, which threatens these three young persons. The hon. the Secretary of State exclaims: "I have been wounded in my honor." Well, if that be so, he has two channels of recourse: appeal to the courts, or bring his charge before the House. But, if he came before the House, he should proceed regularly against these three young men, in order to enable them to be heard, and not condemn them unheard. Yet the House will remember that when we demanded the production of the papers on this head, we could not have placed them before our colleagues, without the intervention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works. The documents were in French, and the English majority of this House would have been obliged to judge this question without understanding it. Owing to the magnanimity of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the majority in this House has been enabled to appreciate the facts and record their votes according to knowledge. If these gentlemen have been guilty of so grave an offence against the hon. the Secretary of State, they are liable to be mulcted in damages. But I appeal to my hon. friends, both distinguished lawyers, and I ask them that if they claimed from the court damages for what is contained in the pamphlet, would they get a \$1,000, the amount of the salary for one year of these translators? Certainly not. The damages would be exorbitant. Then why should this House, the highest tribunal in the country, render a judgment contrary to that which would be rendered by the court of the country to which the hon. the Secretary of State might apply? I shall conclude these few remarks by an article of *La Minerve* in regard to a dismissal which the hon. the Secretary of State would do well to think over before insisting on the dismissal of these three gentlemen. The article is entitled: "A Dismissal is a Stain," and the date is 23rd May, 1863:

"And yet, under the reign of the Macdonald-Sicotte Government, Mr. Dorion's whole influence served to inaugurate a broad system of iniquitous, cruel, revolting dismissals. Civil servants, conscientious, upright, able and without reproach, have been mercilessly thrown into the street, with no regard for their families, reduced to straits and often to want, in consequence of this cruelty of the men in power. They relied on the public faith for maintenance in their situations, but with Ministers who, from first to last, have made game of plighted faith and have
Mr. LANGELETT (Montmorency).

conspired against their own words and engagements, of what use are ordinary notions of honor and morality? You may do as you like, but you will stay small, and very small, besides men of Dr. Meilleur moral character, whom you may dismiss, whom you may drive into misery, when a lucky turn puts you in power, but whom you will never succeed in lowering in the public estimation. A dismissal is a stain, but when it is made unjustly and tyrannically, the stain is branded on the forehead of the heartless, merciless Minister who uses the force lent by authority to persecute his compatriots."

I judge if the hon. the Secretary of State had studied this article of *La Minerve*, he would find out that he is on the wrong track, and along with the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) would withdraw the charges against Messrs Tremblay and Poirier. I trust that, if this House decide that these gentlemen shall be dismissed, it will grant them at least this amount of elementary justice, to which everybody is entitled—the opportunity of producing their defence either before a committee of this House or elsewhere.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the argument in regard to the original resolution before the House has been left largely in the hands of legal gentlemen, but it must not be forgotten that every member of Parliament is supposed to be as good a lawyer as another, especially in regard to his experience of parliamentary practice. Now, Sir, as you are well aware, although I am not a lawyer, although I cannot claim to be a venerable individual, I am beginning to find myself rather a venerable member of the House. For that reason I have no hesitation in expressing my opinion on the point of parliamentary law that has been raised, and without going over all the arguments that have been adduced, it seems to me, Sir, clear that no individual can deal with the employés either on the reporting or the translating of the Debates, but that they are to be dealt with by the committee of this House appointed for that special purpose. It appears that that committee did attempt last year, by a close vote, to transfer the responsibility in regard to the dismissal to the Speaker or to the Committee on Internal Discipline; but, Sir, they failed in doing so, because that having passed in the committee, neither the chairman nor anybody else would venture to move the adoption of that report to the House, and the report became consequently so much waste paper. Therefore the responsibility of the committee in regard to the translators and the power to dismiss or appoint remains where it always has been, in the hands of the committee, and when the committee attempted to deprive itself of that power or responsibility it was not successful. The committee and the committee alone remained responsible for all dealings with those employés. The consequence is that when the Speaker or anybody else pretends to have dismissed those translators that pretended dismissal is null and void. Those translators are officers of the House to-night as much as they were when first appointed according to my view of parliamentary law, and will remain so until they are dismissed by the House or the committee of the House appointed to deal with such questions. I believe that in a court of law those translators could collect their pay for the part of the Session during which they have been here and have not got their salaries, and I believe if they went into the Exchequer Court they could collect their salaries until they are properly dismissed. I am sorry to find that not only did the Speaker illegally and against the orders of the House pretend to dismiss those men, but at the same time he has appointed others in their places who are drawing the salaries which are due to the men whom he unfairly and improperly professed to strike off the roll. That is my view of the technical question. My hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) being a lawyer himself, has attempted to deal with this question of parliamentary law, but he has, as usual, only shown his complete ignorance of the subject. The hon. gentleman quoted to us a statute which gave the Speaker power, after enquiry, to dis-

miss any employé of the House. He forgot two things. He forgot that the statute was passed soon after Confederation, and long before there was any Debates Committee, and long before there were any employés under the care of that committee. Therefore the wording of that statute cannot possibly refer to those employés. Above all, he forgot to tell us that the Speaker did not hold an enquiry before proceeding to dismiss these men on the *ex parte* statement of two supporters of the Government which appointed him, and he took upon himself, without enquiry or without giving the translators a chance to defend themselves, to exercise an illegal power, by telling them that they were dismissed, and preventing them from drawing salaries to which they are legally entitled at the present moment. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe is ignorant of the fact that the statute does not apply to these employés, and he forgot to tell you what he knew very well, that even if the statute did apply, the Speaker did not carry out its terms. That statute authorises him to hold an enquiry and afterwards to suspend; but he held no enquiry, and instead of suspending these officials he dismissed or professed to dismiss them. Then, the hon. member brought up the case of Mr. Tassé, who was a translator in 1873, and whose case he said was precisely similar to this one. Here again the hon. member for Texas—I beg his pardon, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe—it was a pure slip of the tongue—displayed his utter ignorance of the business of the House. He has confused Mr. Tassé, translator of official documents, parliamentary papers, bills, and so on, with the translators of the Debates. The two classes of men are perfectly distinct. Instead of the cases being precisely similar, they are as opposed to each other as any two cases can possibly be. Mr. Tassé, translator of parliamentary papers, was a permanent employé of the House, regularly appointed by the Speaker and dismissable by the Speaker. He was dismissed by the Speaker in pursuance of his undoubted right. But the three translators in question were translators of the Debates, not appointed by the Speaker, but by a special committee of this House, to whom the House has entrusted all its powers of appointing and dismissing translators of the Debates. I do not discuss the question whether Mr. Tassé was properly dismissed or not, as that does not apply to the present question. Then, the hon. gentleman discussed the case of an extra clerk, which is just the same as that of Mr. Tassé. Extra clerks are taken on by the Speaker's appointment, and are dismissed by him at any time with or without cause. There again there is no resemblance whatever to the case of these three translators of the Debates. Then, the hon. member found the case of Mr. DeCelles, who was a translator of the Debates in 1876, and he thought surely that his case must be parallel to the present case; but he forgot, if he ever knew it, which I greatly doubt, that previous to 1883, the translation of the Debates was done by contract, and that the translators at that time were not officials of this House in the sense they are now. Therefore that case is not at all parallel to the case before us. Now, the hon. member said that the quotations made by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) were from *La Presse*, with which none of the translators were connected. There again he showed that he had not been listening to the speech of my hon. friend, for the quotations made by the hon. member for Bothwell were not made from *La Presse* chiefly, but the most damaging of those quotations were made from *Le Monde*, a paper of which Mr. Lasalle, one of the translators who is still retained on the staff, is the editor.

Mr. CHAPLEAU, He is not the editor, although he is a writer on a paper.

Mr. VANASSE. The extracts the hon. member read were not from *Le Monde*.

Mr. CASEY. I have some of them here, and they are from *Le Monde*. If the hon. Secretary of State says of his own personal knowledge that Mr. Lasalle is only a writer and not the editor of that paper, I accept the statement; but it is quite proper to assume, when Mr. Lasalle was known to be campaigning against the hon. Secretary of State at that time—

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. CASEY. Not against him individually, but against the Government of which he is a member—that those writings in the paper of which he wrote the campaigning parts, were from the pen of Mr. Lasalle. My hon. friends, the hon. Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, are certainly to be congratulated on the outcome of their action on this occasion. They appear to have sought two things—relief from some who troubled them, and public notoriety. They have obtained both. They have obtained a degree of notoriety which one of them at least, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, would probably never have attained under any other circumstances. They have obtained relief from trouble by getting rid of these gentlemen who are thorns in their sides, though it remains to be seen what the House and the law may have to say about the supposed dismissal. But I have to call attention to the fact that they do not agree in their treatment of the cases in all points. They unite in declaring themselves, by the action they have taken and the speeches they have made, the two members on that side of the House who have the thinnest skins, who most quickly and deeply feel anything that may be said or done against them, who are the most ready to resent against a helpless employé of this House something that may have been said against them in the heat of the political arena. I do not know any two other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who would have put themselves in the places of those hon. gentlemen, and I say it to the credit of the party. Does anyone suppose that the hon. Minister of Public Works, who is sitting beside the hon. Secretary of State, would have acted in this way if these translators had taken the same action, and used the same language against him in the heat of the campaign? He has been attacked time and again in much more violent language than that used by the Messrs. Tremblay and M. Poirier, and have we ever heard of his asking for the dismissal of any of those who have attacked him? No. It is these two junior members of the House who have shown themselves so impatient. Although much the juniors of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, they have shown themselves much more froward, much more impatient of contradiction, much more inclined to wreak vengeance on those over whom they may think they have power. It is this young member of Parliament and this young member of the Cabinet who have taken advantage of their position to gratify personal spite in this way on these men. The right hon. the First Minister, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, or any of the other gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches, would not be suspected by anybody on this side of taking such a course, and we would not have suspected it of these hon. gentlemen if they had not convicted themselves by the action they have taken. They have shown that they possess influence of a very peculiar and extraordinary kind with the Cabinet. What is the sum and substance of the reasons they give for asking the dismissal of these translators? They produce a number of utterances made by these translators on the hustings, but it is perfectly clear that these utterances, made during the campaign, were not more injurious than the utterances of Conservative employés who have been retained in their positions, or of hon. members who are now hand in glove with the Ministry. After settling out that these translators, whose political autonomy

had never been hitherto questioned, had used the language which everybody else had used on the public platform, the hon. the Secretary of State says :

" I could neither speak to them nor consult them in this House, and I say sincerely that their presence in the precincts of the House is to me a nuisance, which no one has the right to subject a member of Parliament to."

And because the hon. the Secretary of State thinks their presence is a nuisance, he, in his high mightiness, the great Mikado, the grand Llama, says the presence of these men—never mind their wives and families—is a nuisance to him and they must be dismissed. That is not enough. A still greater power appears on the scene in the person of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe who says speaking of Mr. Rémi Tremblay :

" He is unfit for the position he occupies, his presence is distasteful to me, I cannot have any communication with him, and I ask that he be dismissed from the service of the House of Commons."

The presence of Mr. Tremblay was a nuisance to the Secretary of State and distasteful to the all-powerful member for Richmond and Wolfe. If it were parliamentary to use the phrase, I should say that such language on the part of any two members of this House in regard to any employés depending on their positions for the support of their families, was nothing short of scandalous. The hon. the Secretary of State defended this action on the ground that the dignity of the House required it, and he said he would take the same course if any other member of the House except himself had been attacked. He made a very grand speech and played his rôle very well, indeed; but when our unfortunate friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) took the floor, he did what the Irishman did, he opened his mouth and put his foot in it, or rather he put both his feet in it, for he destroyed the whole case which the Secretary of State had so laboriously built up. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe told us plainly that it was not with him a question of the offended dignity of the House, it was not because Mr. Rémi Tremblay had said anything insulting to him, but it was because he had made too many Rouge votes in the county of Richmond and Wolfe. Had Mr. Tremblay confined himself to one parish, the hon. member said, I would not have minded it, but wherever I went he followed me, and he was making Rouge votes and abusing me everywhere. The whole case of the hon. the Secretary of State is thus given away. It was not a question of the dignity of the House, but a question of making Rouge votes. When we come to the question of the offensive language used, let me ask you to compare it with that used by present supporters of the Government in the course of the agitation that followed the execution of Louis Riel. One gentleman is reported by *La Presse* as having said in Montreal on the 26th November :

" The Ministers have proved that they are heartless. The conduct of one whose name is never mentioned has been shameful."

I am informed that " the one whose name is never mentioned " is the hon. the Minister of Militia, —

" This being, whose name has been banished from the Canadian dialect, attended a banquet where Riel's head was a surprise dish offered to the guests."

That banquet, I believe, was the banquet at Winnipeg,—

" Sir John made a great mistake if he thought the Province of Quebec would accept Riel's execution without a word of protest, and he will be dismissed from power as he deserves. These sentiments are engraved within our hearts, and it is the duty of all those who can act in a manly way to avenge the death of Riel by dismissing from power the men who have steeped their hand in the blood of the leader of the half-breeds."

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, Oh !

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. CASEY. I hear an hon. gentleman over there, and I think I could point him out. If I told him who the gentleman is who is reported by *La Presse* to have used that language, he would not speak to him any more. That gentleman is the hon. member for Hochelaga, at present a member of this House, and a warm supporter of the Government which he then attacked in such scathing terms. He is now, however, fit to associate with the Ministers and honored—I do not deny that he is unjustly honored—by them, but I say that while the Government are glad to have the support of that hon. gentleman, those other two gentlemen which happened to be on the opposite side of politics, and who have taken away more votes from the hon. the Secretary of State and from the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe than the hon. member for Hochelaga, have to be sacrificed. I claim that there is neither British fair play nor common sense nor justice in the whole transaction.

An hon. MEMBER. Cock-a-doodle-doo.

Mr. CASEY. As the old cock crows, the young cock learns. I hear a cock crowing on the back benches, and I would advise that boy, for he must be a boy member, or he would know better, to observe the conduct, not only of those immediately in front of him, but of those in the front rows, and like them to listen quietly to what is said. My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Langelier) read in French several interesting expressions of opinion made by different members of the House and others; one or two of which I beg leave to read also in English, because I am afraid that many of my fellow citizens from Ontario were not able to follow him in French. A despatch was sent to the Government on the 13th November, 1835, as follows :—

" Under the circumstances Riel's execution would be an act of cruelty of which we refuse to share the responsibility."

And that was signed not by any unfortunate translators, but by the following members of the House:—Messrs. C. J. Coursol, Alphonse Desjardins, D. Girouard, F. Vanasse, L. H. Massue, F. Dupont, A. L. Desaulniers, J. B. Daoust, J. G. H. Bergeron, J. W. Bain, P. B. Benoit, E. Guilbault, G. A. Gigault, G. Labrosse, L. L. L. Desaulniers, F. Dugas and H. Hurteau; in all seventeen, and this despatch was published in *Le Monde* on the 14th November, and *Le Monde* stated that despatches to the same effect were signed, by whom do you suppose? By Messrs. Ouimet, Fortin, McMillan, Taschereau, Landry and Lesage. If any one could say anything more severe in reference to the Government than that Riel's execution would be an act of cruelty, which was practically putting them in the position of murdering the man, I do not know what could be said. Some of these gentlemen have no doubt reconsidered their decision, and they had undoubtedly a right to reconsider it, but, if they are still treated as honorable men and upright members of Parliament after making such a declaration, why should these poor men who said the same thing and no more be treated as they have been? I think that the language used by these translators on the platform and in the press was just the same as that which was used by all the French opponents of the Government at that time. They just took the tone of the campaign that was going on; and when they were accused of having used language of that kind, what did they do? Every one of these gentlemen wrote to the Speaker and protested that, if they had been carried away by the heat of the campaign into using language which was improper or insulting, they wished to retract any offensive or insulting words they had used, and they asked for an investigation before the Speaker in order to clear their skirts. They denied that they had done so in the first place, but they said that, if they had used such language in the heat of the campaign, they were willing to retract and apologise. But the Speaker did not grant them what, under the statute, he was bound to grant them, an enquiry, which they were

entitled to, not as an act of grace but as an act of right and of law. No, they were not granted that enquiry, but their heads came off at the demand of the great Mikado and the grand Llama. I overlooked one extract in French which deserves to go on the pages of the *Hansard* in English as well. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) at the same meeting to which I have referred, said, according to the report in one of his own papers:

"The Ministers have constantly deceived us"

And he concluded by saying:

"Let Sir John's career, which commenced under the ghastly light of the burning of the Parliament House at Montreal, come to an end behind Riel's gibbet. We must refuse our support to those who have sold us in the Federal Cabinet."

And so on. What could be stronger than that?

Mr. DESJARDINS. Did I say that?

Mr. CASEY. That was reported in a Montreal newspaper, and it has not been denied up to this day that the hon. gentleman used that language. When an hon. member of this House, who is still an honored supporter of the Premier, can say that the career of the right hon. gentleman commenced under the ghastly light of the burning of the Parliament House at Montreal, which is true enough but is not pleasant for him to hear, and when he can remain the friend, and the honored friend, of the Premier, why should we allow the personal spite of two members of this House—one a junior member of the House, the other a junior member of the Government—to be wreaked on three innocent individuals who did not say more, who did not say as much, and upon whose dismissal depends the support not only of themselves but of their wives and families? Everyone who was in Parliament at the time, and everyone who has read the documents which are before the House, knows that perfect freedom of political action was allowed to all the gentlemen who were appointed on the Debates staff in 1883, especially to the translators. It was known that they were journalists, it was known that they would be here as special correspondents, or editorial correspondents, if they were not here as translators, and it was admitted on all hands, as is proved, that they retained their political liberty. The only proper accusation that could be brought against them would be that they exceeded the proper limits of political discussion by attacks upon members of the Government or members of this House. It has been proved that their remarks were below the standard of the remarks which were hurled against hon. Ministers by some of their present supporters during the campaign in Quebec and the agitation which followed the death of Riel. Therefore there could be no reason for their dismissal. A great point has been made as to their attacking members of Parliament, but it must be remembered that at that time the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) and the hon. the Secretary of State were not members of the House any more than the translators, or the reporters, or the pages on the floor of the House. They were simply citizens who were asking the electors to make them members of the House, and they had no more right to consideration than any other man who was asking for election. If the House were to be dissolved to-morrow, the hon. the Premier, except on account of his age and experience, and his venerable appearance, would have no more right to ask for consideration than if he were the greenest farmer from a backwoods settlement. Neither the Premier nor the farmer would be a member of this House. In regard to the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who is not even a member of the Cabinet, the case is much stronger, and I think the depositions, which I hope everyone has read, or will read if he has not read them already, which were put in by that hon. gentleman in support of his own case, show that the language which he

complains of as insulting to himself was not as strong as that which was used against the Government by hon. members of this House with whom he feels himself honored to associate to-day. That is the whole case, and I think the House, if it acts upon considerations of justice, will see, in the words of the amendment, that these men should not have been dismissed, even if it were within the Speaker's jurisdiction to dismiss them, and further, that it was not within his jurisdiction to dismiss them at all. But I waive the technical point, and I think I am within the facts of the case when I say that, if he had the jurisdiction, the facts did not warrant his dismissing these men.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know that I should have obtruded myself upon the House in this debate but for some remarks which were made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). That hon. gentleman indulged in some wit of the same kind as some others who have spoken on the same side have indulged in. I will only say this: that having listened attentively to this debate, my admiration for the logical power which has been displayed on this side of the House, is only surpassed by the pleasure that I experienced at those witty sallies that we have all been so much delighted with. It is evidently considered a triumph of humor on the part of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat to refer to my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe as "the member for Texas," and then correct himself as though he had fallen into that *lapsus* inadvertently. And when the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) referred to my hon. friend the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) because that hon. gentleman most properly said "question," when the hon. member was travelling so far away from the question as any hon. gentleman who has spoken on that side—and that, Sir, is speaking as strongly as one can—when the hon. member for East Grey cried "question," the refined wit, the high culture of the hon. member for North York, found expression in the declaration that "it was a pity Darwin was not here, because he would be aided in finding the missing link." Well, Sir, I apprehend that the features of the missing link would at once be moral as well as physical; I apprehend that the intellectual and moral features of the missing link would embrace this peculiarity, that he would have no power of co-ordinating facts. Sir, I have listened to hon. gentleman after hon. gentleman here to-night, and I am bound to say that had I not heard them speak on other occasions, and if I had not heard them talk over the tea table down in the supper room, when at times I have seen some evidence that they are capable of reasoning, I should have thought Darwin need not go to the member for East Grey, but he might find all the moral features of the missing link amongst hon. gentlemen who have been speaking on the Opposition side to night. Why, Sir, when I heard the hon. gentleman from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) speak, I was amazed at his finding an analogy between the position of Dr. Kenealy, a member of the British House of Commons, and one of the gentlemen employed as a translator in this House. But another hon. gentleman insists, in fact one hon. gentleman after another insists, that there is no analogy whatever between an ordinary sessional clerk and a translator, though there are all sorts of analogies between the position of a member of the English House of Commons and one of the translators of this House. Sir, I fear that the brain of my hon. friend the member for Bothwell is a brain of defective analogies. My hon. friend is a learned man, he is a man of great industry, and his mind is stored with facts, but he is incapable of co-ordinating them, and the consequence is that he belongs to that race of statesmen who are very learned but who are always wrong. He is like a clock with an elaborate face to it, but that never tells the right time. I like to hear him, I like to look at him, but I will say this, that the genius of

persuasion may have kissed his brow, but it was with frozen lips. Now, Sir, there are three questions before this House. The hon. leader of the Opposition, like a statesman, raised the question of the jurisdiction of the Speaker. I will not trouble the House with going over the ground that was so admirably gone over by my hon. friend for Richmond and Wolfe, but I do say that he showed clearly that the Speaker has jurisdiction in this case. Then the hon. member for Bothwell comes in with an amendment and he casts doubt on the position taken by his leader; to use the admirable expression of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, he proposes a vote of want of confidence in his leader. He says that even if the Speaker have jurisdiction, still, under the circumstances of the case, the Speaker should not have dismissed these gentlemen.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he had jurisdiction.

Mr. DAVIN. Even if he have jurisdiction. I am obliged to my right hon. friend. That is not the only time he has corrected me; I am always satisfied to be corrected from that source, Mr. Speaker. He then, in a certain sense, proposed a vote of want of confidence in himself, and he goes on to say, as knowing that he had not taken a very secure position, that "in the opinion of this House the language used by those translators was not more violent than the language used by translators who have not been dismissed." Now, this is not a hasty utterance in debate, this is not a hasty expression, that the ebullient genius of my hon. friend might have led to; this is a carefully worded amendment, and what do we find? We find this hon. gentleman taking up this logical position that, because some other translators may have done wrong, therefore the translators whose wrong-doing has been brought to the attention of the Speaker, should go scott free. The hon. gentleman is a lawyer, and what would be thought of him, what would a judge think of him, if he were to defend a criminal at the bar by saying: "My Lord, I grant you that the case is very strong against this criminal, but there are at least half a dozen men just as bad who have never been arrested." As I say, Sir, it is part and parcel of the logic that has been manifested. Take this newspaper scrap business—the style with which they discuss subjects by means of these newspaper extracts. I have heard, Sir, of thunder and small beer, this is a case of thunder and big scissers. They come here with their newspaper scraps. What on earth does it matter to this House what the *Minerve* said? The hon. gentleman for Bothwell declared that we should approach this question in a judicial spirit—what does it matter to this House what one newspaper after another has said? The question we have to decide here, in the first place, is, has the Speaker jurisdiction? Then the other question has been raised, whether, if he has jurisdiction, he has properly exercised that jurisdiction? Now, Sir, about the accuracy of my hon. friend the member for Elgin (Mr. Casey). He brought that light, airy artillery of his wit and humor on some hon. gentlemen opposite, and he spoke of the inaccuracy of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman himself declares that the three translators appealed to the Speaker, that they wanted an enquiry before the Speaker. He said that with the documents in his hands. What is the fact? They never did anything of the kind. They wanted an enquiry before the Debates Committee, of which I happen to be a member, and when the question came before that committee we discussed it very fully, and what we decided was this: That while we were seized as regards any question of want of efficiency on the part of these men as translators, we had nothing whatever to do with their conduct apart from that; and we referred the matter back to the Speaker. And what does the Speaker do? The Speaker meets that committee of the House that has charge of the conduct of

Mr. DAVIN.

what might be called the government of the household here. They met, they discussed the conduct of those gentlemen, and they decided that it was not in the public interest they should be retained. What idea have hon. gentlemen of what should be done? Do they suppose that it is to be accepted for one moment that if the conduct of any subordinate employé of this Parliament is not such as entitles him to be retained in the employment of Parliament, we are to meet every night like this, and hon. gentlemen are to come here with their newspaper scraps and give us this scissors rhetoric, and all as to the question whether some person was properly dismissed or not? Why, the fact that we are debating this question here shows that if any wrong were done, the jurisdiction of the Speaker will not be final and we can discuss it here. Far be it from me to say one harsh word of those gentlemen. I do not know them. That profession is cognate to the profession that I once exercised myself, and my sympathies, so far as I have any sympathies, are with them. But what do we find? The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) says that they apologised; he says that they expressed regret. I am sorry to say that the worst part of the conduct of those gentlemen is not, in my opinion, what they said on the hustings when fighting a political battle, but in the demeanor they assumed when dealing with the Speaker who represents this House of Commons. Their position is this: they defied the Speaker. They said: "You have no jurisdiction; we appeal to the Debates Committee. They say they have an independent position which has been recognised. And how do they prove this independent position? By answering that they are in the employ of the Parliament of Canada, in the employ of the Government of Canada therefore, which represents this House for executive purposes, and yet they can go through the country and try to lower the efficiency of that Government by lowering its dignity. Do hon. members think that such a position is tolerable? The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) quoted certain dicta, from the *Hansard* of 1878, but there are stronger dicta which the hon. gentleman might have quoted if he had thought of them; these are statements of a gentleman who will be thought the highest authority by hon. gentlemen of the Opposition. I have the language before me of Mr. Blake, who said:

"So long as nomination by patronage continues, resulting generally in the appointment of one friend of the party in power, it must be agreed in the course of time that public officers must dissociate themselves altogether from the field of politics. Everything pointed to the position that a public servant should be neutral—that he should have nothing to do with politics, that he should not consider himself the servant of the majority or the minority, but the servant of the whole people, that he should have such relations to the members of this House that the most active partisans on either side might have free, frank and friendly communication with him on public matters."

And yet with such statesmanlike language on the part of the late leader of the Opposition, a man whom we all honor; a man held in reverence by the Opposition, here we have one member of that party after another rising and denouncing the Secretary of State, forsooth, because he gave expression to the very difficulty that has been sketched by Mr. Blake. He found it difficult to meet those people he said; it was not pleasant to meet them; he could not have that frank and free discussion with them that Mr. Blake said was essential to that relationship not merely between a member of the Government and an employé of this House, but between the humblest member of this House and such an employé. That is not all. In the same speech Mr. Blake said:

"But there was a concurrence of opinion among both parties that their right ought to be simply the right of voting (that is the employés), and that any public servant who went farther than that went beyond the line of his duty, and deserved censure if not dismissal."

He said "dismissal."

Then Mr. Mackenzie in the same debate spoke equally strongly. He said:

"It was quite enough that they should have the right to vote under the law; but it was altogether intolerable that civil servants should actively engage as electioneering agents."

Of course, we have the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) saying that a certain Act, the Act that has been quoted, was passed before the *Hansard* staff was organised. What difference does that make?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not the slightest.

Mr. DAVIN. It requires that particular perspicuous orb, of which hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side have command, to be able to see an analogy between a member of the British Parliament and one of the *Hansard* staff, and to see no analogy between the officers described in clause 16 of the House of Commons Act, and a member of the *Hansard* staff.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I am really sorry that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is not in his place, because he is a very learned gentleman, he is a distinguished graduate of Toronto University, in fact I think he occupies the second position, that of Vice-Chancellor of the University, and I will say this, that he is an honor to the University. But, Mr. Speaker, I will add that his biblical education has been neglected. I am very sorry that he is not here, for I should have liked to have given him a lesson on biblical literature. He spoke of the Government of Canada as determined to dismiss these gentlemen, and determined not only to dismiss them, but to dismiss some people whom he describes as devoted to the shamrock, and it was beautiful to see the Donnybrook Fair enthusiasm he got up about those gentlemen. He seemed to think this Government is determined to destroy the shamrock and *fleur de lis*. I apprehend those hon. gentlemen of the Rouge party, the leading and active members of the party, are not very devoted to the *fleur de lis*. I should have thought it would be quite another emblem they would have been devoted to. As for the Government going against those gentlemen, or against the devotees of the shamrock, where is the evidence? None whatever, any more than there was evidence for the assertions of the hon. member that this or that person wrote such articles to which he referred. But my hon. friend the member for North York (Mr. Mulock), referring to the language that the Supreme Power addressed to Elijah, said that the Government was determined to destroy anyone who would not "bend the knee to Baal." Well, Sir, of course we have heard of Baal. I know Baal, but I am not acquainted with Baal. There is a Baal College at Oxford, but there is no connection whatever between the founder of Baal College and the Baal that is referred to in that recondite quotation from Holy Writ. Sir, I am deeply grieved, I am grieved because I know something of the early training of my hon. friend, and I know he has been well brought up. I know he used to be sent to the Sunday-school, and that he was afterwards examined as to his achievements there, and I am sure that he must have lately neglected his biblical studies to have given us that time-honored quotation as "bends the knee to Baal!" But, Sir, he is not in a very bad position, because on that side of the House he has the assistance of my ingenious friend, who is the very learned member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and I have no doubt they will bring out a revised edition of the Old Testament between them, and the next time I turn to Kings, I will find not "7,000 who have not bowed the knee to Baal," but "7,000 who have not bent their knees to Baal," and my hon. friend from Ann Harbor will declare that some editions of the Septuagint will be found with "Baal" in it. Now, Sir, I want to call the attention of the House to the great incon-

venience that might occur if the doctrines of these gentlemen were accepted. Suppose we accept the doctrine of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that any conduct, no matter how violent against a member of this House, and of which a member of this House had complained, must yet be overlooked by the Speaker. Suppose we accept that, why, Sir, the language may be used towards a man that this House would elect as Speaker, and the Speaker would have to come in contact with gentlemen who had used opprobrious and offensive and insulting expressions against him for which they never apologised; because in those documents placed before us there is no apology to be found and only insult heaped upon insult. We have had the whole matter before us in the committee. Suppose my hon. friend the Secretary of State had been made Speaker, would the relationship be a pleasant one between those gentlemen and the Speaker? I think, Sir, it would lead to a great deal that was undesirable. Sir, I have heard a great deal about the rights of journalists here. I am a journalist if I am anything. I have heard a great deal about the rights of journalists, but I never have considered that it was the right of a journalist to use language insulting towards any man. If it were decided that because gentlemen are journalists and have certain rights, that they can come here and be employed as servants of this House, and then go when and where they like and hurl insults and calumnies broadcast against some of the most honored men in this House, it would be a bad precedent. Why, Sir, the thing is perfectly intolerable. I will say this in passing, also, that in this question we have nothing to do with the motives of my hon. friend the member for Richmond (Mr. Ives), or with the motives of the hon. the Secretary of State. I will not discuss their motives. I believe their motives to be good. I believe the Secretary of State, when he says that he is anxious for the dignity of the House, is sincere. Why, Sir, if a man occupying his position were not jealous for the dignity of this House he would not be worthy of his position. When he says he is jealous for the dignity of this House I believe him. But, Sir, I put aside the question of his motives. We have nothing to do whatever with the motives any more than a judge administering the law would have anything to do with the motives of a man who had brought before his attention a person charged with certain offences. All the judge would have to do in such a case would be to decide whether the indictment lay, whether the charges were proved, and if so, he would have to find accordingly, whatever the motives might be. Mr. Speaker, I have brought before the House the points that struck me as I listened to this debate. I hope that my hon. friend, the member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), will speak on the subject, and he will go more fully probably than I have into what was done in the committee, if he should think it necessary so to do. But, Sir, on this subject I may be permitted to express a hope which I trust will meet with the approval of the House. I do not know whether I should venture to express that hope. My hon. friend the member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) spoke of himself as if he were an old member, and he spoke of some hon. gentlemen as "boys in parliamentary knowledge" and "boys in parliamentary experience." Well, Sir, in the same way I am a boy in parliamentary experience as compared with my hon. friend the member for Elgin (Mr. Casey), and yet, Sir, I will venture—throwing myself on the indulgence of the House—to express the hope that the older members will set to young members such as I am a better example of deliberative discussion in this assembly—this the first deliberative assembly of English-speaking men after the Imperial Parliament, and that they will come here and debate as men with reason and with knowledge should debate, and not come here reading bundles and yard arms long of newspaper extracts which have as much to do with the question and with the real issues as they would have to do with an attempt to square the solar parallax.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Mr. Speaker, the dismissal of those officials has caused a considerable debate in the House. The translators are appointed by the House, the *Hansard* is a growth of the House and the officers are appointed by the House and not by the Speaker. They are not officers of the House in the same way that other officers are. It was only a few years ago since the *Hansard* was instituted by the House and I understand and I expect that there should be fair play in this connection, and that those who are appointed on the staff as translators or as short-hand reporters should bear a relative proportion to the strength of parties in this House. The translators, it appears, are eight in number. It appears that they took part in the election that was held in the beginning of 1887. It appears that both those who profess to be Conservatives and those who profess to be Reformers took part in that election, and I have no doubt they both displayed the same amount of zeal. I have not heard complaints against those translators who opposed gentlemen on this side of the House. It is well known that gentlemen on this side of the House are not apt to complain of every trifling case that arises. They have, perhaps, just as good cause as hon. gentlemen opposite to complain against these *Hansard* translators. It appears that at that time Richmond and Wolfe and the county of Terrebonne were without members; the House had been dissolved, and these gentlemen were not members of the House. These translators were then only speaking of persons who were not members of the House; and if one side had a right, the other side had just as good a right to go out and take part in the election. It is not seriously contended that there shall be one law to govern those who are Conservatives, and another law to govern those who are Reformers. That would be a singular proposition to lay down; yet that is the principle on which the dismissal of these translators is based. I contend, and I think I contend rightly, that the Speaker has no authority to dismiss these translators; they were employed by the House, and can only be dismissed by the House. It is very probable that the translators did not know who the hon. member for Terrebonne, the Secretary of State, was. It is probable that they had not heard of the greatness of that distinguished man, or read his life and times by one of the papers in the Province of Quebec. This work gives the portrait of this distinguished man. But I will trouble the House to read a little of the life-history which it gives of him, and if these translators had seen this and learned the great height to which the hon. Secretary of State had attained in the political world, they might probably not have ventured to say anything about that individual. This history says:

"In the 5th century before Christ there appeared a man to whose care all the people of Greece seemed attached. His insinuating and persuasive eloquence had crowned him king of speech, and his oratorical contests which were but one series of victories gave to his century the name of Pericles. What an admirable analogy between that phase of Greek history and the present time in Canada? In the two countries all depends on speech. The acts of the Governments are discussed openly, the people take part in Government contests. Speech is sovereign. The statesman should be an orator. And if Pericles at Agora, in Athens, defended the rights of his people, here the Hon. Mr. Chapleau in seductive accents of persuasive eloquence supports with energy the rights of progress and patriotism. Everything connected with him recalls to mind that fine eloquence which fascinated and conquered antiquity and enlightened the modern world with the purest rays of oratorical art. It is not the harsh and dry speech of the ancient Romans which had its place rather in the bloody battles in the circus than in the debates in the forum, neither is it that full and majestic eloquence, but an eloquence deep and often without originality of which Cicero is the most brilliant representative. Mr. Chapleau belongs to the finest class of exalted orators, the speech at the same time harmonious and sweet, his incomparable mastery of irony, the broadness of his views and above all his invincible love for his country have raised him to the rank of Demosthenes and Isocrates."

But I will allow the hon. Secretary of State to speak for himself. He appears to have been brought up with the culture which my learned friend here (Mr. Davin) talks

Mr. DAVIN,

about. Under circumstances so agreeable and so refined, here is what he says of himself:

"What is politics? Until now I thought that it was the science of men and things applied to the administration of public affairs. I thought that it was the art of instructing the people and directing them towards their destinies in the world. Was I mistaken? Am I therefore a simpleton? It is true that I was very young when I learned the element of politics. I liked politics before having known the way of interest, ambition or intrigue. I studied politics before having understood the narrow meanness or the calculating impudence which is connected with it. I had just left college. I had read in the history of my country that my forefathers came of a race which could be said with reason: *Gesta Dei per Francos.*"

That is what the hon. Secretary of State said of himself. He had studied politics before meanness and intrigue had entered into it; and this is the gentleman who insists on having three of his French compatriots removed for taking lessons at his feet, for standing on the same platform as himself and discussing public issues before the people. What were the reasons which led the Secretary of State to come and ask the Speaker to dismiss them? It was for taking the same stand that not only he, but all the people in the Province of Quebec, took on that occasion. That is the head and front of their offending. That is why they are now being persecuted. I think the hon. Secretary of State has been studying intrigue to some extent since the time he went to school. Now we find him coming and asking the Speaker of this House to dismiss these translators, because he says:

"I could neither speak to them nor salute them in this House, and I say sincerely that their presence within the precincts of this House is for me a nuisance to which, it appears to me, no one has a right to subject a member of Parliament."

No doubt the hon. gentleman exclaimed to himself and wondered in his youth,

"Oh, why were voters made so coarse,
And M. P.'s made so fine?"

That is the sentiment he displays in the petty act of malice he seeks to inflict on these translators, because they exercised the privileges of British freemen, at a time when they were not employed by this House, to make known their opinions to the people among whom they lived. One of them states that he did not mention the name of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. What an omission? To imagine that any person could write the history of this country and not mention the name of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe! Scarcely, if he had written the political history of the Province of Quebec. I wonder at the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe being so terribly thin-skinned as to be offended at the language these men have used. It is true the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) has been living away down in the sunny south for a certain number of years. It is true he has taken a certain amount of surplus cash and invested it down in Texas—in that land where they are so polite, and where they are so light and free, that when he comes back here to Canada he is astonished that gentlemen in Canada have opinions and express their opinions in clear, straightforward language without anybody gainsaying them. But the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, living down in Texas, having taken away the surplus earnings of the people in Quebec and Ontario and invested it there, says:—why, it is a terrible thing!—that the presence of these translators in the House is disgusting to him. After a residence of three or four years in Texas, he comes back and finds they have used language he was not accustomed to hear in Texas, and which was very offensive to him. Here is what he says:

"He has also written several articles for the press, abusing me and the Government, and he was and is a violent partisan, unfit for the position he occupies and whose presence is distasteful to me. I cannot have any communication with him."

Poor fellow!

"I ask that he be dismissed from the service of the House of Commons."

Just because his presence is distasteful. Is every hon. member to say that merely because an officer of this House is distasteful to him, that officer must be dismissed? What would we come to if such were the rule? Why, the thing is absurd. It is a monstrous proposition to make, that because an officer of the House is offensive to the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, perfumed with the airs of Texas, the owner and master of a ranche down there, he must be dismissed. I wonder why we should discuss that question here at all. Why should we not discharge these officials right away? It was a terrible commentary on British institutions that they should think or say anything that would be offensive to the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, with all his Texan airs brought up from the ranches of Texas; it is terrible that anything should be said against him, when he can stand the language of the cowboys and those who live down there. Now, we find that those translators have not said anything that is very severe, comparing their utterances and writings with the utterances of some strong supporters of the Government. We have a right to expect that the members of this House should set the example to the officials and to the people of this country by using moderate language. If they expect the people to be moderate, if they expect the officials of the House to be moderate, they should be moderate themselves. In this House we have occasionally heard observations made, which, if followed out, would lead to most disastrous consequences to those who made them, but time smoothes down all these acerbities. We remember in this House hon. gentlemen making serious statements against other hon. gentlemen, and yet we have found that time, that smoothing agent, has removed all those disagreeable reminiscences. We find those against whom the strongest epithets were used by leading members of the Government, afterwards honored by that Government, and recommended to Her Majesty as fit and proper subjects for royal decoration. Who can forget the observations made with regard to the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith), by the right hon. the First Minister; we all remember the epithets which were applied by the hon. the Minister of Finance on one occasion in this House to that same hon. gentleman, and yet we see that same hon. member for Montreal West causing those gentlemen to go before Her Majesty and asking that he be named as one willing and deserving of knighthood. Would it not be more manly for the Secretary of State and for the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe to allow time to heal this trouble and repair the wrongs that have been done? Why, this appears to have been a cold-blooded, premeditated thing. After the excitement had died away, three months after the elections, this Pericles, who, or his antitype, was born some years before Christ, lays this charge before the Speaker of this House, and the Speaker himself has made statements, I believe, just as strong against the Government as those translators have. The Speaker was just as much opposed to their policy in regard to the execution of Riel as were the translators. What did the Government do with him in order to convince this country of the insincerity of their course? They said to their friends and to the people: We have executed Riel, and we believe that we were right in so doing; we have been condemned for doing it, but those who were opposed to us were knaves, cowards and traitors. And the Government led the people to believe in the sincerity of that statement, but what do we find? We find that they appointed to be the first commoner the hon. gentleman who gave them abuse without stint. They showed thus there was no sincerity in all the appeals they made to the Protestant element. What was their great slogan against the Reform party in the last elections? It was the cry of danger to Confederation from French aggression. We were

told by the Tories that Confederation was threatened by the stand taken by the French, and the Government wish to show by the dismissal of these translators that they are going to do something to resist the aggressive character of the French people, in this House at least. I would, if I did not fear being taken up for reading language that might perhaps associate my name with literature of a peculiar character, read what the right hon. the First Minister and the hon. Minister of Finance said, as reported in the *Hansard* of 1878. It is perhaps best not to read it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Give everything you can against him.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have an idea that the right hon. the First Minister might probably not care to hear the language he used some years ago. I do not know that he ever publicly retracted that language, or that the hon. the Minister of Finance ever publicly retracted it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do not spare him, let us have it?

Mr. LANDERKIN. As that seems to be the general desire, I will read it. The hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) was then a member of this House, he represented a constituency in Manitoba. There were some differences of opinion existing between the First Minister and the Finance Minister and the hon. member for Montreal West, and they set to work to clear up these difficulties the last day of the last Parliament of 1878. They came here and had a most animating—I do not know what other form of description I might give it, but I will let you judge for yourself as to the epithet that should be applied. After they had sparred, Mr. Tupper said: "Coward, coward, sit down." They went on a little further, and Mr. Tupper says: "Coward, coward, coward." Mr. Smith says: "You are the coward." They go on a little further, and Mr. Tupper says: "Mean, treacherous coward." Then Mr. Tupper says, "Coward, treacherous," and then Sir John A. Macdonald says: "That fellow Smith is the biggest liar I ever met." After language of that kind, I am somewhat surprised that the Secretary of State should feel keenly the language that has been used to him by these translators.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, but his dignity, you know.

Mr. LANDERKIN. But at that time he was not a member of the House, and, although this historian says the Secretary of State is such a wonderful man, I do not know that he is of much better mould than the Minister of Public Works. I do not know whether the Minister of Public Works has learned intrigue or not. I understand the historian says that the Secretary of State did not learn any intrigue, and it appears to have been born with him, this air of lack of communication which he should have, and which every member should have, with the officials in this House. I think a more silly pretext to gratify a little personal malice and spleen has never been heard of. Look at the position in the Province of Ontario, which has been governed by that distinguished man, the Hon. Oliver Mowat, for the last sixteen years. Where do you find any evidences of this petty malice being visited on those who opposed him? Why, the greater portion of the Civil Service there are those who are politically opposed to him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They were when he began, and they continued so as long as they lived, and their places were only filled when those had passed off the stage by death or something of that description. You never find and you never heard of a single instance where any such petty, dominant, arrogant assertion of power was observed or ordered by that hon. gentleman. This is but a prostitution of power to gratify some little political partisan spite. It is unworthy of a government, to take vengeance on those who are not officers of the Government but officers of the House. They went out three on one side and five on the

other. Look at the broad spirit which animates the Liberal party on this side of the House. We do not bring charges against those who oppose us. We do not descend to such petty meanness. We are too liberal in our views to do anything like that, but the Secretary of State coolly and deliberately, with malice—I say it deliberately—endeavors to ruin these men, and I believe there are some men on that side of the House who are willing to assist him. In my own riding, there are two gentlemen who have held positions under the Liberal Government of Ontario ever since I have been a member of the House. They both oppose me, and they go out and do their level best against me. I have never brought any charges against them. I have no doubt they have used language as strong against me as the language which has been used against this Pericles, this Secretary of State, but I have never brought any charge against them, and I believe it would be against my dignity to bring any charge against them if they had used such language. This is not the first evidence we have had of the narrowness which governs the present Administration, apart from the general policy of the Government, which is a narrow policy, a restrictionist policy, and their policy in connection with the Civil Service is just as narrow. Shortly after they came into power, when the Inspectors of Weights and Measures, who were good men, able men, honest men, capable men, appointed by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), what did they do? They passed an Act of Parliament and cut off the heads of every one of them, merely because they were not appointed by that Government, because they were not creatures of that Government. You would imagine that these offices were unnecessary and uncalled for, but they turned right round and appointed others in their stead. That was a most arbitrary, a most narrow exercise of the prerogative of the Crown for the purpose of gratifying party aims. They gave as an excuse at that time that it was done for reasons of economy. Why, the department at the present time is not as efficiently administered as it was then and costs as much. Those gentlemen gave out to the people that they were merely cutting off the heads of those officials to exercise more economy with the public money, but they turned right round and appointed others. You find the same thing in regard to little petty post offices. I applied for a little post-office, or I presented a petition from the people in a part of the riding I represent. They applied for a post office and asked me to present a petition to the Postmaster General. I did present the petition to the Postmaster General. It was not a very important office. It was in a rural section. The salary of the postmaster would be about \$10. But they were so careful that they would not be governed by the petition of the people, but had to look round for some Tory in order to find out who should be appointed postmaster. If the affairs were administered in the interests of the people, it would be all right, but those gentlemen administer affairs altogether and exclusively in the interests of party. Then, before the election, there had been several rural post offices of small moment, but very much desired by some people in that riding, which had been hanging fire for four years, and just before the election those post offices were constituted, and the Government came out and said: See how vigilant the Government are in the interests of the people, when all that time the people had been petitioning for these post offices, and they would not establish them. That is the trouble with this Government. They do not consider the people at all. Their administration is entirely in the interests of the party. Whether the people petition, or desire, or deserve, is a question that does not concern them, unless they find how far it will serve their party. The member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) rebuked the member for North York (Mr. Mulock). He termed him Baal.

Mr. LANDERKIN,

Here is an instance of Scripture repeating itself. Baal was rebuked by an ass.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to order. I desire to correct the hon. gentleman's knowledge of Scripture. It was not Baal who was rebuked by an ass; it was Baalam.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He also told us he was going to instruct the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) on bibulous literature. I do not know whether he thought the bibulous qualities of the member for North York had not been developed, and that he would instruct him.

Mr. DAVIN. That would be impossible.

Mr. LANDERKIN. At all events, he has shown us that he has seen the Bible somewhere. I suppose they have it up in the Prairie Province, and I recommend him to read it again. I say in conclusion that the motion that has been introduced by the leader of the Opposition, is, in my opinion, a correct stand for this House to take. I do not believe in allowing any official of this House to take away the privileges and the rights that the people gave to the members of this House, and when the members of this House appointed that committee on the *Hansard* debates, and when those gentlemen have discharged the duties entrusted to them with zeal and ability, then I say the Speaker of this House has no power to dismiss any of the officials appointed by this House unless he is directed so to do by this House. It is beyond his prerogative to dismiss them, and I consider that he has exercised partisan powers that should not emanate from the Speaker's Chair. The Speaker, of all gentlemen in this House, should hold the balance of power equal between the parties, and he should guard the interests of both parties, particularly of the minority. You will find that laid down by all constituted authorities, and every gentleman in this House must come to the conclusion from reading them that it is the duty of the Speaker to exercise that right and power, with which he has been clothed by members of this House, with fair play, with justice, and with equal rights to both parties. I think the Speaker travels beyond his prerogative when he attempts arbitrarily to dismiss any officials of this House before he has had the order from this House to do so. It is the power that creates that should destroy. The House of Commons alone should give instruction to the Speaker to have these officials removed, and if the Speaker attempts to do that without an order of this House, he is going beyond his jurisdiction. I think if the Secretary of State would only ponder over this question, and reflect upon the language that was used of him by this author, whose name I do not know, if he calmly and carefully considered the opinion given in that paper, he would rise superior to this little petty malice, and would withdraw from the Speaker the request to have these translators removed. I think it would do him infinite credit, with his wonderful abilities which have been paraded by this authority; it would show that he had a magnanimous heart in his bosom; I think it would do him a great deal of credit to reinstate these parties, and to let them go on and pursue the work which they have done with efficiency and despatch.

Mr. SPROULE. We have just had an exhibition of the logic that hon. gentlemen have given this House, and if close reasoning could prove anything, I think they might hope to accomplish a great deal by their arguments. It seems to have been the object of hon. gentlemen, from first to last, to steer as far from the subject of discussion as it was possible for them to do. The gentleman who has just taken his seat has travelled over very extensive ground, he has pressed into service almost everything that his fertile imagination could invent, but without touching the question at issue at all. His sallies of wit addressed to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) appears to be in harmony with

his reasoning. He referred to him as representing that character in the Bible where it is said that Balaam first spoke to that noted beast, the ass, but he did not tell the House that it was the ass who replied to Balaam. It was true that the member for Assiniboia made his criticisms, it was true also that a reply came back to him. If there was any analogy in the scriptural quotation, it must apply to the party that replied to Balaam, and if he himself be Balaam, who must the party be who replied to Balaam? The hon. member for Assiniboia made reference to the retort, not a very courteous and gentlemanly one, that was addressed by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) to this side of the House, when "question" was called, because the hon. gentleman was wandering entirely from the subject. The hon. gentleman from North York gave his first edition of his speech before dinner. I think the House accepted it as his views upon the subject. But that hon. gentleman has this peculiarity, that he sometimes revises and gives a second edition of his speech. It is true that his speech after dinner was revised by the original author, but when we come to compare what he said before dinner with what he said after dinner, we may be charitable enough to suppose that there is a reason for excusing the great difference between the two. But coming more directly to the question in which we are interested, I think that when we adopted the system of reporting the debate of this House, and of translating them, we entrusted that duty to men in whom we had every confidence. Both sides of the House have a right to look upon those men with confidence, as honest men, as honorable men, as men who would not willingly misrepresent the statements of any hon. member; and if we afterwards find them using language the most intemperate, the most extreme, and I think I might say the most untrue, that could be either invented or spoken by one man against another; and if we find some of these same men coming back as translators for this House, how can we ever have confidence in them that they will do their work impartially? But we are asked whether we are prepared to condemn the Speaker because he exercised what is recognised to be his undoubted authority in dismissing these men. I think both the law and the Rules of this Parliament, as laid down by the Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), must be admitted, by every fair-minded gentleman in this House, to be the correct rules, and to be the law which governs either the engagement or discharge of employes of the Government in the branch of the service in which they were engaged. I say we are asked to condemn the Speaker because he has used his undoubted right in discharging men that he believed were not fit to be employed in the capacity they were. Now, I think we can come to but one conclusion, after looking carefully over both the law and the rules under which he acted; and if we find that he has acted within his right, then I think we ought to sustain him. But if we go beyond that, and if we ask ourselves whether the language that these men have been charged with using is such that a member of Parliament could endorse, either in this House or out of it, against members of Parliament, I think we can come to but one conclusion. I may be pardoned if I give you some of the choice epithets which were hurled at heads of Ministers of the Crown in this House. I have here some of them, as given in a report that is before this House, and I assume it to be correct. It says that Mr. Rémi Tremblay courted the loss of his position. Now, I may say in passing, that hon. gentlemen opposite contend that this gentleman apologised for using language in the temporary heat of debate, that he might not have used under other circumstances. But instead of apologising, at the very time he used that language, he stated that he was likely to be called to account for it, and that he was willing to risk his position. Is that like apology? Hon. gentlemen defending him say this was done in heat of debate, and afterwards he made an apology. The same gen-

tleman, I believe, if I have not forgotten the distinction between the two, made a reference to a statement, and said he regretted that he was unable, except in an indirect way, to give the lie direct to the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe, that he was unable to do it to the Secretary of State, as he was able to do it to the member for Richmond and Wolfe. I say that was clearly the inference that must be drawn from the letter he wrote to the Speaker afterwards, in reply to the allegation set forth by the Secretary of State and by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). Did that look like an apology? It was rather a defence. He said they might be pardoned for having the temerity for standing by their convictions. They were honest enough to admit those were their convictions. And in my opinion it was a defence rather than an apology for what they had stated. He goes on to speak of those hon. gentlemen who represent the Crown to-day in the following language:—

"Triumphant vice insults helpless virtue. Orangeism, that hideous monster which hell has vomited forth on Canada, raises its horrible head and casts a covetous eye on the prey which hateful treason is preparing to throw to it."

Is that language any hon. gentleman would tolerate against himself or any of his friends either in this House or outside of it? Is it language we should condone by allowing these men to hold responsible positions between two contending parties, believing that they will fairly discharge their duty impartially towards men against whom they have used such intemperate language. It is not reasonable, it is an insult to the intelligence of the House and of the people to say that we are obliged to retain such men in the employ of the Government, knowing they have used such very extreme and intemperate language. He says:

"The hangmen are jubilant."

Who are the hangmen? Those hon. gentlemen entrusted with the confidence of the people, some of them for more than a quarter of a century, those hon. gentlemen who stand so high to day in the confidence of the people as to have been returned, once, twice, three or more times, not by small but by enormous majorities. And those are the men designated as hangmen. He continues:

"They have succeeded in proclaiming to the world that we are a heartless and venal people."

Then he goes on to say:

"The re-election of all the hangmen Ministers, and the sustaining in power of Sir John Macdonald and his accomplices, stains with a fresh blot, still more ignoble than the first, our escutcheon, which had been already sufficiently degraded."

After the elections, when the country had given its verdict, Rémi Tremblay published the following:—

"At last you have had your day of victory; you have insulted the country in its agony. For you, treachery is a title to glory; you heap opprobrium on the noble Gallic race."

"Everlasting shame to you, mercenary renegades, for whom lucre is the supreme law!"

"Courtiers of a sanguinary sect, traitors to your native land, traitors to your faith; degenerate sons of a manly race, conceived by self-interest, born of terror; applaud and shout for joy, you servile phalanx; we are branded, thanks to you, a heartless people."

And those men who used such language against Ministers of the Crown are men whom hon. gentlemen opposite would attempt to stand up and defend. I do not wonder that they themselves indulge in intemperate language, both in and out of Parliament, when they are prepared to condone and to defend such language. I do not wonder that their followers use violent language, when hon. gentlemen, who, by the Rules of the House we are compelled to call honorable, defend such conduct either inside or outside of the House. They should be the last to do it. But the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), in his celebrated after-dinner speech, which was so different from his before-

dinner speech, when he might say of himself: It is not I that speaks, but the spirit that is within me—he was speaking out of the fulness of his heart—said we hold hon. gentlemen opposite responsible for it, and we condemn them for it. Hon. gentlemen have been condemning them for years. They have held the Government responsible for years, and hon. gentlemen representing the Government and their friends in this House and the country are willing to bear that responsibility. They are willing to shoulder it, and the country will exonerate them for doing anything wrong. They say we hold them responsible for it and condemn them for it, and that some of us on this side of the House have dug our political graves. He spoke of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran), the Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. It ought to be at least a consolation to the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to remember that when they have indulged in prophecy they have only made faithful that saying of the Scriptures which declares there shall be many false prophets in the latter days, because their prophecy has nearly always been unfulfilled. It has rarely ever come true, and therefore it carries very small weight with hon. members of the House. But the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) comes forward with an amendment which, as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says in so many words condemns his own leader. I believe such to be the case. The hon. member for Bothwell goes further and lays down a proposition or allegation, the most unreasonable proposed by any man who pretended to have ability. What is the nature of the amendment? It is that if Mr. Speaker has the authority, under the circumstances, we think he was not justified in using it, and that in the opinion of this House the language those gentlemen used was no worse than the language used by other translators who are not arraigned before this House. But they are not men who were not arraigned we are here to try. No matter how intemperate their language, we are not conversant with that language because it is not before us, but we are conversant with the language used by the gentlemen arraigned before this House and dealt with by the Speaker of the House previous to this debate. Those men are the men we are trying, and not those who have not been arraigned. It is absurd to contend that two wrongs ever make a right. If other gentlemen have been wrong that is no reason to say those men are right. It matters not what language may have been used by other gentlemen, the only language before us is that in the printed record, and it is for the House to judge whether that language was right or wrong. The hon. gentleman has referred to the conduct of various Governments, and has referred to employés of the Governments who have taken part in elections, and if you believe the contentions made by those hon. gentlemen, you would believe that both they and their party never indulged in anything like recrimination. Is not the history of the Government of Ontario, of the Government of Quebec, of the Government of Manitoba an argument to the contrary? All those Governments have adopted the same rule, and have invariably dismissed parties brought to their notice as violating this rule. It was only a few days ago that we saw this occur in Manitoba in regard to quite a very large number. Does any hon. gentleman pretend to say that Mr. Greenway had not dismissed civil servants who have been in opposition to his Government and to his party? And it is only within a few days past that he has been dismissing them. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the Hon. Mr. Mercier in Quebec has dismissed those who are opposed to him? Why we see an account of it day after day. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the Hon. Oliver Mowat is following out the same rule invariably in every one of those cases? And if it has not been carried on to a greater extent it is due to the fact that it has not been brought to the attention of the Government. In every

Mr. SPROULE.

Province the rule has been carried out, and parties who have committed similar offences have been dismissed. It is not for us to say to-night whether the principle carried out to extremes is right or wrong. It is for us to say whether we support the action of the Speaker in discharging what we conceived to be fairly his duty. If you go beyond that to say whether we believe the conduct of those men is entitled to be condoned or condemned by this House, I maintain that no matter from what point we view it, we are bound to condemn that language and bound to sustain the Speaker in his action. I for one am prepared to do so, not only on this occasion, but on every occasion where a charge comes before this House, no matter which side it comes from, and where I find the offence as grievous as it is in this particular case.

Mr. FISHER It is not my intention at this late stage of the debate to at all go into the question of the authority of the Speaker as to his action in the dismissal of the *Hansard* translators. There are one or two points I wish to allude to and which I will do very briefly. I was not at all surprised that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) quoted words from the Hon. Edward Blake's utterances upon constitutional questions and questions relating to the rights and privileges of this House. I have noticed on frequent occasions, Sir, that hon. gentlemen who differ from the Hon. Edward Blake on many questions when they wish to quote utterances of a broad and patriotic and statesmanlike character, are obliged to go to the words of that gentleman to support their assertions and to make a point if they can. If the hon. gentleman's contention is correct that it is not right for public servants to engage in a political warfare I would like to know how it is that while the Secretary of State has insisted upon the dismissal of those three Liberal *Hansard* translators that he has not also insisted upon the dismissal of the other five translators, who certainly have taken part in political discussions and certainly have taken a controversial position upon the political questions of the day. If the one side is to be dismissed and this is to be the rule of procedure by the Government, they ought to dismiss their own supporters as well. Perhaps I may not ask nor expect that they will agree to this. I do not believe, Sir, it is the intention or the practice of hon. gentlemen opposite to follow out that rule. I know, Sir, that in years gone by not only have they allowed particular supporters of themselves in the civil service to go to the country and canvass and work against gentlemen on this side, but I have myself in my personal experience suffered from that fact. Perhaps I ought not to say suffered, because I do not think that gentlemen who came to work against me accomplished any very great good for the party they worked for. In 1880 I was running for a vacant seat in the House of Commons, and a gentleman who was at that time in the employment of the Department of Agriculture was present in my county and spoke against me at various meetings, and against the party to which I belonged, with considerable vehemence and considerable virulence. Still that gentleman was not only not dismissed from his employment but he has since obtained preferment and advancement in the Civil Service at the hands of the gentlemen who employed him then to do that party work for them. I do not believe this is an isolated instance, for I know several occasions in which this occurred. I think it lies but ill in the mouth of the hon. Secretary of State and of the hon. gentlemen now on the Ministerial benches to pretend for an instant that they are jealous of any abuses of a political character in the Civil Service which they control. But, Sir, I have one particular object in speaking here to-night, and it is to a large extent in consequence of the regret which I feel that the hon. Secretary of State, in speaking of these gentlemen should, as I understood him,

characterise them as blackguards and use very strong epithets in regard to them. I am not personally acquainted with the utterances or speeches of two of those gentlemen. But in regard to one of them, Mr. Ernest Tremblay, of St. Hyacinthe, I am well acquainted with his utterances, with him personally, and with his conduct in the campaign to which allusion has been made. It happened, Sir, that in the last general election for this Parliament Mr. Ernest Tremblay was in my county. Mr. Ernest Tremblay in that contest assisted me in my campaign, and I can say most emphatically that not only is Mr. Ernest Tremblay a well educated, well informed, and cultured gentleman, but that on every occasion that he spoke in that county, or in that campaign, his utterances were uniformly characterised by extreme courtesy to his opponents, and by an absolute and entire lack of any references that would be considered personal or against which objection could be taken. Not only can I make this statement, but I have in my hand a letter which was addressed to Mr. Ernest Tremblay by a gentleman in my county, who has managed and controlled and conducted the campaign against me. I will read that letter so that you, Sir, may understand that those are not simply my own experience which I am expressing with regard to Mr. Tremblay, but that they are also the opinions of those opposed to him in that campaign and against whom he spoke not personally but politically. The letter is dated :

"KNOWLTON, 7th June, 1887.

"MR DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 4th inst., I must say that I was present at most all the meetings you attended in Brome, P. Q., during the last Federal election. On no occasion did I hear you make a personal attack on any of the Ministers or any member of Parliament. You will pardon me if I say that I regarded your speeches rather as political lectures for a select assembly than as effective hustings addresses. You are at liberty to make such use of this letter as you please.

Yours truly,

"W. W. LYNCH."

Now, Sir, I think that so far as Mr. Ernest Tremblay's conduct in the campaign to which allusion has been made is concerned, that this letter written by a former colleague of the Secretary of State, and a gentleman whose word the hon. the Secretary of State will take, and whom he holds in high estimation, will sufficiently dispose of the accusation in this respect. But, Sir, this is not the only proof that I have in regard to the conduct of that gentleman during the Federal election campaign. It happened at one time he was not occupied in my county, and that he left my county to attend a public meeting in the county of Richelieu, at St. Roch. On the following day the *Sorelois* gave the following account of an encounter between Mr. Ernest Tremblay and Mr. Vanasse, one of his colleagues in the *Hansard* debates translating staff. Mr. Vanasse was, I understand, at that time the editor or manager of the *Sorelois*, the newspaper from which I am quoting :

"Mr. Vanasse spoke the second time and then Mr. Ernest Tremblay, from St. Hyacinthe, not the one who attended the meeting held in this town last Saturday, addressed the meeting in the interest of the Liberal cause. If we do not always approve of the political opinions of Mr. Tremblay there is in his case one thing of which we do approve, and which it is a pleasure and a duty for us to mention, and it is his courteous manner of carrying on a discussion. The polite language which Mr. Tremblay used yesterday, contrasted peculiarly with the preposterous remarks and the rude and vulgar expressions of the young demagogue Lemieux, and the audience proved that people can perfectly make a distinction between a gentleman and a blackguard."

Here is the utterance of that gentleman's colleague, who met Mr. Tremblay on the hustings, and so far from characterising his language as the hon. Secretary of State to-day characterised it, as that of a blackguard, —

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to hear the hon. Secretary of State say he did not; I am glad to find that he was more guarded in his language and that he did not use this extreme

epithet which I thought he did use; but I fear that some of the epithets he did use were almost as bad. But I am glad to find that one who was present at that meeting, and had a better opportunity of knowing what Mr. Tremblay's language was like, though politically opposed to him, has characterised it in the way I said. I confess I am very much disappointed to find that this question in regard to these gentlemen has been brought up again this Session. I am surprised to find a gentleman in the position of the Secretary of State, who, perhaps, on the spur of the moment, immediately after the campaign, might have felt hurt by the language used, and might have been indiscreet enough to allow himself to be carried away by his personal feelings, and to forget the dignified position he ought to hold in this Government; I am surprised to find that he has nursed his wrath for a whole year; and that, instead of this matter being allowed to pass away as a thing of the past, his vengeance must be carried out to the end. I believe conduct like this is unworthy of a government. I was going to say that it was unworthy of the Secretary of State, but perhaps I had better not. If the hon. gentleman is prepared to say that it is worthy of himself, I am quite ready to let him think so. I am not going into the details of the question as to who ought to dismiss the gentlemen, or as to how their action should be treated, which I believe has been thoroughly discussed by gentlemen on this side. I must again express my surprise that this action has been taken, as I think the question might have been left in abeyance and this discussion avoided.

Mr. McNEILL. I am not going to enter into this debate; but I desire, with the indulgence of this House, to read a speech of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), which I intended to hand to the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), but which I omitted to do in time. The hon. member for South Oxford in the Session of 1886 made use of these words :

"Now, I have always myself contended, and I am quite willing to give the gentlemen opposite the benefit of that contention, that if a civil servant, a man in the employment of the Government, chooses to step out of the line, and chooses to canvass or make himself conspicuous in opposition to the candidate of the Government, he must take the consequence. I have always believed that it is impossible to maintain the discipline of the service if that occurs."

Furthermore, he says :

"If the hon. gentlemen who are the subjects of this motion are prepared to show that this gentleman actively interfered, I say that I, for one, would sustain the action of the Government in dismissing the civil servant."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. member for North Bruce has correctly defined the position I have always held on this question. I am of opinion that a civil servant who intermeddles in political matters takes his political life in his hands, and must abide by the consequences; and all I would ask in this matter is that the same rule and the same measure be extended to all those gentlemen of the translating staff who have interfered in politics. If it be right to dismiss the one, it is equally right to dismiss the other. That is the position I hold on that subject, and I think it is a position which is pretty generally held. It was substantially the position which I understood my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) to take regarding the merits of the question. Here we have seven or eight translators, all of whom it appears have been interfering actively. Some two or three are selected for dismissal. My hon. friend objects, and objects very properly, to those who interfered on one side, being servants of this House, servants of the whole body, being selected for dismissal, and the others being let go scott free. That is the objection of my hon. friend, passing over for the moment the point as to who had the right to dismiss, which is an entirely different point. The question as we now have it, is on the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), I

believe. I am quite prepared to say that my own view of the case is that no civil servant at all should interfere in elections, and I would go even further, as I have said many a time, and say that I think it would conduce to the general welfare of this community, and to the welfare of the civil servants themselves, if they were relegated very much to the position to which we relegate our judges, and required in elections to abstain even from voting. That, however, is another matter; but I still adhere to the position I have always held as to the interference of the civil servants in elections.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It appears to me that after the expression of opinion of the hon. member who has just sat down, this discussion is practically closed. In fact, the ground which had been taken by the hon. leader of the Opposition has been left altogether in the speeches which have been made, and especially in the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell. In fact, most of those who have spoken have tried to cover their retreat by exhuming from the past some speeches which at the time they were made seemed to have been after their own hearts. Well, I do not care for myself if they are quoted in the House, and if they have any significance now, I do not know that they will go to the credit of the Opposition themselves. If it is true that a certain number of members belonging to the Conservative party thought it necessary, in fulfilling what they considered their duty, to condemn the Government on certain matters, and afterwards felt it to be their duty, as between the two parties, to continue to support the Government in power, I do not see what the Opposition can gain by invoking those expressions at the present time. I think it does not reflect a great deal of credit on the Opposition to go on making those quotations, because, after having condemned the administration of the Government in some measures, we believed it to be our duty and in the interests of the country to support them in their general policy. In fact, at the last general elections, all the members who opposed the Government on the Riel question declared, with the assent of the electors in our Province, that they would support the Government of the day, because, after all, they are the only Government which could represent the true interests of the country, and because the people had no more confidence in the Opposition then than they had before. It is my duty to say a few words as to the policy adopted by the Debates Committee with regard to those appointments. Up to 1880, this House will remember that the Debates were given under contract. In 1880, official reporters were appointed, and the committee then took care to declare by resolution that those reporters would be officers, under the rules and regulations of the Speaker and the Commission of Internal Economy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Yes; I have the resolution here. In 1880, the official reporters were appointed regularly by a committee of the House, and the translation continued to be done under contract up to 1883. Then, when the translation was no longer done under contract, the committee did not consider it necessary to declare that the translators would be considered officers of the House; and it was only because they would not be obliged to do other duty than to translate the reports of the debates that they were paid only \$1,000 per Session, while the reporters got \$2,000 with the understanding that after the session they would be at the call of the different departments or the Speaker to fulfil any necessary duty. That was the only reason why there was a distinction made, and we declared then that the translators would be only subject to the duty of translating the Debates of the Session. To show that the opinion of the committee has never been to consider itself above the general rule regulating

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

the House, I will quote the contract that was made that same year for the publishing of the Debates, by which the House will see that the committee understood then, that, being in existence only during the Session, any work that was to be done after the House closed, was to be subject to the control and authority of the Speaker. Here is the contract:

"That if at any time during the continuance hereof, the contractors shall fail to carry out and perform the conditions of this agreement and contract and all his obligations under the same, to the satisfaction of any committee of the House of Commons aforesaid, which may be duly appointed to supervise the reporting and publication of the Debates aforesaid, if Parliament be then sitting or of the Commissioners under the Act respecting the Internal Economy of the House and for other purposes, if Parliament be not then sitting."

So with the officers of the committee.

Mr. LAURIER. Parliament was sitting.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Parliament was not sitting. Suppose the translators after prorogation had taken place, neglected to complete their work, who would call them to time, if not the Speaker? The House having prorogued the Committee of Debates is no longer in existence, and consequently the Speaker or the Commission of Internal Economy must deal with the translators regarding the completion of the work or their conduct, should they fail to accomplish their work or behave in such a way as to incur the condemnation of the constituted authorities. Further, it will be seen by the order of reference that the committee is appointed to supervise the printing and reporting and publishing of the Official Debates. It has nothing else to do. When the Speaker, who has been very unjustly attacked by an hon. member here for having acted in a partisan spirit in that matter, was called on to dismiss those translators, he did not rush into it, he did not immediately dismiss them, but he sent letters to those who had been accused, and gave them a chance to make any explanation they might think fit to make. In fact, he consented to send to the Committee of the Debates the complaint of the hon. the Secretary of State and of the hon. the member for Richmond and Wolfe, only towards the end of the Session. The committee took those letters into consideration, and when they saw that the accusation was not about the way the work was done, but was with reference to a breach of discipline, they said: We have nothing to do with that, and referred it to the Speaker. The Rules of Parliament must be applied in the settlement of questions like this. If the committee had taken authority in this matter, we would have had two conflicting authorities. Therefore, the majority of the committee, after having considered the whole question carefully, declared they had but one thing to do, and that was to declare, as stated in the report that was laid on the Table at the end of last Session:

"That whereas this committee has been established for the special object of looking after the reporting, the translation, and the publication of the Debates; and whereas, the complaints of the Secretary of State and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe against the conduct of the gentlemen connected with the French translation of the Debates, made to the Speaker and referred by him to the committee, appeared to the said committee to be in the nature of a question of privilege and discipline, and therefore do not fall under the control of the said committee, be it resolved that the said complaint, with the answers thereto, be referred back to the Speaker, to be dealt with by him as he sees fit."

Objection is taken against the Speaker's dealing with that matter, after that report was sent to him, because the House was not called to concur. It was not necessary that the report should be carried by the House in order to give effect to that resolution. We know that concurrence in the reports of general committees is not necessary, unless the resolutions brought by them before the House involve an expenditure of money, or the appointment of some one, or some action to be taken by the House. In this case, there was no action recommended. We merely declared in that report

that we had nothing to do with the question, that it was within the province of the Speaker and under the authority of the Speaker to deal with that matter. I find here, on page 452 of Bourinot, that :

"It is the practice to move concurrence in the reports of committees in certain cases. For instance, the reports on printing are invariably agreed to, as they contain recommendations for the printing and distribution of documents, which must be duly authorised by the House. Also, reports containing certain opinions or resolutions are frequently concurred in, on motion. But, when the report does not contain any resolution or other proposition for the consideration of the House, it does not appear that any further proceedings with reference to it as a report are necessary. It remains in the possession and on the Journals of the House as a basis or ground for such further proceedings as may be proper or necessary."

They make an accusation against the Speaker because he took action on the report. He could not ignore it. In fact, the committee not only placed that resolution in the report which was brought before the House, but a copy was ordered to be sent to the Speaker himself, so that he was cognisant of the fact that the opinion of the committee was that it had nothing to do with that question of discipline, but that in its opinion it was for the Speaker to deal with it. So the Speaker and the House were in possession of that report, and it was for them or for any member who did not agree with that report, or who did agree with it, to take any proceedings on the report, to rise and move in the House so as to deal with that report, either against or for. I think that question is pretty well settled after all, and that the discussion can be resumed in the reading of the clause of the statute, which I consider as clear as it can be. The question of the jurisdiction of the Speaker being plainly defined by the statute itself, which says :

"If any complaint or representation shall at any time be made to the Speaker for the time being, of the misconduct or unfitness of any clerk, officer, messenger or other person attendant on the House of Commons, now or hereafter to be appointed, it shall be lawful for the said Speaker to cause an enquiry to be made into the conduct or fitness of such person; and if thereupon it shall appear to the Speaker that such person has been guilty of misconduct, or is unfit to hold his situation, the Speaker may, if such clerk, officer, messenger or other person has been appointed by the Crown, suspend him and report such suspension to the Governor, and if he has not been appointed by the Crown."

It does not say if he has been appointed in such or such manner, or appointed by the Speaker, but "*if he has not been appointed by the Crown.*"

"then, the Speaker may suspend or remove such person."

In fact, this has been so well acknowledged that since 1873, after the dismissal of Mr. Tassé, no officer of the House was ever called to the Bar of the House when there was a complaint against him, but, upon calling the attention of the Speaker to the case, the Speaker would remove him, and that was all. I think that has been the practice. Some cases have been quoted, but I find there are others.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has read the clause of the statute which says the Speaker has a right to remove or suspend an officer for incapacity or anything of that sort. I understood the hon. gentleman to argue that, in this case, that was a matter wholly within the jurisdiction of the committee. If the hon. gentleman is right in saying that the statute applies to this class of cases, he will see that he must be wrong as to the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Not at all, since the House has given special authority to the committee to deal with the qualification of the translators. The House has acknowledged the right of the committee to recommend the appointment of the proper persons to be translators, and that is all the right given to the committee. In fact, that is precisely the explanation of that part of the clause of the statute. The House has legislated otherwise as regards the translation, because it has given the committee the right to deal with the qualifications of the translators, but, as to

their behavior or as to questions of discipline, no authority has been given to the committee.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman will see that that provision is a statutory provision. The other is a mere resolution of the House, and, if he is right as to the construction of the statute, clearly no resolution of the House can override the authority given by the statute, and then the committee cannot have any authority at all.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It has never been contested, and it has been acted upon as the policy of the House, and the rule adopted by the House was never put in conflict with the statute. The first appointments made were those of the official reporters in 1850. What does the resolution say, which was concurred in by the House?

"That, as greater permanency in the *personnel* of the reporting staff would ensure a higher state of efficiency, the committee would recommend that six reporters be engaged and recognised as officers of the House, subject to such regulations as may from time to time be enacted by the Commissioners for the Internal Economy of the House."

That was the declaration which was made when the first officers under the committee on the Official Debates were appointed. They were immediately acknowledged as officers of the House. It is true that, when the translators were appointed, the Committee did not find it necessary to make the same declaration, because it was really considered that those officers could not be treated otherwise than those who were the reporting officers of the House. They were the same officers, and were acting under the same authority, and under the same rule, and I do not think it can be contended that it has ever been the idea or opinion of the House that they would constitute two conflicting authorities in this House; so the Speaker remains the authority of the House, the guardian of the dignity of the House, the one to whom any member who has been unjustly dealt with, who has been attacked or calumniated or insulted by any of the officers of the House, must apply for redress, and I think that is the only conclusion at which we can arrive.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. So many appeals have been made to me, to my good heart, as some hon. member said, that I cannot allow this debate to close without saying one word. If it was a question of personal resentment, I would answer immediately that I forget and forgive all that those gentlemen may have said against me. I have already shown my good will towards one of them, Mr. Poirier. He was a candidate against me in 1882. Notwithstanding that, in 1884 I recommended him to the *Hansard* Committee to be appointed as translator. It is true I was badly rewarded by him, as he said in the country that I must have lied here when I stated that I did not know he was an applicant for the position up to the time I had heard that he had been recommended. I was the one who had recommended him, and I spoke as I did in the House to spare him the imputation of having surrendered his opposition for the sake of a position in the public service. I said then that I was ready to forgive the past, and I said that he was qualified to be a translator. As for personal resentment, I have none. I only wish to maintain the authority of the Speaker, the authority of this House, and the dignity of its members. I say that the conduct of these men since the complaint was made against them, has been even worse than it was before against myself and other hon. gentlemen in this House. Since that time, if they had made the least apology to the Speaker, if they had only explained that the offensive language they used was in the midst of a wild excitement in the Province of Quebec, I would have been the first to ask the Speaker, and to ask my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe, to forgive and forget. But instead of that, they have been defiant in this House, they have been parading themselves in the corridors, loudly asserting that they would keep their positions in spite of the Speaker's action,

and their conduct is not defensible. If the decision of the Speaker of this House is set aside, the meanest messenger employed in this building would have the same right to set at defiance the authority of the Speaker, and to treat the members of this House, whose servants they are, with contumely. Again it has been charged that I am actuated by spite. That is not so. I do not wish to refer to the quotations that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has made from the *Monde*, expressions that have never been written in the *Monde* by anybody who occupies a position here as a servant of the House. My hon. friend has been mistaken, misinformed, his quotation is incorrect, and is not true. I have never been accused in the *Monde*, or even in the *Press*, of being a public thief; he will never find that in these papers, and his quotation is incorrect. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), said there was a great difference between the conduct of officers according to the salaries they were paid; and that a man who is paid two or three thousand a year should have more respect for the House, more respect for the authority of the Speaker, than a man who is paid only one thousand for three months' work. Sir, I do not value the honor of the House and the dignity of its members by dollars and cents. The man who works here for three months for one thousand dollars should be subjected to the same rule as a third-class clerk who works for four hundred, or a messenger for three hundred dollars a year. These technicalities of the hon. gentleman are not worthy of this debate. When I made my complaint before the Speaker I did it in accordance with the same principle that guided me in 1882, when I was Premier of the Province of Quebec. I had an Order in Council passed saying that members of the Civil Service and other public officers should not meddle conspicuously in elections, and should not go on the hustings and oppose candidates. I was exactly of the opinion of the hon. member for Oxford. I say now that if any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House makes a complaint, similar to the charge now under debate, against one of the officers of the House, belonging to my own party, and if the hon. member shows that offensive expressions have been used against him publicly, I would at once vote to dismiss that officer. In 1882, in that report to Council, I stated that it would destroy the trust, and confidence, and the harmony that should exist between civil servants and members of the House of Assembly, if the former were allowed actively to engage in politics. I was not alone in taking that course. On the 11th April, 1887, the Hon. Mr. Mercier, Premier of Quebec, whom the hon. member for Oxford banquetted and applauded last night, did the same thing that I had done in 1882, and he dismissed, whom? Not a civil servant, but he dismissed Mr. Languedoc, interpreter in the Court House at Quebec, a man learned in the law, a Queen's Counsel, whose knowledge of both languages entitled him specially to serve as interpreter in the courts. Here is the reason given for his dismissal by the Premier of Quebec.

"That Mr. Languedoc has presented himself as a candidate, that he has defended one party and opposed another on the hustings."

And the Premier concludes:

"Under the circumstances, and applying the principles laid down by the Order in Council of the 20th April, 1882,"—

—that was my Order in Council—

—"with reference to the interference of employes in the election, that gentleman is dismissed."

My course in this case has been consistent with my course in the Government of Quebec. I have always been in favor, without regard to one side of the House or the other, of discipline among civil servants, and if the Speaker's decision was not supported in this case, any or all the messengers might leave this House at will during elections, and we might be insulted by them under pretence that they are free citizens, and can say everything they please of mem-

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

bers of this House under color of exercising their rights. I was almost ashamed to hear some hon. members say to-day that we cannot be supposed to take notice of all the obloquy and calumny that may be heaped upon us. Then the hon. member for Bothwell said that hon. members with whom I shake hands to-day have used expressions against me as offensive as any that I have complained of. That is not true, but if it were true, it would be because, as between gentlemen who have quarrelled, reconciliation has followed, so that I can still meet those gentlemen, and stand on the same platform and sit in the same room. A public man must have no resentment, because we do not know what a near future may bring forth, and we should always act honorably towards one another. Some of my hon. friends have been sitting along side the Premier of this House, who were formerly strong opponents of his. The Hon. George Brown sat in the same Government with him, and God knows what they said of each other previously on public platforms. I know very well the strong language that has been used against me publicly by some hon. members who are now my friends, men who, at a time of great excitement in the Province of Quebec, expressed publicly their disapproval of the Government, but those hon. gentlemen never used, with regard to my private character, such personally offensive language as would prevent us from meeting, and shaking hands, and being friends. Nobody will find in the speeches of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), for instance, who was probably one of those who was carried the furthest away in the excitement of 1885, that I was a public thief, that I was a dilapidator of other people's fortunes, that I was a liar. They will never find, in the language of the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), who was also in that movement, anything of a personal character. We must make allowance for the expressions of public men on political questions, which are far different from private and personal calumny. These hon. gentlemen were members of the House, they were not asking for favors, they were not in the service of the Government, they were their own masters as well as we, and they had a right to stand up with me as an equal. The hon. member for Bothwell reminds me of a story. A cook once said to his master: "Sir, your expressions are such that they require us to meet in an encounter." The master said: "Very well, but you must first leave the kitchen, and then we will see about it." I have not done anything from a feeling of resentment or spite, but in my actions I have been inspired only by a strong feeling as to what is due to the honor and discipline of the House and the dignity of its members.

Mr. PLATT. I rise to express my opinion to the House, and I feel disposed to do so because I find my opinion differs from that of a large majority of those who have spoken upon this question. The people of the country may be listening to this debate with more interest than we imagine. Members of Parliament may think as they say in the present discussion they are supreme, that they are much better than outside people; and I apprehend that when we are in Session we are supreme, but when His Excellency dismisses us at the close of the Parliament, all the citizens are placed on a par. I differ from those on this side of the House, as well as hon. gentlemen opposite who have expressed the opinion that members of the Civil Service, especially members of that part of the Service who are essentially servants of the House receiving their authority from Parliament, shall be debarred from the rights of citizenship when this country is called upon to express its opinion on public questions. That is the ground upon which I object to the opinion expressed on the floor of this House, that there is a certain class of our community that should be debarred from expressing, at any time, their opinions upon the questions of the day. I am prepared to take my stand upon this

ground, that members of the Civil Service, even the *Hansard* translators, and above all those who are employed in the public service, the same as I might employ men in my service, should not be debarred from rights of citizenship. I cannot for a moment accept the idea that we in this country, having so few people, having as many thousands in our employ as we have millions in our country, should allow men to be made slaves, should allow their intelligence to be dwarfed that they should have no opinions of their own, should not dare to enter on public discussions when a general election comes round. I grant that during the session of Parliament they should act with a certain amount of courtesy to members of Parliament; but when His Excellency dissolves Parliament and an appeal is made to the people to express their opinions on the great public questions, then I say a civil servant is just as good as a member of Parliament or any body else; there is no man in this country having a right to vote who has not a right to express his opinion. It is only a matter of degree. Members of Parliament face each other, draw the sword of warfare and tell each other what they think face to face; but are we to suppose that those who are in the employment of the House of Commons or the departments of the Government have no opinions on these questions? If they have opinions, why in the name of common sense, should we not allow them to express those opinions. I take it that the moment His Excellency dissolves Parliament the people of the country are in common, no man is better than another, every man should be allowed to express his opinions just as he thinks, and although the Secretary of State may think that at certain times and on certain occasions it behoves a member of the Civil Service to pay obeisance to him or a member of Parliament, there is a time when these men feel they have within them just as much manhood as I have or as is possessed by that hon. gentleman or any member of Parliament. Why should we ask them to deprive themselves of the right of citizenship and the right to discuss the public questions of the day; and if they do express an opinion, why have they not the right to express an opinion just as strongly as has a member of Parliament? I wish no dividing line between the citizens of this country; I do not believe there should be a class of men who should make themselves slaves because they serve Parliament or the Government. Let us all be free men, let us have free speech, free thought, free action. I do not believe hon. members on this side need be afraid of the civil servants in the employment of the Government unless we have done something wrong, and hon. gentlemen opposite will not fear the expositions which intelligent men such as the translators may offer unless they have done something wrong. When we find these men acting upon their common rights as citizens, when they are manly enough to go forward on the public platform and expound their opinion on public questions, is that a reason why we should have them dismissed from their positions and have slaves instead of free men occupy the positions which they occupied before? On no other subject do I feel more keenly than this, that we are not a sufficiently large population in this country to have any large number of our citizens made slaves, unable to express themselves, unable to vote, unable to act as their conscience dictates. I claim for civil servants of the country, for the *Hansard* reporters, for the translators that they are citizens as much as you and I are, Mr. Speaker, and while I do not question the legal right of the Speaker to act as he has done—that is a part of the question I leave to old parliamentarians and lawyers—but as citizens I think they have the same right as I have or any member has to act at a general election just as each man's conscience dictates. I say, therefore, that we should not support the dismissal of any civil servant so long as he acts as I act and anybody else acts according to his con-

science and the best interests of the country which it is his bounden duty to serve.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid I cannot earn the applause of my friends behind me, because I am not going to make a speech on this occasion. The subject has been fully discussed on both sides, every hon. member understands the question and the various phases of it as they appear in the different speeches addressed to the House. I am satisfied that the Speaker had the power which he has exercised, that the power was given to him by the complaint addressed to him as to the conduct of these three persons mentioned. I am satisfied these three persons come within the purview of the statute, that they are persons attendant upon the House, and, therefore, if the misconduct has been complained of, it is the Speaker's duty to act upon it and within the scope of his power to do so; and I also think, after hearing the language that has been used, and after an inspection of the papers laid before the House, that these men richly deserve the exercise of the power by the Speaker. I therefore, move in amendment to the said proposed amendment, that all the words after the word "That" in the original motion, where it appears the first time, be struck out, and the following substituted in lieu thereof:—

Mr. Speaker, in dismissing Rémi Tremblay, E. Tremblay and A. E. Poirier from their offices of translators of the Debates of this House, has acted within the scope of his powers, and has exercised such powers with a due regard to the dignity of this House, and to the consideration and respect due to its members.

Mr. LAURIER. I have just one word to say in answer to the right hon. gentleman. If the same measure of justice is to be applied to all the offenders who have equally offended in this matter, the resolution of my hon. friend does not go far enough and it should include all those who being actual officers of the House are not only during the elections, but are day after day writing letters and writing correspondence to their papers upbraiding members of this House. The practice should not be tolerated at all. I have said in my opening remarks and I repeat it here that it should not be tolerated that an officer of the House should engage in active politics. I think the principle is a wrong one. I agree with my friend from Oxford. I agree with everybody who has spoken on this side that if my hon. friend the Secretary of State wants to pose in a magnanimous position it does not lie in him dismissing men because they offended him, but let him say, we have been violating the rule, let us make a new rule and let us forget the past, and then we will think it magnanimous. Notwithstanding what my friend may say, I cannot believe he is actuated, unconsciously, perhaps, since he protests, with anything but resentment. If he were not actuated by resentment he would say: I will make it a rule that those men will not in future trespass against the privileges of this House; but the result will now remain with the connivance of the hon. gentleman who leads this House that three men will be selected because they have not offended against the majority, and those who offended against the minority will be paid and protected by the majority of this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think the hon. gentleman ought to make that charge against us. If the hon. gentleman will look at the clause he will see that the Speaker has no power to dismiss or suspend an officer except a complaint or representation is made against him. A complaint and representation was made to the Speaker against those three men. No complaint or representation was made against the other five men of which the hon. gentleman now speaks, and until a complaint or representation was made to the Speaker he did not interfere. It was such complaint and representation that invested him with the power, and if a complaint or representation is

made to the Speaker about the other parties at any time I have no doubt that the Speaker will take the same course in respect to those other parties as he was obliged to take on the representation made to him respecting the other three.

Mr. LAURIER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say one word in answer?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. LAURIER. I will not make such a complaint against any of those translators here on the Debates, because they have been allowed the right in the past and I would think it unmanly on my part if I were to make any such complaint. I have a paper here full of extracts. It is true that I am not called a *pendard* or such expressions but I am treated to things not at all flattering of myself. I will not make any complaint against those translators so long as it is allowed by this House that they have a right to engage in politics or anything else after the session. So long as that is not forbidden I will not make a complaint.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have not taken any part in this debate, but I have listened to it with a good deal of attention and I am surprised at the course taken by the right hon. gentleman in moving this amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear; oh, oh.

Mr. MITCHELL. Of course I expected that the *claqueurs* behind him would interrupt. I knew what was to come and I expected it.

Mr. RYKERT. You have been there.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have never been there a tool. I am surprised at the remarks of the right hon. gentleman. He says it requires a complaint to be presented to the Speaker before action can be taken by the Speaker in dismissing those men. I am not going to discuss the question whether the Speaker has the power to dismiss them or not. That has been discussed by other gentlemen in this House. In reference to the conduct of the right hon. gentleman who professes with such humility and suavity to present to this House the position in which the matter stands I am going to say that this debate has shown that the other five translators are guilty of the same acts as has been alleged against the other three. Those allegations have been made by gentlemen who occupy a position in this House which entitles their statements to be received with reliance and respect. The right hon. gentleman instead of moving an amendment to dismiss those men, who from enthusiasm or strong party feelings might be led away by the practice which prevailed—not alone amongst the employés of Parliament, but amongst the employés of the Government in Ottawa and elsewhere, who have taken part in public contests—I say it would have better become the right hon. gentleman if he had taken the stand, that after hearing the allegations against those three men, he should defer the matter until he considers the case of the others. I am not going to justify those men, for my opinion is this upon that question: that the employés of the Government, or the employés of this House, ought to refrain from taking any very active part in public contests when a contest is going on. They may have their opinions, they may even state their opinions, I would concede that, but they should not take any very active part at all events in any public contest that goes on. It would better become the right hon. gentleman as arbitrator of the affairs of this country and as the absolute autocrat of this House if he in this case said: Those three men have had a charge laid against them because they have chosen to attack the hon. the Secretary of State and the case of the other men who were equally guilty upon the statements made in this Parliament, and upon the honor and responsibilities of members of Parlia-

Mr. LAURIER.

ment must be considered. It would have been better for the right hon. gentleman to have taken the course, if he desired to be fair, of giving those charges consideration and if those other five men are equally guilty to deal out the same treatment to all alike, because hon. gentlemen on that side of the House have brought charges which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have refrained from doing, he should not dismiss those three men and keep the others in office.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes. Oh, oh! It would better become the right hon. gentleman, if he desired to shew any spirit of fair play and distribute that justice which he professes to distribute, to have said to this House: We will defer consideration of this matter until we have considered the cases of the others and are in a position to treat all alike. For my part I shall vote against the amendment not because those men have the right to interfere in public affairs at all, but I vote against it as a protest against the injustice done to those men by the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The First Minister professes to act in a fair manner towards those three employés of the House whom he says have been complained against and who deserve dismissal. The hon. gentleman knows that the members on this side of the House have again and again proposed that those employed in the public service should cease to be political partisans on either side the moment they are employed. That is a principle which the hon. gentleman has never conceded, and so far as those translators are concerned it was said at the time of their appointment that the House gave employment to them but for a very small portion of the year and that their salaries were less than the ordinary reporters upon the Official Debates, and that they were to be at liberty to engage in ordinary avocations whenever they were not employed here. It was well known at the time they were appointed that some of them were on the political press of one side and some on the political press on the other side, and it was expressly stated by the committee at whose instance they were appointed that they were not to be interfered with in their political freedom or independence. That was the position in which the parties stood, and the hon. Secretary of State has complained against those men for exercising their rights as free men.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, and the hon. gentleman who moves the amendment is acting on that assumption. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman cannot have forgotten that he caused to be appointed here a number of men who were engaged as reporters on the political newspapers supporting him, as extra sessional clerks at \$4 a day, and that they never wrote a line in the public service, but received their \$4 a day to contribute to those newspapers which were weekly employed in maligning and misrepresenting hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. And now, for him to say that he is prepared to sustain the Speaker in dismissing an official the moment he is complained against on that side of the House, is a very extraordinary statement to make.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then I will not charge him with saying it, but I will say that the hon. gentleman is prepared to sustain the speaker in dismissing an official from the public service as soon as he attacks any one on that side of the House, but he is not prepared to dismiss him when he attacks hon. gentlemen on this side.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that either.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, that is the clear inference, not only from what the hon. gentleman has moved and said, but from what he has been doing for the last ten years. Now, I wish to call the attention of the House to this section of the Act, because I do not think it is open to the construction the First Minister has put on it. At all events, that is not the clear and obvious construction that has been put on it by the House. What has the House been doing? A committee of the House has been appointing certain officers; it has exercised supervision over them; it has done what the Speaker is authorised to do with regard to the officials here spoken of; it has judged of their fitness, and has decided whether they ought or ought not to be retained in the service. It is well known that no resolution of this House can override a statute; but if these people come under this Act, this committee has been overriding this statute. The term "other person" in the Act does not refer to this class of officers, but only to those who are *ejusdem generis* as those before mentioned, and who are appointed either by the Speaker or by the Crown. These officers are appointed by neither, and therefore the House has properly interpreted the Act in authorising a committee to judge of the fitness or unfitness of these men, and not the Speaker. The House has for the past five years been assuming that by doing this it has not been going in the face of this statute. Without interfering with the statute at all, the services of these men might be dispensed with precisely as they were appointed, by resolution of this House. Now, Sir, it is perfectly clear that the resolution of the hon. gentleman is a mere *ad captandum* resolution. It is one intended to uphold and perpetuate a personal wrong done to these parties. It affirms a jurisdiction which under the provisions of this law is not given to the Speaker. It is making the declaration that the House has for the past five years been guilty of a usurpation of functions not given to it but to the Speaker by the Act. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I say it is impossible for him to escape from that position, and he now asks the House to stultify itself and to declare that it has been acting contrary to the provisions of the statute for the last five years. I trust that no hon. gentleman on this side of the House, at any rate, will be guilty of so gross an act of inconsistency, as well as so gross a wrong, as would be done by the adoption of this resolution.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am speaking to the question. If the hon. gentleman who is interrupting me had one tithe of the interest at stake that there is at stake in this matter, he would be ready to spend the time of the House in its defence; and he is ready to do a gross act of injustice to three men who have done no wrong and who are entitled to his protection. The hon. gentleman who is interrupting me is ready to take the bread and butter out of the mouths of men who are just as honest, as intelligent, as earnest in defence of what they believe to be right and fair, as the hon. gentleman himself is. It is a matter of too much consequence to those parties to be treated as cavalierly as the hon. gentleman proposes to treat it. Here are men who are shown from the extracts that have been read to have said more violent things of the gentlemen on the Treasury benches than those whom they propose to dismiss, and they do not even complain of them, because they belong to the party behind them; and they now level their attacks daily against hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and are maintained in that position. Sir, this resolution is a resolution to discriminate between men belonging to different political parties. It proposes to mete out one measure of justice to one portion of the public service, and another and different measure to another portion, and I trust, Sir, that this country will not fail to mark the course hon. gentlemen opposite are taking. Why, the

right hon. the First Minister sustained here last year a man who, in violation of his oath of office and in violation of the statute, did a gross wrong to eighty members on this side. And what has he done to him now? He has put him into the Agriculture Department, in charge of an important portion of the public service, with a salary of \$600 or \$800 more than he received before. It will be possible, with that fact before the country, to convince any one that the hon. gentleman proposes to punish these men, not because they have done a wrong, but simply because they happen to be Reformers.

House divided on the amendment to the amendment of Sir John A. Macdonald:

Yeas:

Messieurs

Audet,	Foster,	Mills (Annapolis),
Bain (Soulanges),	Freeman,	Moffat,
Baker,	Girouard,	Moncreiff,
Bergin,	Gordon,	Montague,
Bowell,	Grandbois,	Montplaisir,
Boyle,	Guilbault,	O'Brien,
Brown,	Guillet,	Patterson (Essex),
Bryson,	Haggart,	Perley (Assiniboia),
Burns,	Hall,	Porter,
Cameron,	Henderson,	Prior,
Cargill,	Hesson,	Putman,
Carling,	Hickey,	Reid,
Carpenter,	Hudspeth,	Riopel,
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	Ives,	Robillard,
Chapleau,	Jamieson,	Roome,
Chisholm,	Joncas,	Royal,
Cimon,	Jones (Digby),	Rykert,
Cochrane,	Kenny,	Shanly,
Cockburn,	Kirkpatrick,	Small,
Colby,	Labrosse,	Smith (Sir Donald),
Corby,	Landry,	Smith (Ontario),
Costigan,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Sproule,
Coughlin,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Stevenson,
Coulombe,	Macdowall,	Taylor,
Couture,	McOulla,	Temple,
Daly,	McDonald (Victoria),	Thompson,
Daoust,	McDougald (Pictou),	Tisdale,
Davin,	McDougald (O. Breton),	Tupper (Pictou),
Davis,	McGreevy,	Tyrwhitt,
Dawson,	McKay,	Vanasse,
Deaision,	McKeen,	Wallase,
Desaulniers,	McLellan,	White (Cardwell),
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	McNeill,	Wilmot,
Dupont,	Madill,	Wilson (Argenteuil),
Ferguson (Leeds & G.),	Mara,	Wilson (Lennox),
Ferguson (Renfrew),	Marshall,	Wood (Brookville).—113.
Ferguson (Welland),	Masson,	

Nays:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Ellis,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fiset,	Meigs,
Barron,	Fisher,	Mills (Bothwell),
Béchar,	Geoffrion,	Mitchell,
Bernier,	Godbout,	Mulock,
Bourassa,	Guay,	Paterson (Brant),
Bowman,	Holtom,	Perry,
Brien,	Ives,	Platt,
Burdett,	Kirk,	Préfontaine,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Landerkia,	Rinfret,
Casey,	Lang,	Robertson,
Casgrain,	Langelier (Montmor'cy),	Rowand,
Choquette,	Langelier (Quebec),	St. Marie,
Chouinard,	Laurier,	Semple,
Cook,	Lavergne,	Sutherland,
Davies,	Lister,	Trow,
De St. Georges,	Lovitt,	Turcot,
Dessaint,	Macdonald (Huron),	Watson,
Doyon,	McIntyre,	Welsh,
Edgar,	McMillan (Huron),	Wilson (Elgin).—61.
Eisenhauer,		

Amendment to the amendment agreed to.

Motion of Mr. Laurier, as amended, agreed to on the same division.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:55 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 12th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 95) respecting Gaming in Stocks and Merchandise—from the Senate.—(Mr. Thompson.)

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. O'BRIEN moved that the petition of the Central Railway Company, which was reported on and not allowed by the Standing Committee on Standing Orders, be referred back to the said committee for further consideration. He said: The objections which were taken to the Bill when it was before the committee have since, I understand, been removed.

Motion agreed to.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 99) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act. He said: This Bill makes one or two not very important amendments to the present Act, and provides for the issue of permits on examination and report by the Inspector of Boilers to persons who carry passengers on their boats in certain waters, which are defined.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

DETENTION OF A REGISTERED LETTER.

Mr. McMULLEN (for Mr. LANDEKIN) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to pay to Mrs. Barbara Winkler, of Newstadt, the balance of principal and the interest on the sum of \$689.60, contained in a registered letter sent her by the Bank of Commerce, Walkerton, on the 22nd of June, of which sum she received only \$688.80 on the 12th of December, 1887, and whether any steps have been taken by the Government to discover and punish those guilty of the detention of said letter?

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. member is authorised to ask this question by the hon. member in whose name it stands?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would be better to state that, as otherwise it would be irregular.

Mr. McLELAN. The Government has made no payment whatever to Mrs. Barbara Winkler, of Newstadt, on account of the money contained in a registered letter to her address which was lost in the Walkerton Post Office. The money paid to her was paid by the postmaster of Walkerton, whose office was responsible for the letter going astray. Mrs. Winkler has received \$688.80 out of the amount of \$689.60, and for the amount of 80 cents remaining unpaid she must prosecute her claim against the postmaster of Walkerton. The case was thoroughly inquired into at the time by the Government inspectors, but they were unable to discover that anyone connected with the Post Office Department was in any way responsible for the loss of the letter.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE DEBATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before we proceed to the Orders of the Day, I wish to call the attention of the

House to the numerous complaints that have been made by members of the press, that they have not received, as has heretofore been the custom, copies of our *Hansard*. I think some of the hon. gentlemen who preside over the distribution of the *Hansard* are here, and I would be glad to know from them if steps have been taken to remedy these complaints, because I must say it has been most unfortunate if the *Hansards* have not been distributed to the newspaper press regularly. It is almost the only way in which the people at large can obtain a reasonable return for the very large sum of money the Debates cost us; and if through any inadvertence that has been done, I hope that members of the committee will rectify it without delay.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I do not know the reason of the failure to distribute the *Hansard*, but I know that the committee has given no orders to have the supply cut off. I will enquire and ascertain why it is that the Debates have not been sent out as usual to the newspaper press.

Mr. MITCHELL. I may remark upon this point, that I enquired at the *Herald* office on Saturday in reference to the complaints that were made, and I find that we received the copies of the debates. But I understand that country papers are complaining that they have not received it. The city papers I believe have no cause of complaint.

Mr. HESSON. I think that hon. gentlemen are under a misapprehension upon the whole question. Complaint is not made by the newspapers that they are not receiving the daily issue of the *Hansard*, but that they are not supplied by the Debates Committee with a bound copy.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh, no.

Mr. HESSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. You hear that complaint all around the House, and if you will simply open your ears you will hear it from the gallery.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The reason I mentioned the matter is that I have received information that during the last debate the *Hansards* have not been supplied to the country press.

Mr. GILLMOR. It occurs to me that we should distribute rather the corrected copies of the *Hansard*, instead of the daily issue. I think the corrected copy of the *Hansard* is what should be distributed to the press. All the members of Parliament get the first copy before it is corrected, therefore they have it as it is taken by the reporters. But these copies that are not corrected go over the whole Dominion, and the people see the report of a man's speech with all its imperfections and the mistakes that may arise in taking down the speech, or some omissions that may have been made. He meets that everywhere, and he says: "That is not my speech as corrected." All the members of the House have an opportunity to correct their speeches, and it is the corrected speeches, in my opinion, that ought to go to the country; then, whenever a member is called to account for his speech, he refers to the corrected copy, and there is what he said. Of course you may say that members may alter their speeches; but I think there is not much danger, because the whole of the 211 members have heard the speeches, and if there has been any alteration made, it can be detected. But sending out the daily issue is a great evil, and I think it would be better to have the corrected copies go out to the country and the press. I am anxious that the press should have just what an hon. member said, and intended to say.

Mr. WELSH. I quite agree with the hon. member that the *Hansard* should be corrected before it goes out. I will give you an instance in point. When I was speaking here the other day, I made the remark that I had "a boatswain" in my employ, and it was taken down as "a Boston man." Now, I am sure that no hon. member of this House would wish a statement of that kind to go to the public, an incor-

rect statement. I think the suggestion of the hon. member is a very good one, that we should send out the corrected report, and I think the hon. gentlemen who have control of this matter should take it in hand.

Mr. EDGAR. I see that the hon. Minister of Customs is in his place, and he can recollect that on Monday he suggested an amendment to the motion that I made for papers and correspondence between the Canadian and American Governments about wrecking vessels, limiting that motion to the papers since the last return; but he was not able at that time to tell the House what the date of the last returns was, and he said that he would do so. I would like to know from him the date of the last return, so that we may refer to it. I would like also to suggest to the Minister that the returns should be brought down at as early a date as possible, in order that it may be before the House when the Bill comes before us on that subject which the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has in hand. With reference to the matter which was spoken about just now, the *Hansard*. I quite agree with the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) in reference to imperfect reports. I remember that on a former occasion—if I may be allowed to refer to a former debate, without being irregular—I happened to remark that an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House spoke with the airs of "Turveydrop," and I was horrified to see in the *Hansard* next day that I was charged with saying that the hon. gentleman spoke with the airs of "a turkey cock."

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). We have had all these questions in the past in connection with the *Hansard*. If you adopt the principle that none shall go to the country except those that have been previously corrected, it simply postpones the receipt of them by the newspapers for several months. Now, any one who knows anything about newspapers, knows that they cease to be of any value if they do not get the material with which they make their comments for two or three weeks after the event, when the matter ceases to be of any practical interest. The mistakes that the gentleman refers to are mistakes that are almost inevitable, and I think that we may fairly say of the *Hansard* staff, and the reporting of our debates at the present moment, that I do not think there is to be found anywhere—and I use that term in the broadest sense—half a dozen gentlemen who do their work more conscientiously, and on the whole, more satisfactorily, than the gentlemen who are at the table now. The other question, as to whether the debates, as officially revised, should go to the press, is, of course, a separate question altogether, and it involves a separate explanation. For myself, I would like very much to see them get the corrected copies, because all these reports are matters of record, and newspaper editors, in discussing these questions later on, have to refer to the *Hansard*, and it is a very decided advantage if they can refer to the corrected copy, as bound. As for these little errors that occur, where one hon. gentleman says that he was made to say he was employing a Boston man instead of a boatswain, and the other remark, that an hon. gentleman spoke like a turkey cock instead of Turveydrop, these are mistakes that almost any person in hearing them, especially the latter, might make; but these are technical errors that are of very little importance. I think it would be a very serious matter for the press if they did not get the *Hansard* before it had passed through the hands of the members, and through the hands of the printers the second time.

Mr. TROW. It has often seemed astonishing to me that there are not more errors in the *Hansard*, and I am frequently astonished to find the speeches of hon. gentlemen so correctly reported. Private discussions go on all round the Chamber when hon. gentlemen are speaking, and I am surprised at the accuracy of the reports; it is evident to me that the reporters are thoroughly up in their profession, or

otherwise they could not perform their duties in the perfect manner they do perform them.

Mr. SPROULE. I think, when this subject is under discussion, it would be well to have a general expression of the House in regard to it, because I believe the opinion is prevalent throughout the country that it would be a great improvement, even with the delay that would occur, if a revised copy of *Hansard* were sent to the press. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) says it would be a serious matter if it was not sent out immediately to the press, but, in any event, the copies of *Hansard* can only reach the press a hundred miles or so of the capital within a day or two, those going down to Prince Edward Island, Halifax, Manitoba and British Columbia not reaching there for several days. It could not make much difference if there was a few days' longer delay, provided a correct copy was sent out. The *Hansard* is referred to principally by the weekly newspapers throughout the country, and if *Hansard* sent out this week were too late for next issue it could be used the following week, and it would be almost equally fresh. Complaints are constantly received in regard to this matter. Members are called upon to account for speeches they make in this House, and they are able to question what it was represented they did say, and they were entitled to do so, because they did not correct the original copy of the report. When we consider the difficulties the reporters have to contend with, first, in regard to hearing accurately what is said, then in taking it down, then in transcribing it, and inaccuracies take place; add all these together and it will appear that the daily issue sent out is literally full of mistakes and of little or no use. Now, we can easily get the copy of speeches within twenty-four hours; twenty-four hours after that I think almost every member would correct it, and we would have a delay of only two days, and a great benefit would accrue from a correct copy going out of what members said, and which they must stand by, and for which they would be expected to be held accountable. It is most important that this should be done, and from the expressions I have heard from different members on both sides of the House, this amendment should be made so that correct copies would be sent out.

Mr. LAURIER. There is another matter to which I desire to call the attention of the House, and it is the most objectionable practice which has grown up of late, and which, if pursued in, will surely impair the good relations that ought to exist between the two sides of the House. Every division we have had during the present Session has been characterised by most offensive manifestations on the part of some hon. gentlemen opposite against some hon. members on this side of the House. There seem to be some hon. members who are made the butt for hooting and insults. Hon. gentlemen opposite must admit that if the practice is continued it must provoke retaliation, and retaliation would be far more desirable than the practice itself. I can understand there will be, and must be, differences of opinion in the House, but every member has a right to expect that his opinions will be respected by his colleagues. In so far as I am concerned in this matter from the position which I occupy, I shall endeavor to see that not only the debates but the proceedings will be characterised and conducted—and I invite the co-operation of my hon. friends on this matter—with that courtesy which should prevail in such an assembly as this. At the same time I shall expect that the same courtesy be extended to us by the other side of the House. Last night the division was conspicuous by the most offensive manifestations, and I have only this to say in conclusion, that I hope in future such manifestations will not take place as occurred last evening.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I agree with the hon. gentleman that it is very important each side of the House should respect the other side, and each member should re-

spect all the members of the House. Of course, the hon. gentleman has observed certain manifestations that have taken place during divisions, but I must say that, with my recollection of last Session, I cannot but feel that similar manifestations were made towards certain members on this side of the House by hon. members opposite. Perhaps that would not be a good reason for one side or the other to retaliate, but it shows, at all events, that if there has been any feeling in this direction on one side there has been the same feeling on the other side of the House. Therefore, without naming or recriminating I think, speaking for this side of the House, that we agree that it would be a great deal better that no manifestations should be made against any hon. member. Of course, there is always allowed the parliamentary manifestation of "hear, hear," when a member's vote seems to be a little extraordinary to members of the House. That is the parliamentary way of showing approval or disapproval on one side or the other, and I am sure the hon. gentleman would not wish to put a stop to that proper way of manifesting one's sentiments; but I am sure we all agree, as well as the Opposition side represented by the hon. gentleman, that the proper way of conducting the business of this House is to cease on both sides from making manifestations of that kind.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not exactly remember what took place last Session, but perhaps the hon. gentleman has a stronger motive for remembering what took place than I have. I thought, as hon. gentlemen opposite were far more numerous than those on this side of the House, there were more manifestations on the other side than on this; but, at all events, let that be so or not, I hope that we will agree that past issues be buried and a better understanding be had in the future.

Mr. MITCHELL. I quite agree with the suggestions made by the leader of the Opposition, and I was glad to find the leader of the Government for the time being assented to the suggestion that special manifestations should cease. The act of calling out "hear, hear" is not very offensive, but there are other calls which have been made to certain members which are really personally offensive. Both parties are somewhat to blame. The only party really free from blame in this House is the party represented by myself, and I may say for that party that I will endeavor to pursue the course pointed out by the leader of the Opposition and accepted by the leader of the Government for the time being, and refrain from anything like very offensive personal remarks.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I think the hon. gentleman has undertaken a most important task, and a more difficult one for him to perform than that of the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BOWELL. I promised the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to tell him when the last report upon wrecking and tugging was laid before the House. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Sessional Papers of 1881, No. 9 of 37 and 28, No. of paper 50, he will find the report.

Mr. EDGAR. That was the matter to which I referred.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. AMYOT. Do I understand that the Government have abandoned their Bill to amend the Controverted Elections Act.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Government do not propose to introduce any Bill to amend the Controverted Elections Act, but we have as the hon. member will see on the Order paper a Bill to amend the Dominion Elections Act on the

same subject as his Bill. I would suggest that he should let his proposal stand until that Bill is in committee, and then we can discuss the whole subject more easily.

Mr. AMYOT. I suppose there will be the same chance given to my Bill to have it considered if it is not included in the Government Bill. I understand the Bill on the Dominion Elections Act and on the Dominion Controverted Elections Act are two different things. The hon. Minister says his Bill on the Dominion Elections Act comprises the same thing as mine, and I have no objection that it should stand. I do not care who proposes it if it becomes law.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Government Bill I referred to is not to amend the Controverted Elections Act but to amend the Elections Act, and it does not contain the provision which the hon. gentleman has in his Bill. It seems to me it would be more convenient if he would let it stand until the Government Bill is in committee, when he might move, if he adheres to his view about this provision, to add it to the Bill relating to Elections, although it is not technically under the same Act.

WRECKS ON THE GREAT LAKES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Dawson for a return respecting Canadian vessels lost or wrecked on the great lakes during the past season of navigation.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, when this matter was last brought before the House the discussion was postponed until the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should have brought down his report, and now that the report is in the hands of hon. members, they will be able to see the extent of the losses and the number of wrecks on the great lakes. This is a very important subject. It is too much the custom in a great many quarters to look upon those lakes as mere mill ponds, requiring very little attention and in which there is very little danger, but lakes that run up to the length of 400 miles and have a width of 200 miles, as Lake Superior has, would be formidable seas anywhere. The losses which have occurred last year are much less in number and less in amount than those which occurred some years previously. During the last six years the losses on the great lakes have been exceedingly heavy. A number of fine steamers have been lost and a great many valuable lives lost with them. But, as I said, the number has been fewer and the amount of loss involved much less last year. That, Sir, is due in a great measure to the improved manner of the inspection. The Government now inspect the hulls and machinery of steamers, and that, I believe, has led to a great saving in life and property. A great deal has been done, but a great deal remains still to be done, and this inspection should be carried somewhat further than it has hitherto been carried. It should extend to vessels which now escape inspection, and I shall touch on that point later on. In the meantime I will draw attention to what the report says of the losses that have occurred on the great lakes last year:

"The barge *Oriental*, of Kingston, 328 tons register, left the port of Charlotte, U. S., on the 23rd of October last, with a cargo of coal 650 tons in weight, in tow of the steam tug *Scotia*. The vessel was 21 years old, and was probably worth \$1,000. Her crew consisted of a captain, who held a certificate of service as master, a mate, who was an uncertificated man, and two deck hands. There was also a woman cook on board. The vessel encountered very heavy weather and when about three miles of Port Dalhousie the tow line parted. The *Oriental* went down with all on board and the *Scotia* made for the port of Niagara, which she reached in safety."

Now, Sir, here is the case of a vessel into the loss of which an investigation was held and it was clearly proved that this vessel was not only unseaworthy but that she was overloaded, and that it was in the power of people consigning freight in order to make money, to put an unseaworthy

vessel to sea, the result of which was the loss of five lives. Five poor people were carried to the bottom without any means of saving themselves. That is one instance. Now the next thing spoken of in the report is the loss of the *California*.

"The propeller *California*, of Montreal, left Chicago for a port in Canada on the 1st October last, with three passengers and 22 of a crew. She had on board 20,000 bushels of corn, and 696 barrels of pork on deck. On the morning of the 23rd she encountered very heavy weather and commenced to leak; the cargo also shifted and increased the difficulty of steering the vessel to such an extent that she would not answer her port helm. The violence of the waves drove in the anchor shutter, and the vessel shipped a great deal of water through the opening. The leak continued to gain and put out the fires, leaving the vessel at the mercy of the wind and waves, and she finally foundered on the night of the 3rd of October off St. Helen's Island, towards which the vessel was drifting. The vessel was built in 1873, and was cut in two and had 35 feet added to her length in 1883. She was 900 tons gross and 580 tons register tonnage. By this casualty seven of the crew and two of the passengers were lost, although the vessel had four boats, which left her when she foundered with a few persons in each."

Here is another case of overloading. There could be no doubt that that vessel could only carry 22,000 bushels of wheat or corn, and that those 690 barrels of pork put on as a deck load was the cause of her loss. Here is also a statement of the total amount of loss:

"The disasters reported to this department as having occurred to vessels on the inland waters of Canada, and to Canadian vessels on American inland waters during the year 1887, were 39, and the tonnage involved was 13,137 tons register. The number of lives lost was 21, and the amount of loss, both partial and total, to vessels and cargo, as far as estimated, was \$90,915."

Now, Sir, last year, although wrecks were fewer and the total amount of loss less than in ordinary years, here is an actual loss of over \$90,000, and it becomes a very important matter to enquire how such loss could best be prevented in the future. I think, Sir, there is one obvious way, and that is to compel the barges, the smaller craft, and the craft which are now very little looked after, to undergo an inspection as well as the large steamers. I have recently received several letters from experienced lake captains about this system of putting unseaworthy barges in tow of steamers, and the result of enquiries which I have been making may be taken from what I will now read:

"Referring to barges in tow of tugs, they should have the stability of a sailing vessel, and if not of sufficient sail power to take care of themselves under all circumstances, they at all events should be provided with good ground tackle, that is, good anchors and chains suitable to their tonnage. Good boats, with all necessary appliances ready for immediate use: life-buoys and life-preservers for the crew, properly placed; a captain and mate with certificates, good substantial windlass and bits, tow ports well secured, good, tow lines of sufficient length. This in itself might be the means of saving the crew and vessel. Barge towing is very hazardous, and every reasonable precaution ought to be used. When you consider the tug and her tow on a lee shore, the tow line parting and the barge left helpless, her anchors, handled by competent men, might even then save both crew and vessel. The tug towing the barge has no security that her machinery may not give way at a perilous time, showing plainly the necessity of the barge being well found in crew and outfit. The unseen vessels that are under repairs: *Manitoba*, *Detroit*, *Champion*, *Owen Sound*, *Frances Smith*, *Collingwood*, *Southern Belle*, *Desserton*. The hull inspectors, up to this date, know nothing of repairs done to the resurrected craft; they have no power."

From another source I have this:

"Hull inspectors are not privileged to use their discretion in matters of inspection, materially affecting their duties. They are hampered by not being allowed to see vessels undergoing repairs. When closed up and completed the repairs are not visible to the inspector, and then the only possibility of ascertaining the correctness of the statements furnished by owners of the repairs, is redocking, which causes great expense and very great dissatisfaction."

Now, Sir, that is a point to which I would draw particular attention, the necessity of having a vessel inspected when she is undergoing repairs. She can then be easily seen. But after she has been patched up and painted over, and when everything looks smooth outside, it is very difficult for the inspectors to ascertain whether or not there is anything wrong with her. Another frightful source of danger

is sending out vessels overloaded in the fall. There should be some means found of preventing that; and I think it could be prevented, as I suggested on a former occasion, by giving authority to the Customs officers at the different ports to decide when a vessel is overloaded. In all of these lake-going vessels there should be a line such as that known in England as the Plimsoll line, beyond which they should not be allowed to load. It is not in the regular steamers that the danger lies. On Lake Superior there are a number of very fine steamers, such as the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers, those that ply from Sarnia, and those that ply from Owen Sound. There are no vessels in the world superior to those, or better adapted for the navigation for which they are used; in fact, they are floating palaces. Those vessels are always inspected, and it is not in them that the danger lies. It is in those patched-up vessels, old schooners, not properly rigged, which are sent out in tow of steamers, and which are cut adrift the moment danger arises, and are very likely to be lost. One cause of disaster hitherto has been that the lakes were not properly surveyed; but I am very happy to say that that risk is likely no longer to exist. There has been an admirable hydrographic survey going on from year to year on those lakes, and I hope it will be continued until a complete survey is obtained. The survey made by Admiral Bayfield, which has immortalized, and very justly immortalized him, was made under circumstances which did not admit of his finding all the shoals existing in those lakes; but the hydrographic survey which has been going on since has revealed a great many hidden shoals and rocks, which will hereafter appear on the charts. In order to convince the House of the necessity of going on with these surveys and the necessity of providing properly for the navigation of the great lakes, I need only draw attention to the enormous traffic which is springing up on them. Last year I took occasion to say that the traffic of the great lakes passing through the Sault Ste. Marie canal was nearly equal to that passing through the Suez canal, which carries the traffic of three continents, Europe, Asia and Africa. Would it be believed, Sir, that on these inland lakes we have a traffic not very far short of that traffic? I have not precise return of what it was during the past summer; but in 1886, 4,527,000 tons of freight passed through Sault Ste. Marie canal; and I am told that during the past year the freight tonnage exceeded 6,000,000 tons. Now, Sir, that represents an enormous traffic, which you may form some idea of when I tell you what the traffic of the Suez Canal has been. In 1879 the total freight traffic of the Suez Canal was 3,236,000 tons, in 1880 it was 4,344,000 tons, in 1881 it was 5,794,000 tons, and it has gone on increasing until in 1886 it had reached over 8,000,000 tons. But here is an inland canal of North America, the traffic of which is not so very far short of the traffic of the Suez Canal. Now, Sir, what does all this show? It shows that there is a traffic growing up on our great lakes that should be adequately provided for. It shows that every precaution ought to be taken to make the navigation of those lakes as safe as it can possibly be made. I am happy to say that on the Canadian side of the largest of these lakes the navigation is naturally very safe, and with a few more lights and a few additional harbors, the whole traffic to and from Sault Ste. Marie would be brought in that direction, through Canadian waters, calling at Canadian ports, and giving life to Canadian traffic and trade. I believe that I have drawn the attention of the department to all that I can think of at present in relation to this matter, and I hope the inspection of these old barges and the preventing, if possible, of their going out will not be neglected. I have a list here, Inland Lloyds special register for 1887, and it is perfectly frightful to see by it the number of old wooden vessels, from 25 to 36 years of old, that are being patched up and repaired. The traffic on the great

lakes will be very large this coming season, and if all these vessels are to be allowed to go forth in tow of steamers, the temptation to send them out will be great because the traffic will be great and the profits large; and unless something be done, we may look to a larger and more deplorable loss of life than has occurred in years past.

Mr. DAVIN. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion of my hon. friend. I think that the Department of Customs might be very properly utilised for carrying out the intentions that have been so well explained by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson). In looking over the report of the Department of Marine, I find that, in the case of the *California*, the account given there can leave no doubt whatever in the mind of anyone that that vessel was unseaworthy. She was valued at \$27,000, although unseaworthy, and insured for \$21,000. We may be perfectly certain that the vessel was not worth \$27,000, and of course the temptation to overload a vessel like that and to send her out in an unseaworthy condition, taking all the risks, is very strong to the owner of such a vessel. The question is one that appeals not only to our humanity, but to our esteem for our reputation as a great commercial community, and it is one in which the western people are deeply interested. I would therefore urge strongly, in supporting the motion of my hon. friend, this subject on the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine. It is not necessary, so lucid and so full has been the statement of my hon. friend, that I should say more than that, having looked into the question and knowing something about it, I can endorse all that my hon. friend has said upon this subject.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would like to say only a few words in order to call the attention of the House to the report made by the owner of the barge *Oriental*, the case of which was referred to by the hon. member for Algoma, when he made this motion some weeks ago. As regards the subject-matter of his motion, the hon. gentleman has my most cordial assent and support. I think it is of the deepest moment that vessels should be thoroughly inspected and every precaution taken to prevent their leaving shore, unless they are in a seaworthy condition. Thousands of lives are entrusted to them, and every precaution should be taken to ensure the safety of those lives. If there is a *Plimsoll* in England, we ought to have one here in Canada, who will see that the lives of these poor men, who have to earn their living by going down to the deep, should be protected; and I hope the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not allow the inspectors to do just as they please, but will see that they do their duty, and thus take care that these old vessels, of which the hon. member for Algoma has spoken, are made tight and seaworthy before being allowed to leave port. But, while I regret very much the loss of life which took place last year, we must, in justice to the owner of the barge *Oriental*, let him state his own case, and he has sent me this letter, a portion of which I think it my duty to read to the House. He says:

"That the barge was not an unseaworthy vessel, but was one of the strongest boats of her class that was ever built on the lakes, and when I owned her was very tight. I sailed her for the two seasons before her loss, with heavy freights, and on several occasions in heavy storms, and she never strained or made a drop of water, and she was at the time of loss in good condition and perfectly strong and tight. From the water to the top of the rail amidships was six feet, and the distance of the bow was ten feet, when loaded, which is a very large size for a boat to have out of water."

That disposes of the statement that the boat was overloaded. Another statement is made that the tow line was cut, and that she was allowed to drift in the trough of the river, and so perish. To this charge, the owner replies that the tow line was not cut, but that the barge sunk before the tow line broke; and he has proved that by demonstration, having sent down a diver to examine the position of the

Mr. FOSTER.

barge, who reported that she lay upon the bottom of the lake, in thirty feet of water, heading straight for the harbor to which she was heading at the time of the disaster. She had not turned in the trough of the sea as she would have if she had sunk after the tow line broke. Moreover, the diver who went down, reports that the hull is perfectly strong and tight, and the disaster apparently occurred through the neglect of the unfortunate men who were on board, in not having the fore-castle fruttle properly secured. It was not secured at the time, and the sea washed over her, and she foundered. In justice to the owner, Captain Fraser, I think this statement should be made, and I do so at his request.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire from the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether there is any truth in the statement which appeared in some of the papers, that certain portions of the hull of this vessel were exhibited to him, and were found in a state of advanced decay. I know nothing of the facts, but that statement was made, and probably the hon. gentleman will inform the House whether it was correct or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Some very small portions of the vessel have been brought to the department for examination, and labels have been put on them to show the parts from which they come. It is scarcely possible, until the vessel is raised, as I believe the owner intends to do, to say accurately whether it is true that these come from those portions of the vessel or not. I may, at this stage of the discussion, say a word or two with reference to this matter. I had not the advantage of hearing all that my hon. friend for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) said, but from what I could gather in his speech, he has collected a large amount of valuable information which will be on record, and which I will take occasion to look very carefully into. It must not be supposed, however, that the Marine Department, either now or at any previous time in its history, has not been as careful as possible in looking into this matter, especially of inland navigation, and in taking the best means in its power to overcome the difficulties and make navigation on our great lakes as secure and safe as possible. The Steamboat Inspection Act has gone a long way in that direction. A large portion of the expense of the department for new lights and fog-alarms is now made in the region of the great lakes, which is rapidly bringing up that portion of our waters to a state of very great efficiency and security as far as these are concerned. Again, as my hon. friend has said, we have had an exhaustive survey conducted on the most dangerous of those waters in and at the mouth of the Georgian Bay. This survey has been a great advantage so far, and will be of still greater advantage when completed. Notwithstanding the remark of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), I think we have a very good board of steamboat inspectors and of hull inspectors. They are all men who do their duty very faithfully. I have called their attention, owing to disasters which have taken place lately, and the information which has come to the House in a special manner this year, to the inspection of boats of the class spoken of, these old boats which are being lengthened and rebuilt, and have asked them to insist on a most thorough and vigorous inspection of that class of boats. It would be our advantage to look after those boats while they are in the process of being repaired, when they have a better opportunity of seeing the progress which is being made with them. As to the *Oriental*, the matter was very thoroughly investigated, and my officers who investigated and reported on that came to the conclusion, notwithstanding the evidence which was given by the owner himself, that the vessel was not a seaworthy vessel, and that it was owing in the main to her unseaworthiness that the accident occurred. That vessel went out from an American port, and of course we have no jurisdiction there. No law

that Canada has or could have remedied the difficulty in the case either of the *Oriental* or of the *California*, both of which were sent out from foreign ports. Of course greater care could be taken in regard to them, being Canadian vessels, when they leave Canadian ports, to prosecute their foreign voyages, to see that they were seaworthy. As to the overloading, that is a matter which would be in the power of the country in whose ports they loaded, and from whose ports they started. I believe, in the case of the *California*, the evidence shows that the vessel came to grief chiefly from the want of shifting boards with reference to her grain cargo. It was late in the season and she had a large cargo on board and the precaution of putting in shifting boards was neglected, and the grain shifted, and that was the chief cause of the loss of the vessel. As to the inspection of all these barges, that would involve an extension of the policy adopted by the Government some time ago as to steamboats, and it would not only be expensive but would be burdensome to the shipping if it were carried out in the same way as it is with regard to steamboats. Still, I have no hesitation in saying that both the expense and the burden should be incurred if it can be shown that it is necessary to take such measures for the preservation especially of life, and the preservation of property as well. But, taking the series of years from 1840 to the present time, we have had a very gratifying record in the Dominion of Canada as to these casualties, and this last year the number of lives lost was, I think, only 46, which is less than the number in 1870, and only about one-fifth of the average number from 1870 to 1887. My attention has been called from various sources to the matters which the hon. gentleman has called attention to, and I will give my best consideration to the subject, and if anything further is necessary I am sure the Government will be prepared to do their duty in the premises.

Mr. SPROULE. When this subject was under consideration some years ago, I made a suggestion which, I think, would tend largely to remedy the evil. I think this evil is principally due to the fact that men who are expected to perform the duty of looking after vessels when they are in port seldom do it. The duty is given to Customs officers, and, although they may understand that it is a duty they are expected to do, I do not think they understand that it is one which they are compelled to do. What a man is not held responsible for when he neglects it, he is not likely to look after very closely. As time advances, the casualties which happen make us understand more clearly the importance of having a man at every large port in the country where vessels are calling and leaving in great numbers every year, whose special duty it shall be to look after those vessels when they are in port, not only to see that they should not be overloaded, but to see that the cargo is so distributed as to suit the craft it is on. I think, when the *Jane Miller* was lost, it was generally believed that her loss was attributable to the fact that her load was on deck, and that consequently she could not stand the roughness of the sea. Various vessels have been lost on the Georgian Bay and in the Channel and on Lake Superior, and there has been scarcely one in regard to which there does not appear to have been some defect which might have been removed. While this might be an additional charge on shipping, I do not think that is a fair argument against incurring the expense, because, if a single life is lost in one year which might not have been lost with proper precautions, I think it will be held that it is the duty of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to incur the expense, and continue his exertions—for I think they have been well directed in the past, towards the end of saving life—in that way, and I think that there might be a great saving of life and property in this way. If you look at the amount of freight which

is lost and its value, and compare that with the cost which would be incurred by the appointment of a few additional inspectors or men to look after vessels in important ports, the expense is comparatively trifling. Perhaps one-tenth part of the cost of the freight which has been lost—leaving out of account the value of human life—would more than pay the additional cost for inspectors to take the further precautions where necessary. Then, in regard to the inspectors of hulls and of steamboats generally, I believe it is held that an inspector of engineers, to be competent, should be an engineer himself. I understand that the present inspectors are engineers; but it is equally important that the inspectors of hulls should be shipbuilders, or ship carpenters. I am credibly informed that the inspectors we have at present are not all ship carpenters; that they have never served their time at that business, and that they, therefore, cannot understand it as well as those who have. If anything can be done, I think it is important that the best men should be employed. If any freight can be from destruction or any lives from being lost by the appointment of additional men, I think it is equally incumbent upon us, in order to have this done, to appoint, not Collectors of Customs, but a special man to look after vessels in every port where vessels call, to see that they are not overloaded, that the freight is properly stowed away, and that, when leaving, they are properly equipped with every provision for the saving of life in case of stress of weather. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) is entitled to a great deal of credit for bringing this matter before the House year after year. From his position he is cognizant of a great many of the accidents that take place. He is constantly travelling up and down the lakes, and the trade is continually increasing, and there are a large number of crafts on the lakes which are old and are becoming rotten and should be taken off the lakes entirely. I think this system of an inspection should extend not only to steamboats but to sailing vessels and all kinds of boats which are found on the lakes, whether for the purpose of carrying freight or passengers, because every one of them carries less or more of human life, and whenever there is a loss, almost always there is a loss of human life. But if this trouble were taken, if they were inspected, I think it would be equally desirable, because these sailing vessels do carry both freight and passengers. It is important that the hull inspector should examine the whole of them, not only after they are repaired and painted up, but while the work is going on. I think it would be still better to have the repairs made under the supervision of a competent officer whose duty it should be to see that all the timbers of that vessel were sound, as well the new timber as the old timber that was left in them.

Mr. MASSON. I am very glad this matter has been brought up and that so much valuable information has been given to the House respecting vessels. That a certain advance has been made during the last few years in the matter of inspection, and that great benefits have already been derived from inspection, is well known to all those interested in the trade of our lakes; but that a great deal more has yet to be done, is also well known to all those interested. I wish only to point out now the importance of inspection, both during the course of construction and during the course of repair. I think that is a matter of very great importance, and I was pleased to hear the Minister of Marine say that inspectors have instructions to inspect while repairs are being made on the class of vessels referred to by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson). If such instructions have been given to the inspectors, I believe they have not acted upon them to any great extent; I know from my own personal observations that, so far from going out of their way to inspect vessels in course of repair, they have absolutely refused to do so, telling the parties who asked them to go

and inspect while repairs were being made, to see if anything more required to be done, so that the owners might turn out a ship in a seaworthy condition, and in a condition that would assuredly pass a most rigid inspection—I say when the inspectors were invited to examine these repairs, they replied to the owners: "Finish your vessels, and when you are ready to call for inspection, we will go and inspect; until then we have no right to do so." Now it appears that they were not obeying their instructions. I would press upon the House and the Department the necessity, not only that the inspectors should have the privilege of inspecting during construction, but that it should be their bounden duty, whenever called upon, and even if not called upon, to inspect any vessel they know to be in course of repairs or construction. When an old vessel is being repaired the object of the owner is to make it pass inspection. Besides, under this system, the dishonest builder is put in the same position as the honest builder. It is in the interests of the honest builder to turn out a good and seaworthy vessel, and it is to his advantage to have an inspection while the repairs are being made, and that the repairs should actually be made under the direction and superintendence of the inspector. I do not think any honest builder would object to that. The hon. member for Algoma mentioned one or two vessels undergoing repairs at Owen Sound. I may say that the Dry Dock Company of Owen Sound has specially asked for inspection while vessels are in course of repair. It is their aim to turn out the very best kind of work, and the most seaworthy vessels, and, on behalf of honest men, I think it is the duty of the department not only to make it the privilege of the inspector, but to make it his bounden duty, whether called upon or not, to inspect vessels, whether in course of repair or under construction.

Mr. COOK. I believe with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that it would be well for inspection to take place while a boat is undergoing repairs, as well as during construction. But I am of opinion that as there are several shipyards on the Georgian Bay and the inland waters, and as these shipyards compete against each other, the one that turns out the best work will get the greatest amount of trade. Now, I believe the Board of Steamboat Inspection in the city of Toronto are a very efficient lot of gentlemen. I am satisfied that Mr. Harbottle is a very painstaking and efficient officer, and I have yet to learn that he has refused to inspect any boat under his jurisdiction. I believe Mr. Harbottle is always ready and willing to do his duty, and I do not believe, as the hon. member for Beak Grey (Mr. Sproule) has stated, that he has refused to do any important duty incumbent upon him as steamboat inspector. If the Government propose to have an inspection of vessels that are under repair, it would be necessary for them to appoint an assistant, and that would increase the expense to the country. I believe that a change for the better is taking place, and since an inspector of hulls has been appointed, we are getting a great deal better class of vessels upon the lakes. It is very important that inspection should be rigid, and that unseaworthy vessels should not be allowed to go out. I believe that the *Oriental*, from the information I have received, was not a seaworthy vessel. I have seen pieces of wood exhibited in the windows in the city of Toronto, that were said to come from that wreck, and they were entirely decayed and rotten; whether they really came from the wreck, I do not know. Now, several disasters have occurred lately on the great lakes, attended with considerable loss of life. The *Asia*, for instance, you will remember, only a few years ago, went down. It was said she was unseaworthy, but I believe that, upon investigation since, it has been discovered that she struck a reef of rocks that was discovered since a survey has been going on. Surveys are of great importance to the shipping

Mr. MASSON,

in the Georgian Bay, on the north coast of which a great many reefs and shoals were found by the survey that were not known before. Although the *Asia* may have been seaworthy and a good vessel, yet, striking a reef like that, she would have gone down. I believe the system of inspection that has been adopted is doing a great deal of good upon the lakes, I am glad to know from the lips of the Minister of Marine that he is vigilant in that regard, and that he has given instructions to the board that inspection shall be carried out rigidly in order to prevent, if possible, a recurrence of the disasters that have taken place in the past.

Mr. WELSH. With respect to the system of steamboat inspection and the inspectors, I think the law is very good. It may be subject to some improvement, but down in the Maritime Provinces there is no complaint, and the steamboat inspectors there have given satisfaction to the public as well as to the steamboat owners. If I understand the matter rightly, it refers more particularly to the navigation of inland waters, of lakes and rivers. In regard to building under inspection, I do not think we can lay down a cast-iron rule with regard to it. Considerable expense would be attached to it, and people would be forced to get inspectors to examine the ships. But the public interest would be secured by adopting a principle something like that adopted by the Board of Trade in Great Britain. There the ships are classed in Lloyds or Veritas, or some other society for classing ships. If a man wants to charter a vessel he turns up the register and finds where a certain vessel was built, what it is classed and so forth, and the insurance companies know what rate to charge, and the shipper knows what risk he will be compelled to run. Notwithstanding that system is in force in England they have also a board of trade inspection. In all the ports there are boards of trade inspectors appointed and paid by the Government, and are not allowed to charge any fees or extra remuneration. There is one of these inspectors in every principal port, and his duty is to see that no rotten or unseaworthy ship goes to sea; if such should be the case he is held responsible, and no doubt he loses his office. Port wardens have been appointed by the Government here in all the ports of the Dominion by the present Dominion Government. These should be appointed board of trade inspectors, and be compelled to see that no ship that is old, unseaworthy or rotten, should be allowed to sail. In England the law is that a board of trade inspector can go aboard, without leave or license, of any ship ready to sail. He has the power to prohibit a vessel from sailing. There is a board of arbitration also, and one appointed for Canadian ships, in England. I remember an instance of my own. I had a new ship, and unfortunately she was touched with worms. She was in England, and I found it would cost a very large sum to repair her. I determined to bring her out here and replank her; but on taking her out of dock, ready for sea, she was stopped by the Board of Trade inspector. When asked the reason, he said that she was not seaworthy. I had to send an agent there. He brought the matter before the Board of Trade, and by representing the matter and by putting a life-boat into the vessel, I was permitted to bring her out. All the difficulty experienced here would be removed by the Government appointing the port wardens at the different ports Board of Trade inspectors and entrusting them with the duty of seeing that no vessel left port that was unseaworthy. I am satisfied that would obviate the difficulty; but I do not approve a system of appointing inspectors and compelling vessels to be built under certain regulations. I believe in Free Trade. At the same time the Government should have Board of Trade inspectors to stop any ship that was unseaworthy. A vessel might be built in the best style and fitted out in first-class style, and yet three months afterwards she might meet with an accident that would seriously

impair her condition. This system of forcing people to have vessels built under inspection was not found to work successfully in practice. I think this is a good motion to bring before the House, and the subject should be taken in hand by the Government and be dealt with in an inexpensive way and with great regard to the safety of the public interest.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I cannot fully agree with the remarks of the last speaker, although he no doubt fully understands marine matters. It would appear, if you look at the records of the wrecks on our northern lakes and inland waters, that some measures should be adopted by the Government to prevent the great loss of property and sacrifice of human life that annually occur. I can fully understand that a proper inspection of vessels during the time of construction would prove of great value, for it would be the means of securing efficient construction. I was very much pleased that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that the Government were carefully examining and seeing that the inspectors did their duty. That may be the case to a great extent as to sea-going vessels; but in regard to vessels on our great lakes, I am afraid that attention is not paid to the proper inspection of the boats and the manner in which they are loaded and the way they are constructed. I think these different matters are not fully and carefully attended to. Further, I contend that they have no right to load a barge or vessel below a certain mark. If it is necessary in England that there should be a Plimsoll mark, why is it not necessary in Canada? Are the lives of our people not as precious to us as the lives of the people of Great Britain? It is the duty of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to see that vessels navigating the lakes are not overloaded. We know full well that these inland lakes are far more treacherous than the sea. There is greater danger to life and property than there is in navigating the open sea, yet there is marked indifference on the part of the Government to see that human life is protected in a proper manner. I think it is the case that many of the engineers who are employed upon those vessels have not passed an examination as to their competency before taking charge. Such should not be the case. There should be an examination; but if I understand correctly—I have seen it so reported in the press—it is the intention of the Minister of Marine to lessen or almost do away with the examination of engineers running vessels. That would be an unfortunate thing, a calamity. We all remember the sad accident that occurred to a boat at London a few years ago, due to negligence on the part of the authorities to see that the vessel was not overloaded. And circumstances of that kind occurring ought to be ample and sufficient to induce the Minister to see that every person employed upon those pleasure vessels should be competent for their position and able to perform their duties efficiently and well. I hope that after this discussion and after the manner it has been brought to the attention of the House by the member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), the Minister will exert himself and see in the future that every man employed upon any of those vessels where they not only carry ordinary freight but human freight on board should be an efficient man, that the boat should not be overloaded, and that the materials of which the boat is constructed are of the best that can possibly be obtained. If he will do that he will do a good service, but if he relaxes his energy he will do a wrong, I believe he will be held responsible for the wrong if he will permit in any way the lessening of the severity of the examination which engineers and all those connected with vessels have to pass to show that they are fully and thoroughly competent to perform the duties that devolve upon them.

Mr. McNEILL. I very much agree with almost all that has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. I am only sorry that in the last few words he addressed to the House he seemed to imply that he thought it possible that the hon. the Minister of Marine would relax his vigilance. I do not think we have any reason to suppose that that is at all likely. I think that since the hon. gentleman has occupied the position he now holds—

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon for one moment. I said I had seen in the *Empire* that a relaxation was likely to take place in the examinations of engineers on passenger boats.

Mr. McNEILL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did not hear that observation, and I sincerely hope that no relaxation will take place. If there is any intention or any prospect of any such relaxation taking place, I should only add my mite of approval to what the hon. gentleman has said. I think it would be a very unfortunate thing if there were any degree of relaxation, and, on the contrary, I think we ought to proceed in the very opposite direction. When we see the loss of life, when we see the amount of misery that is entailed by that loss of life, when we see the loss of property and realize the enormous extent of that loss year after year upon the lakes, anything like relaxation of the rules which now obtain, would, I think, be nothing less than a calamity. While I agree with a great deal of what my hon. friend has said I must say that I do wish to enter my protest against a remark which has fallen in the course of this debate, namely, that the proper way to do is to leave this matter to competition, as it were, that is to say, that the best builder will be the man who will get the best custom. That may be all very well, but I do not think that that will be a remedy for those who find a watery grave in rotten or weakly constructed vessels. The fact is, that I think my hon. friend, the member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), deserves the thanks of the country for the manner in which he has adhered to this matter. From the very first he has taken it up warmly, he has stuck to his guns and I believe that he is now about to do us a very great service. The two points which seem to have been brought before the House to-day are with reference to the inspection and loading of vessels. So far as the inspection is concerned it seems to me that if we are to have vessels constructed as they ought to be constructed, it is absolutely necessary that the inspector should be called upon to inspect the vessels while they are being constructed, for we all know how easy it is to cover up any defects afterwards. The real way to strike at this mischief, is to have a thorough inspection of the vessels during the course of construction. My hon. friend, the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has told us that when a Government inspector is called upon to do this very necessary work, he refuses. If that be so I hope that the Minister of Marine will see that in future the inspector pursues a very different course. The question of overloading is one of almost as great importance and to all those who have taken any interest in this question must be very well aware of the almost incalculable advantage that has followed in England from the use of the Plimsoll mark. That is simply a round mark upon both broadsides of each vessel with a line drawn through the middle, and any person, whether he be a seafaring man or not, who sees that vessel afloat can, at a glance from the shore, tell whether or not the vessel has been overloaded. A mark of that kind if it were rendered necessary to be used on our lakes would be fruitful of the very greatest possible advantage and would be the means of saving many a life and many a wreck. That is so far as sailing vessels are concerned. I do not know whether in the case of steamboats on the lakes it would have the same

effect, because the difficulty there seems to arise, not so much from the overloading—not so much from the vessel being sunk too far in the water—as from the fact that the cargo is badly stowed. In many cases, as in the case of the *Jane Miller*, referred to by my friend the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the loss does not arise from overloading, but arises from improperly loading the vessel. When the *Jane Miller* was lost she had hardly any cargo in her hold, and the whole cargo was in the upper works of the vessel. It was a deck cargo, and when she came to round to heading for the land in a breeze of wind a squall struck her and she simply turned right over. There was no sea on at the time, and it was not in rough water she went down. It was in perfectly smooth water, in an almost land-looked bay. That vessel was lost simply from improper stowage, and the Plimsoll mark would have no effect in such a case as that. The appointing of inspectors at each port, whose duty it would be to see that no vessel was allowed to leave the port unless her cargo was properly stowed, would meet that difficulty. I do not see why the Custom house officers in the different ports might not be utilised for this purpose. They cannot be expected to do the work unless they get extra remuneration, but in a case of this kind, when we remember the loss of life and the losses of property each year, the additional expense which would be incurred in that way is a matter which I think this House ought scarcely consider at all, because it would be infinitesimal as compared with the property which is lost, and compared with the loss of life it is a thing that cannot be weighed in the balance for a moment. I sincerely hope the Minister of Marine will take this matter deeply into his consideration, and that he will see that no relaxation in the rules shall occur, but that he will make the rules still more stringent than they are at present, both in regard to inspection so far as the construction of vessels is concerned, and in regard to the inspection of loading vessels.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me say just one word in reference to a remark which dropped from the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) who stated that he had seen in the papers that deputation had been waiting on the hon. the Minister of Marine asking for a relaxation of the rules in reference to steamers on the lakes. Having been instrumental in moving in this matter, I may just say that the deputations that I accompanied to wait on the hon. Minister of Marine did not ask for any relaxation of the regulations in reference to the inspection of steamers or vessels on the great lakes or the minor waters. What we have asked and do contend for applies to a class of small steamers of twenty or thirty tons plying on the minor waters of Canada. Where I reside there are large numbers of small yachts of twenty or thirty tons that are engaged during the pleasure season, for a week or ten days, in taking out fishing parties. Before these steamers can engage in such pursuits, they must, under the present regulations, have a competent captain and a licensed engineer. On account of the scarcity of licensed engineers, there are not sufficient to fill all the places, and according to the law at present, a person cannot become a licensed engineer unless he has served three years in a marine engine shop, and one year on a steamer. We have many mechanics who help to construct engines, and who are just as competent as if they had served the required three years. What we ask is that a competent person may be granted a permit over a specified route for a limited time, and that legislation may be passed giving the Minister power, on the recommendation of the inspectors, to grant such permits. That has nothing to do with the motion before the House.

Mr. McNEILL.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to correct one impression which I did not intend to convey with reference to the inspection spoken of by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). It is not the duty of the inspectors to make more than one inspection yearly. When the owner of a boat has it ready for inspection, it is his duty to notify the board and have it inspected. If he does not do that, he is liable to a penalty. If the chairman of the Board of Inspectors refuses a request to go and see a vessel that is undergoing repairs, on the ground that it was not ready to undergo inspection, the letter of the law would justify him in doing that; and when I spoke of his having visited several of those vessels undergoing repairs, I did not mean that it was the rule that he should do it, but in a great many cases I have given directions for the inspectors to do it, being guided by the circumstances. As the information my hon. friend asks for has been brought down in the report of the Department, probably it would be as well, after having had this interesting discussion, that he should withdraw his motion.

Mr. DAWSON. I had no intention, in mentioning the vessels that had been lost, to cast any reflection on anybody. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) has referred to the captain of the *Oriental*. I believe he was a brave and gallant man, as is proved by his having gone down with his vessel. I was very happy to hear the hon. Minister of Marine express his opinion that, notwithstanding the increased expense that would be involved, a more comprehensive system of inspection should be undertaken, if thereby life and property should be secured. As to the remarks made by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook), in reference to Captain Harbottle, I quite agree with him that he is a very able and excellent officer; but certainly one man cannot do everything in the matter of inspection. Now that this discussion has taken place, and that this amount of interest has been excited, I would, with the leave of the House, withdraw the motion, as all that I wished to gain has been gained in drawing the attention of the Government to the matter.

Mr. LISTER. Before the motion is withdrawn, I wish to say a word or two with regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), as to allowing people without proper certificates to act as engineers. If such a course were adopted by the Government, we might as well abolish the system of granting certificates altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. I would just say that I intend to introduce a Bill dealing with the suggestion of the hon. member for Leeds, and the whole discussion will come up then.

Mr. LISTER. In that case, I will say no more on that point. But there is another matter that I want to bring before the hon. Minister of Marine; I brought it before the House one or two Sessions ago. It is this. The American Government will not permit a Canadian engineer to act as such on an American steamboat unless he has a certificate from the proper quarter on that side, and he must, in addition, be a resident of the United States. The consequence of that is that many of our Canadian engineers living in Sarnia and other towns on the border, have had to go and live in the United States so that they might take charge of American steamboats. I believe I am correct when I say that our law does not require engineers to be Canadians or British subjects before receiving certificates. If I am in error as to that I would like to be corrected. I know that our engineers complain very bitterly indeed that while the Americans protect their engineers, there is no protection granted to our engineers. If the legislation was the same on both sides, it would be an inducement to our people to go into engineering, and it would remove this well-grounded complaint. I am not complaining

against the Government; I am merely pointing out the fact, and expressing the opinion that our engineers, who are a large and important class, ought to be protected. I hope the Bill the hon. Minister intends to introduce will provide for that.

Mr. BAKER. The discussion on this motion appears to be taking a very wide range. The subject of engineers and engineers' certificates, in my opinion, has nothing to do with the matter under discussion. That subject may come up at the proper time. We are talking of steamboat inspection, which may in an indirect way have some connection with it. To my mind, the disasters referred to must be attributable to one or two causes. Either the vessels were in themselves unseaworthy or they were unseaworthy from having been either overloaded or improperly stowed. As to the remedy, I think that would lie in the first place with the master of the vessel, who is responsible for everything connected, not only with the navigation of his vessel, not only with the discipline of his crew not only with the interest of the owner, but with the interests of the shippers of the cargo, and with the lives of all on board. It is his place to see that the vessel is properly equipped and manned, and that she leaves port in a seaworthy condition. In the first place, therefore, it is the duty of the master of the vessel to see that the vessel is in all respects seaworthy; secondly, at all the principal ports of the Dominion, there are harbor masters and port wardens, and if hon. gentlemen will refer to the Act of the harbor masters and port wardens, they will find that the port warden may, wherever he sees fit, initiate proceedings, when occasion may necessitate his doing so. Therefore, I think that with the master primarily responsible for everything pertaining to his vessel, and with the harbor and port wardens having general supervision of everything regarding the seaworthiness of the vessel, the ground is fully covered.

Motion withdrawn.

OWNERS OF BOTTLES AND VESSELS.

Mr. DENISON moved second reading of Bill No. 3—to protect the owners of certain bottles and vessels therein mentioned. He said: I do not see the object of the applause with which hon. gentlemen greet my rising to move the second reading of this Bill, unless it be that they have the idea that I am doing something in the way of legislating in the cause of temperance. There is no doubt this Bill is in the interest of the manufacturers of soda waters and aerated waters, of whom there are a great many in existence in this country, and the industry has become a very extensive one. It is with the object of protecting them that this Bill has been put in my hands. I may say that on account of the manner in which this business is carried on a great deal of loss is sustained by those interested in it. A soda water bottle, filled with soda water, is, we will say, worth at the rate of a dollar a dozen. The contents alone are sold at the value of 25 cents and the bottles are supposed to be retained in the ownership of the sellers, and they are valued at seventy-five cents per dozen, or, in other words, the value of the contents, as compared with the bottles, is as three to one. The trouble is that second-hand dealers or junk dealers, as they are called, purchase these bottles from any person who may bring them to their establishment. The ownership, as I have said, has not passed from the person who sells the soda water, and he has therefore to sustain very heavy loss on account of these bottles being dealt in by these junk dealers. The object of the Bill especially is to prevent, if possible, any traffic in soda water bottles or aerated water bottles. The bottles, it is proposed, shall have a trade mark upon them, and they have also a peculiar fastening at the top which makes them of considerable

value. This measure, I may state, is somewhat similar to Acts of a like nature which have been passed in some twelve or fourteen States of the Union, so that it is not entirely legislation of a new character. Under clause one, the bottlers are to have a trade mark on their bottles. Clause two prevents trafficking in the bottles, and throws the onus of proof on the party in whose possession the bottles are found. It is proposed to make some alteration in that clause. Clause three provides that no one shall fill such bottles. Clause four deals with the proof in the case of unlawful traffic. Clause five provides that a record shall be kept of the bottles by the junk dealers. Clause six deals with lost vessels. Clause seven allows a search warrant to issue, so that the owner of the bottles may have an opportunity of searching the junk shop and recovering the bottles, which are sometimes found there in large numbers. Clause eight provides for an appeal. I may say that if it is considered by this House that it would be better to leave this Bill to a committee, I would be very glad to move one.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not wish to say much on the matter. I do not know that I want to prevent the hon. member taking the second reading of the Bill, but I think he is dealing with rather a difficult matter, and it seems to me that if it goes into committee it will have to be very carefully considered indeed.

Mr. THOMPSON. I was going to call the attention of the House to the Bill, with the same view that the hon. gentleman has just taken. I appreciate very highly indeed the reasons which the hon. gentleman who introduced the measure has for supporting it, and with an explanation of which he has favored me at some length privately. I understand pretty fully from those who are interested in the kind of business which this Bill is designed to protect, what the difficulties are in respect of it, from which they seek relief. It is stated that their bottles are manufactured in very large numbers, stamped with their names or their trade mark, and that the liquids which they manufacture—soda water, ginger beer, and waters of that description, are vended and delivered in these bottles, the bottles themselves not being sold. It is stated—and this appears almost like an oversight or want of ordinary business precaution—that no account whatever is kept by them of the bottles they deliver to their customers or the general public, and therefore they come and seek legislation of this kind to give them an extraordinary protection. The objections which must be taken to the Bill are fundamental and extend almost to every clause, and I could entertain no hope that, if the Bill had a second reading and went to a committee, it would be amended in such a way as to make it at all safe. If the business in which these gentlemen are engaged requires protection to such an extent as to make it a crime to be the possessor of a soda water bottle, the business is a very dangerous one to the community. There is hardly a householder in Canada who, if this Bill should pass, would not be liable to be brought before a magistrate and sent to goal for at least ten days. Before calling the attention of the House to the principal features of the Bill, I will mention that it professes to deal with the subject from the point of view of trade marks legislation; and in that respect I would ask the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill whether he does not consider that the measure which the Government introduced with regard to the fraudulent marking of merchandise is not sufficient to meet the whole purpose he has in view, in so far as that purpose can safely be carried out, or whether the Bill, in connection with that subject, introduced by the Government could not be amended so as to meet his view in so far as it is wise at all to carry out the precautions he wishes us to adopt. I think it would be unwise to deal with the subject of trade marks and the marking of merchandise in a general statute by which Par-

liament is asked to adopt the principle of recent English legislation dealing with that matter, and at the same time to pass an Act on different lines and to suit one particular business. I might call the attention of the House to what the remedies are which are afforded to these manufacturers at present. They have the same remedies in this country as they have in Great Britain, and I have not heard that any legislation has been called for there by those that are engaged in this business. The remedies which are pursued in Great Britain by the manufacturers of these aerated waters are these: The junk dealers, or any persons who have these articles improperly in their possession, are liable to be sued by the proprietor, and the value of the properties is recovered. It is stated by the manufacturers that that is an insufficient remedy, because there is no means of ascertaining, without a search warrant, how many bottles the junk dealer has in his possession, but our own Statute in regard to junk dealers provides that they shall keep a record of every article they purchase. In our present Act there is also a provision that if any person—

"Encloses, places or attaches any chattel or article, or causes or procures any chattel or articles to be enclosed, placed, or attached in, upon, under, with, or to any cask, bottle, stopper, vessel, case, cover, wrapper, band, reel, ticket, label or other thing having thereon any trade mark of any other person, he is guilty of a misdemeanor."

Let me refer to some of the clauses of this Bill. In the first place, the first section is purely trade mark legislation, providing that marks or devices may be registered. That is a feature of the present law and is unnecessary here, and will be more unnecessary after the new Trade Marks Bill is adopted, if it should be adopted by the House. There is another provision which is already embodied in our statute. The third section reads:

"No person shall fill with soda waters, mineral or aerated waters, porter, ale, cider, ginger ale, milk, cream, beer, small beer, lager beer, weiss beer, white beer, or other beverages, or with medicines, compounds, or mixtures, any such vessels so marked or distinguished as aforesaid with or by any name, mark or device of which a description has been filed and published as provided in section one of this Act, or to deface, erase, obliterate, cover up or otherwise remove or conceal any such name, mark or device thereon, or to sell, buy, give, take, or otherwise dispose of or traffic in the same, without the written consent of the person whose mark or device is in or upon such vessel so filled, trafficked in, used or disposed of as aforesaid, or unless such vessel has been purchased from him; and the burthen of the proof of such purchase, or written consent from the rightful owner or owners, whose registered mark appears on such articles, in the event of the defence of purchase, or written consent, being set up, shall be upon the person in whose possession such articles are found, who must strictly prove that such possession is lawful, and duly authorised by the person whose registered name, mark or device appears or did appear impressed on such articles."

It is made an offence punishable by imprisonment for not more than one year, and not less than ten days, to have violated that section, and the effect of those provisions is, substantially, that, if any person in Canada hereafter is so unfortunate as to have one of these dangerous soda-water bottles in his possession, and puts milk into it, he is liable to be sent to gaol for not less than ten days and possibly for a year. He may put whiskey into it, but not milk, cream, lager beer, or ginger ale or anything of that kind. Even if he puts it in for household purposes and not for sale, he is liable to these extraordinary penalties and the burden of proof rests upon him that he purchased the bottle from somebody who had the right to use the trade mark. I think that it is a very unnecessary provision and a very extreme one, to provide criminal legislation of this character, changing the burden of proof, and compelling everyone who has innocently in his possession articles of this kind, to show how he became possessed of them. We know how common it is for persons to possess these vessels, and this Bill makes it not only fraudulent, but criminal to have these bottles in possession, without proving the title by which they were obtained. We know from the vendors that these bottles are sold in carts in the street to anyone who chooses to buy them. The bottles are not sold, but the mineral

Mr. THOMPSON.

waters are sold, and the bottles are delivered, and they come into the possession of the servants of the household and are not under the immediate supervision of the proprietor of the house, but the possession of these articles and the attempt to use them, even for household purposes, is here made a crime. It would be far more reasonable, if the manufacturers need this protection—and I admit that they seem to need some protection—that, before they come here to ask for this extraordinary legislation, they should take ordinary business precautions to preserve their property. At present they do not; they do not even keep a record of the persons to whom they have delivered bottles, and they propose to remedy their neglect by making it criminal on the part of those who possess these bottles. Section 4 pursues the same line, and makes it punishable without authority to use a marked bottle; and then there is a provision which is in our present law, and is therefore unnecessary, that the junk dealers shall keep a record, and penalties are imposed upon them if they do not. Then there is a provision making it penal even to buy, or sell, or use any bottle of that kind even though the bottle has been lost, and therefore it puts upon a person having one of these bottles, innocently in his possession, the burden of proving the title to it, which is absolutely impossible, considering that tens of thousands of these bottles are issued every week in large cities, especially in the summer season; and, if the person fails to prove his title to every individual bottle in his possession, although it is an absolute legal impossibility that he could do so in any court of justice whatever, he is liable to these heavy penalties. Then section 6 provides not only that, but that any person who is so unfortunate as to have any of these bottles in his possession is liable to have a search warrant issued against him. We know that the ordinary provision of law in regard to such warrants is that oath must be made that the property has been stolen, and is believed to be in the possession of the person referred to, but under this Bill it is only necessary to allege these bottles in possession to obtain a search warrant. Then there is a provision for the recovery of the various penalties. I hope the hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill, and he has done it, I know, from the sense he has of the difficulties sustained by the people in this line of business, will not press the Bill, but will consider whether a provision in regard to the fraudulent marking of merchandise will not be amply sufficient to prevent what I admit we ought to prevent, that is, these bottles being made use of by other dealers who may have purchased them improperly from junk dealers, to prevent the bottles of one person being used by others in the same business. But I think that to attempt to prevent, by criminal penalties, the innocent use and the household use of these bottles, and to impose such severe penalties would be exceedingly unwise and quite uncalled for, especially when we know how little care is taken by the proprietors themselves as to the bottles they use.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I supposed that perhaps the Minister of Justice, in his many duties, had not been able to look at the Bill. I view it as a very extraordinary Bill, and I am glad to see that he has taken the same view of it. As I said before, I think it will have to be greatly curtailed in committee. I thought when on my feet before I would ask the mover if he could not cover all that ought to be covered by some amendment to the Act relating to trade marks, if it is not already covered. But the design of the Bill seems to me to be more than to prevent parties using other people's brands in order to sell their own goods, for the penalty in this, I see, is for removing, or erasing, or taking out the stamp, or the brand of the maker. The value of trade marks, as I understand them, lies in this. A manufacturer registers a trade mark, he is, perhaps, manufacturing a specialty, he

has, perhaps, attained a name for the high quality of a certain kind of goods, and brands his name, or has it blown upon the glass and bottles, or brands it upon wood packages. All these packages are valuable because they have his name upon them. Another dealer, not as successful in business, with inferior goods, might secure the empty packages of this first manufacturer and fill them with his own manufactures, and thus do the other man an injury. But the object of this Bill, it seems to me, does not cover that case, that should be covered under the Act. But it is made an offence under this Act for a person, having another man's bottles or boxes with his brand on them, to remove the brand, to deface or erase it. Therefore, the object is not to secure that a manufacturer's name being branded upon his packages they shall be filled only with the goods manufactured by him, but, as the Minister has pointed out, it seems that the effect of it will be, that however careless a manufacturer may be in the distribution of his goods and his empty boxes, they are to be taken care of by the community at large, and if they do not do so, they are liable to fines, imprisonment and penalties. I quite agree with what the Minister has said. I do not wish to oppose the Bill on its second reading if the hon. member is anxious to send it to committee, but I think that the work of the committee will be very formidable, because it certainly never could be allowed to pass in its present shape. I think, as suggested by my hon. friend, and as has evidently been suggested to the Minister of Justice, that if there be any difficulty by a party using the names of other manufacturers to sell his inferior goods, by using their empty packages, that they would be entitled to protection in that respect, if it is not already given to them in the Act relating to Trade Marks. But I think it is; if not, the Minister has said that he is willing to consider that matter.

Mr. EDGAR. I have looked over the copy of this Bill, as it has been amended in Committee of the Whole, and as it is proposed to be reprinted; and although it is proposed to remove some of the objectionable features from the Bill, I still agree with the Minister of Justice that there are many remaining. The provisions as to issuing a search warrant to find out whether a person has these bottles in his possession, without proving that there has been some theft committed, is very unusual and unreasonable, I think. And so with regard to the provision as to the penalty for parties having these bottles in their possession. Still I think something ought to be done, because surely it is desirable that we should encourage the sale of these cheap temperance drinks. We are desiring in this House to promote temperance, I think, in every legitimate way, and if we support legislation which will protect those who make and sell what is generally known as pop summer drinks, we will be doing a great deal for the cause of temperance. It does seem not unreasonable that when bottles made by owners especially with their own marks upon them, and containing these cheap drinks, costing three or four times, I believe, as much as their contents—I think it is not unreasonable to throw around them some protection. I think that, at least, if the Minister of Justice can put in the Bill which he has before the House now, the Merchandise Marks Offences Act, taken, I believe, from the English Act of last Session, largely, if he can insert in that a clause which will not prohibit people from having possession of these things, and force them to explain all about it, but will prevent them from exposing for sale these bottles so marked, I think he will be doing a right thing, a fair thing, and a service to the country.

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think there is any objection to that at all. I may say that the present Trade Marks Act makes it a misdemeanor to sell a bottle, for instance, that is trade marked, with compounds in it other than those produced by the person whose trade mark it has. While

that will be a misdemeanor under the Act, it will be under summary conviction, and the penalty will be much more stringent. I think the object can be quite as well served by the Trade Marks and Registration Bill.

Mr. DENISON. The Minister of Justice stated a short time ago that apparently there was no effort made on the part of these people to keep any record of their bottles. Although I am not well informed as to the manner in which they conduct their business, I am told it is almost impossible to keep any proper record of the bottles, and to have the bottles returned; that, on account of the competition being so keen, they have to let the bottles go with the contents, and trust—if I may use the term—to luck to the bottles coming back. The effect of that condition of things is, that these smaller dealers may buy up bottles belonging to large dealers, and use them to sell their manufactures at a cheaper rate. You can easily see that if the larger dealer has to pay 75 cents a dozen for bottles, and 25 cents for the contents, while the smaller dealer can buy up the empty bottles at half-price, it puts the latter in a better position to compete with the large dealer. I am informed that some of the large dealers lose as much as four or five thousand dollars a year in bottles alone, that are used by smaller dealers and other people. I would like to say a word as to the question of "the use" referred to by the hon. the Minister of Justice. That "use" has been struck out of the amended Bill; but it says: "No person shall buy, sell, expose or offer for sale, dispose or traffic in bottles." The object of this Act, I may say, is not to prevent any persons having bottles in their possession, or giving them away, but it is to prevent the traffic in bottles. It is principally aimed at the junk dealers who make a business of dealing in those kind of articles. However, Mr. Speaker, what we want is not particularly this Bill, but we want relief, and although I think it would be a little more convenient if this Bill should go through in its present form, still, as the Minister of Justice has stated that he can see his way clear to give us some measure of relief in his Trade Marks Act, I think that I will be quite justified in letting this Bill stand in the meantime, with the permission of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the best plan would be to adjourn the debate, then the Bill can stand on the paper, and my hon. friend, after examining the Government Bill, can consider whether he will press his own. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to; and debate adjourned.

DISCHARGE OF SECURITIES TO THE CROWN.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved second reading of Bill (No. 4) to amend the Act respecting Defective Letters Patent and the discharge of Securities to the Crown. He said: I move the second reading of this Bill at the request of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). It is a Bill to remedy an old and anomalous state of the law, and it refers to transactions which occurred prior to Confederation and altogether in the Province of Ontario. Prior to 15th August, 1866, it was the law of Ontario that bonds given to the Crown either to secure debts or as surety for officials, such as postmasters, custom house officers or others, were filed in the office of the clerk of the Court of Queen's Bench, *ipso facto* created a lien on the lands of the bondsmen without any further registration, any specific registration on the lands, in the various counties where the lands were situated. This required so much searching that no man could get a clear title to his land or any parcel of land he was buying without having a search made in the office of the clerk of the Court of Queen's Bench. That was remedied by it being enacted in 1866 that those bonds should no longer be a lien on the

lands unless specifically registered against them. The Legislature of the Province of Ontario, by the Revised Statutes have released the lands from those bonds, so far as that Legislature has authority to deal with them, that is to say, from any debts due to the Crown, which were within the provincial jurisdiction; and it is now asked by this Bill to release the lien on lands in all matters that come under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. The difficulty has been suggested by the Referee of Titles of the Province of Ontario, who says it is a matter of very great difficulty and expense now to pass a title without going back and searching over those old bonds to the Crown, and difficulty arises if a man has acquired his title from a man, say named John Smith, because there are several registrations under that name, and it must be shown that that was not the John Smith whose title is now being searched or affected. This difficulty is so great that the Referee suggests that the Dominion Parliament follow the example of the Legislature of Ontario, and release the liens upon the land so far as they are subject to the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. EDGAR. I understand that this Bill is an exact copy of the section of the Revised Statutes of the Province of Ontario, changing the words "Provincial Government" to "Dominion Government," and I think it perfectly proper that it should pass. I suppose the blank date left in the clause will be changed, and it will be made to apply from and after the passing of this Act.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Yes, from 1st of May or some such date.

Mr. EDGAR. The title of the Bill is also defective. That, however, cannot be changed until the Bill reaches its last stage.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

PROTECTION OF RAILWAY EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. DENISON moved second reading of Bill (No. 5) for the protection of railway employés. He said: I have been requested by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to move the second reading of this Bill, and in doing so I have only a few words to say in regard to it. I regret very much that the hon. gentleman is not present, as this is a very important measure for the protection of the lives of railway employés. I have before me a statement of accidents to such employés during the year 1886, and I find that in coupling cars there were 210 cases of injury and 12 deaths; walking, standing or lying on the track, 72 deaths and 63 persons injured, or in all 135 accidents on the track. I suppose a considerable portion of these have been due to one of the causes referred to in this Bill, frogs on railway tracks not being packed, with regard to which provision is made in this Bill. I have here a copy of a presentment sent by the Grand Jury of the County of Elgin, in which they pray for several matters in connection with this Bill. They pray that all boxed or covered freight cars that are run over the various railways shall by law be required to have a one and a-half inch plank or board on the centre of the top outside for the use of the brakemen as a walk, the plank to be not less than eighteen inches wide. Also, that iron railings shall be placed along the footboards at a convenient height for the further protection and safety of brakemen. Also, that the old system of couplings and brakes, being insecure, unsafe and fraught with danger and accident, should, at as early a date as possible, have a modern improved system substituted therefor. Also, that all engines shall have a steam brake and cylinder attached to them after due notice has been given. There are also other matters mentioned in the presentment which it is not proposed to cover by this Bill.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

Mr. COOK. I also regret, as does the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, the absence of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). That hon. gentleman has given considerable attention to this matter, and I think he introduced the same Bill last Session. I have taken a very deep interest in this matter for a number of years past. While I had the honor of a seat in the Ontario Legislature I introduced a Bill similar to this, and, after introducing it, the Government appointed a commission, took the matter in hand, and passed the measure which is now the law in the Province of Ontario. But upon the passage of the Act, the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Finance Minister of this country, being at that time Minister of Railways, carried a Bill by which he took over all the roads of the Provinces; that Dominion Act rendered this Ontario Act almost worthless, because in that Province we have scarcely any roads that are under that jurisdiction. The packing of frogs is a very important matter, but in my opinion the hon. gentleman has not gone far enough. There is one difficulty in the way, and that is the throwing open of switches. As switches are at present, they are thrown three inches apart, and the brakeman or man in the yard is as likely to be caught in the switch as in the frog. My former proposal was to have the switches so arranged as to be thrown open six inches, so that a man's foot could not be caught in them. It is from men having their feet caught that accidents of this nature occur, and they are crushed by the cars. The proposal respecting running boards is a very good one. On the whole, I approve of the Bill, and I hope it will pass into law. I trust the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), will be more successful this Session than he was last, and that the proposal to refer the Bill to a committee is not for the purpose of burking this very useful and important measure. The mover (Mr. Denison), on behalf of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), stated the great amount of accidents that have occurred in this way. I think it is nothing but right and just that the Government of the day should have an Act of this kind made law, so that protection can be extended to the people who are working on railways. There are such a large number of people now working upon roads in Canada that the danger has increased every year, because of the greater number employed. I think, Sir, that as this Government has passed an Act by which they took away from the Province of Ontario the large number of railways, formerly under the jurisdiction of that Provincial Act, that it is their duty now to afford railway employés, by Act of Parliament, the same protection that they had under the law of the Province of Ontario. I have an instance in my mind which bears on the question. Shortly after the passing of the Act by which the railways were taken over by the Dominion, an accident occurred upon the Midland Railway, which charter was obtained from the Local Legislature and which was under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature. The party to whom the accident occurred sued the railway company for damages, but the court decided that as the Ontario Act had no jurisdiction the complainant was nonsuited. I contend, therefore, that the Government should see that protection is extended to that class of people in this country, who richly deserve the same protection at the hands of this Government that they receive at the hands of the Ontario Legislature.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). This no doubt is a very important Act and there can be no objection to referring it to a special committee. At the same time it appears to me that an Act of such importance proposing to deal with interests of such a large extent and in such various ways should be taken charge of by the Government, and that they should deal with a matter in which the public are so largely interested. I hope the Government will take that view of

it, and when it comes from the select committee will propose the measure to this House and accept the responsibility of it.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). Mr. Speaker, this I consider is one of the most important Bills that has been brought before the House during the Session and I agree with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that it being such an important measure the Government should take the Bill in their charge and in amending the Railway Act that they should have the principle of this Bill incorporated in it. No one who has had an opportunity to witness the number of casualties on railways to brakemen and others who earn their living by being employed on railways will deny that there should have been long before this some provision made whereby the lives of these unfortunate individuals might be protected to as great an extent as possible. We know very well that the avocation of the railway employé is a dangerous one under any circumstances. They have to endure hardships which perhaps in no other calling are people called upon to endure. That being the case it ought to be the duty of those who have charge of railways and railway companies to make provisions whereby the lives of employés may be protected. When the Dominion Government assumed the control of the railroads chartered by the Local Governments and took them out of the hands of the Local Governments, thereby preventing the enforcement of the Provincial Acts they should have made provision for enforcing the law for proper packing of the frogs. They neglected to do so, however, and very many lives have been lost on account of this neglect. Perhaps the most dangerous work connected with railroading and in which more lives have been lost than in any other is by brakemen who are compelled to remain upon those cars and pass from one car to the other to set brakes, falling off and being killed. Although the packing of the frogs may be absolutely essential and necessary for the protection of parties employed in and about the yards, I consider the necessity of making suitable and ample provision for the running boards so as to protect the brakemen, of far greater importance. Any one who has witnessed the brakemen running from one car to the other can readily understand the danger those men undergo while performing their duty on those cars. They not only have to be at their dangerous work when the weather is fine and when the cars are in safe and proper condition for them to pass from one to the other but they have to be at their post at all times and at all seasons during the most inclement weather, when perhaps from cold they are almost unable to move. They have at all times to go from one car to the other and run the risk of a sudden jerk, or a sudden jar which might precipitate them to the rails or between these cars, when they would be crushed to atoms in a second of time. It is utterly impossible during the prevalence of a storm of sleet or snow to keep those running boards in a safe condition for use. They become slippery and the men who are compelled to step from one to the other are placed in the greatest danger. Yet we find that the country has been quite indifferent to the dangers and the hardships which those men endure. The necessity of a proper running board should be considered by this House. I can understand that we cannot perhaps legislate in this direction immediately, and have all cars passing through the country properly protected in this way, as the United States has no law on this subject.

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

After Recess.

Mr. WILSON (Elgin). When the House rose for recess, I was endeavoring to show the necessity that exists for

protecting railway employés. I pointed out the absolute necessity of having the frog thoroughly packed. I believe that it is in the interest of the companies as well as of the employés and general public that every protection should be afforded to the employés. The company would be less liable to damages in case of accident, and would have fewer maimed men on its hands. The Bill not only provides for the packing of the frogs, but also for improving the running boards. Everybody who has had an opportunity of witnessing the difficulties and hardships endured by brakemen in connection with their dangerous employment, will agree with me that if any device can be found for affording better protection to them, it is the duty of this House and the railway companies to see that such a device is employed. We all know that the present system of box cars with running boards is a very dangerous system, from which many lives have been lost. The space between the cars being considerable, when a sudden jar or jolt takes place, the brakeman, while passing from one car to another, is very liable to be thrown forward, and having nothing to hold by to protect himself, is liable to be thrown between the cars and killed. Then, these boards are frequently wet, and covered with ice or snow, so that it is almost impossible for the men to pass along them even during the day time. But consider for a moment the difficulties a man must experience during the night when passing over the cars with a lantern in his hand. If there is a jolt or jar when he gets near the end of the car, having nothing to take hold of to support himself, he is liable to be thrown between the cars, or thrown down on the top of the car and rolled off on the track. Many lives have been lost by these accidents, which are constantly occurring. If we take the whole of the mortality in connection with railroading, I suppose there is no other cause that has produced as great a destruction of life and limb as this very cause. It may be objected that so long as our present close commercial relations with the United States continue, with cars coming from the American side to the Canadian side, and not constructed in the same way as our cars, the present system must continue. But this is no excuse. It is our duty to protect our own citizens. We all know the value of a life; we all know the value of a citizen of the Dominion of Canada; and those who are injured are generally young and useful men, who have arrived just at that time of life when they are going to increase the wealth of the country. They are those who have just started out in life, and they may have a wife and small family depending on them for their maintenance and support. If we can make any provision whereby the lives of these men will be more secure without injuring the railway companies, it is our duty to do it. Instead of injuring the companies, I think I shall be able to show that such a measure of protection for the men would be a material advantage and saving to the railway corporations. Not only should the running board be improved, but the space between the two box cars should be overcome so that there would be, as it were, one continuous board from one car to another, so that the brakeman would not be obliged, as at present, to leap from one car to another. I think this could be done without much difficulty. When the cars are attached, a running board with a coiled spring could be so arranged as to allow the boards to come together when the cars are tense, and to spring back when necessary, so as not in any way to break connection of the running board. As at present, there is a considerable space between them, the ends of the running boards are also frequently broken, thus increasing the space over which the employés have to jump when passing from one car to another. Then I think there should be a hand rail on each side of the running board, extending from one end of the car to the other. In the Bill it is proposed that there should be a side rail, either of iron or a chain, two and a-half or three feet high. Such a rail, placed on

either side of the running board would give the brakeman something to take hold of in passing along the car. It could be made, say, of gas pipe, and when approaching the end of the car let the side rails turn to the right and to the left, so as to embrace the whole width and end of the car. If that were not done the brakeman would be obliged to step over the railing to apply his brake, and might be thrown from the top of the car. This device would I think very materially protect the brakeman in passing over the tops of the cars. As this is a question in which we ought all to feel an interest, I may be allowed to read you letters which I have received from men who are conversant with this subject, and who take a great deal of interest in it. One of these is Mr. Deyell who has written me as follows:—

"The old running board in general use by railway companies is still retained within a short distance of each end of car, this space being occupied by our device which consists of a casing, into this casing is placed a slide that can easily be moved in or out of casing and projects sufficiently over ends of car to fill up gap caused when two cars are coupled together, thus making a continuous running board whole length of car. It is made self-adjusting by coil springs back of slide and inside of casing allowing them to cushion into casing when two cars come together. It is likewise provided with a hinge in order to overcome unevenness of track or when two cars come together of different height."

He mentioned here a difficulty that I had not pointed out. Very frequently those cars are of different heights, some being from two to four inches higher than others. Of course there is less danger when they are of the same height, but when there is a difference in height, there is danger that a person running along the foot-board would slip in jumping from one car to the other. This device is so arranged that it is on a hinge, and when one car is higher than the other the hinge will raise up, and allow one board to pass in such a position under the other as to keep continuous connection between the two cars. Now if such a device as this can be made applicable to freight cars, and it in no way interferes with the operating of the brakes, the cost of the hand rail is of very little expense indeed; then I have made out a just case for calling on railway companies to comply with the request I am making. I have a letter from the secretary of the order of railway conductors. These men are constantly employed in railroading, and ought to be able to know what would be the best device in the interest, not only of the companies, but the men they employ. The following is the letter:—

ST. THOMAS, Ont., 18th March, 1888.

"I. DEYELL, Esq., St. Thomas, Ont.

"DEAR SIR,—We have this day been shown a model of running board and roof box car, as designed by you, and after thoroughly examining the same have found it to be a complete device which will fill a long felt desire of all railway men whose business requires them to go over the tops of trains, as it makes it impossible for a person to fall between the cars when in the act of stepping from one car to another, and we heartily recommend its adoption on all freight and box cars.

"Signed on behalf of the members of Union Division No. 13, Order of Railway Conductors.

"G. H. HILL,

"Secretary and Treasurer."

I have also another letter from the Brotherhood Brakemen, the men to whom, I am contending, this boon ought to be given:

"ST. THOMAS, 27th March, 1888.

"ISAAC DEYELL, Esq., St. Thomas.

"DEAR SIR,—I am instructed by our lodge to inform you that we, as a body, have inspected your automatic running board, and it was the opinion of the whole lodge that it is the best device for protection of brakemen that has ever been brought before us. The points that we look at are, namely, an unbroken run way, no leaping from car to car, and the hand railing which you have placed along the running board and encircling the brake, will make it as safe as it is possible to do. We feel grateful to you, and will say if your device had been in use prior to this, we would not mourn so many brothers who have met their deaths by falling between and off the sides of trains.

"Yours sincerely,

"F. W. COWLEY,

"Secretary."

Mr. WILSON (Elgin).

Of course, not being a railway man, I cannot say positively that this device will be a success, equal to what these men anticipate it will be. But I can say that no one who has seen the model can fail to see what a great improvement, as regards safety, its principle will create. I feel earnestly in the interest of railway men that something should be done to protect them. There is another provision in the Bill which I heartily approve of. That is the provision making it compulsory on all railroads to have some means whereby the cylinders may be oiled from the cars. That system is the one adopted by the majority of the roads at present, but there are some which do not adopt it, and which compel the fireman or engineer to go out of the car and run along the running board forward to the cylinder and there to place the oil in a cup over the cylinder. This was the system followed to a great extent upon the Michigan Central road until the last two or three years, and it was the cause of many accidents, the men being compelled to go out in the dark on these running boards, perhaps only six inches wide, carrying their can of oil in one hand and with the other raising the covering of the oil cup, without any means of hanging on to anything, so that often they were suddenly thrown from these running boards and killed. Now, although the majority of railroads are oiling from the cab, yet it is not compulsory, and some roads still adhere to the old system. I think it is in the interest of the country, as well as it is in the interest of those who are employed upon the road, that this should be made compulsory on all railways, that they should have a device by which the cylinders may be oiled inside the cab, so as to prevent the necessity of the men going out at all seasons, at all hours, and under all circumstances to oil the cylinders. I believe our railway system is a very important one in the interests of this Dominion. I believe it is something we ought to do our utmost to make as complete and efficient as we possibly can, and there is nothing that will conduce to that efficiency so much as to give that protection and assistance to those who are employed upon it. If we could possibly make railroading as safe as other employments, railway companies would be able to employ men at a more reasonable rate, perhaps, than they are now compelled to pay, and it would not only benefit the men by saving and protecting their lives, it would not only benefit the various insurance companies who now lose heavily by the accidents to the men employed on the roads, but it would protect the companies which are more or less liable for the accidents which occur to their employes while they are in their employ. It may be said that the company compels these men to sign an agreement that they will not expect indemnity when an accident occurs to them, but, if it is shown that this is caused through the negligence on the part of the company, I think they are liable in a court of justice for damages for injury to the individual employed on the road; and, if that is not the case, it ought to be. If it is owing to the carelessness of the company the individual who is compelled to remain in their employment, in order to obtain his daily bread, is injured, the company ought to be held responsible, and the time is not far distant when a compulsory law of that kind will come into force. Therefore, if you can make a provision to protect the company and the men, it is the duty of the Government to consider the Bill carefully, to adopt its provisions and to incorporate them in the consolidation of the Railway Act, and to make it compulsory on every company to adopt the provisions of this Bill in every Railway Act which is placed on the Statute-book. Feeling this, I shall support the Bill with much pleasure.

Mr. SHANLY. I do not suppose there can be any special objection, at least I do not myself know of any special objection, to granting the special committee which

has been moved for by my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Denison), in the absence of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). But, as regards the Bill itself, it appears to me that it is entirely behind the times. I understand from some words which fell from the hon. member for East Simcoe that this Bill has been introduced from year to year to this House, and now it is simply what I would call a Rip Van Winkle Bill. It is not changed in any particular, and it is evident that the mover, in reprinting it from year to year, has reprinted it without any knowledge of what is going on in the railway world around him. I believe that the matters which this Bill proposes to deal with will never be settled by any legislation in this House, and my reason for so thinking is that the matter is now engaging the attention of a far abler parliament for this kind of legislation than ever assembled or ever will assemble within these walls. That parliament is composed of men of the best brains and the best trained intellect in this direction that are to be found on this continent, or I might say in the world. It is a parliament composed of the master-mechanics of all the great continental railways, in which parliament Canada is represented, and it is a parliament in which every member knows what he is talking about. You may ask perhaps what this parliament to which I refer has done. I will tell you what has been the outcome of it. Already the old-fashioned coupling, which has caused so much loss of life and so many accidents to limb, is a thing of the past. The decree has gone forth and an automatic coupling, which is to take the place of the old-fashioned contrivance, is to be applied to all the railway cars of this continent, as well to those of our country as to the cars on the other side of the frontier; and what will compel us to adopt that improvement is not any legislation we may pass here, but a far higher law, the law of necessity, because we have to interchange with railways on the other side, and whatever improvements are decided upon by the parliament to which I have already alluded, and of which our own mechanical managers are members, will be used in Canada, without our legislating here in the crude fashion which is proposed in what I have called this Rip Van Winkle Bill. My hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) has given us a very long dissertation upon another matter which is a fruitful source of very sad accidents, and that is the necessity which exists for the brakemen on railway freight trains to run along the cars from end to end, be the night ever so dark, and the tops of the cars ever so slippery. The hon. gentleman did not exaggerate when he said that that is one of the most fruitful sources of accident, and scarcely an accident of that kind occurs which is not fatal. But I do not think the remedy my hon. friend proposes, or which is proposed by certain correspondents of his, will be worth patenting, because, before he could patent his invention and apply it to the cars, before the running board that the Bill of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) provides for could be applied to the millions of cars which are now rolling from end to end of this great continent, the necessity for the poor brakemen to run along the tops of the cars will have ceased for ever. The same parliament that I have spoken of are now providing for the adaptation, to freight trains, of the Westinghouse brake which has been so great a success in securing the safety of passenger trains, and on some of the western roads it has been so successfully adapted that a pattern train of some 30 cars has been sent, at the expense of the Westinghouse Company, to travel all over the Union and to show how easy is the adaptation of the Westinghouse brake to freight trains. That being so, my hon. friend's running board passes away. The patent is not worth paying for.

Mr. WILSON. I would ask the hon. member, even if you had that law, would it be possible to do away with the necessity of brakeman passing upon the top of the cars.

Mr. SHANLY. It will not necessitate the passing of brakemen from car to car at all, or along the tops of the cars. The object of the Westinghouse brake is to get rid of the necessity of employing brakemen to run along the tops of cars. Now, it is only by unanimity of plan, and by singleness of action, that we can hope to obtain practical legislation of this sort, so as to do away with the dangers which now beset so many railway employes. I would ask, what can we expect from this Bill before us? It provides for a running board; but can we, with our few thousand miles of railway, legislate for the tens of thousands of miles upon the other side of the frontier. Why, Sir, after we have adapted our running board to all our cars, we may any day see cars from 500 miles beyond the Mississippi, 500 miles east of here on the Intercolonial Railway; not a car of them with running boards to match ours, which thus becomes a trap and increased source of danger. It is not in our power here to legislate for all or any of the foreign railway companies sending their cars over our lines. By uniform, concerted and continental action only can the safety appliances under discussion be brought into successful use. Such action is now being taken by those most competent to deal with it, and with them it will be wise to leave it. Sir, I say again, this Bill evidences want of thought, carelessness of study and consequent ignorance of current railway events. It may very well be referred to a committee, but the conclusion which the committee will assuredly come to will be that the best course will be to wait for the improvements that are now being devised by the parliament of master mechanics; and when they are perfected and brought into use, as they will be, the higher law of necessity will compel us to adopt them. Interchange of cars is absolutely necessary for us. We can no more work our railways without assimilating our cars to those in use on the United States system, than we could work them if we used a different gauge. The inconvenience in the one case would be just as great as in the other. I may add that attempts have been made by almost every State in the Union by State legislation to adopt just such plans as suggested by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), and laws have been enacted by various States that such and such coupling, for examples, be used, and such and such devices adopted. But the law was always inoperative, because the moment the trains reached the frontier of the State they came to a different system of coupling, to a different system of improvements, and their own became entirely useless. Therefore, while I do not object to a special committee amusing themselves over this Bill, the conclusion they will come to will be that they know very little of the matter referred to them. The special committee will come to perceive their utter want of knowledge on the subject on which they will be expected to report, and they will assuredly come to the conclusion that the true way to deal with this matter is to leave it in the hands of the great parliament composed of the master mechanics of the continental railways.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentlemen who have preceded me to-night have addressed their remarks almost exclusively to this running board. I do not know that the member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), has any particular object in advocating this running board, other than the interests of railway men.

Mr. SHANLY. Allow me a remark. I see no reason why my hon. friend from Elgin should not advocate it, I am merely putting him right upon this point, and telling him that something is going to happen that will render this running board useless.

Mr. LISTER. We agree about the running board, to some extent—I do not know anything about it.

Mr. SHANLY. I would suggest that my hon. friend's name be added to the special committee.

Mr. LISTER. It is very likely that there is something in the running board. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman for East Elgin was actuated by some sort of a motive in saying so much about that running board. It is probably a good thing, but there are other features of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, that deserve the attention of the House. In the first place, I think it is greatly to be regretted that the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill, is not here for the purpose of explaining to the House its peculiar features, and the advantages to be derived from the passing of this Bill. We do know, however, that my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Cook) several years ago, when he was a member of the Ontario Legislature, introduced a measure of this sort for the protection of railway employes, and we know that the measure he introduced was, to a certain extent, adopted by the Legislature of Ontario in 1881. Now, Sir, that legislation does not deal with this question of running boards, but it deals with questions which, I think, are of equal importance to the railway employes of the country, and which would not make it necessary that the railway companies should buy the patent that has been referred to by the hon. gentleman from East Elgin. In 1881 the Legislature of Ontario passed an Act for the purpose of making provision for the safety of railway employes and the public, and that Act only proposed to deal with the question of frogs, and with overhead bridges. Now, the whole legislation of modern times is to compel the employers of labor to provide, as far as is practicable and possible, for the safety of the people in their service; and if it is the duty of the manufacturers of the country to do that, it is equally the duty, if not more so, of the railway companies, so far as possible, to protect the thousands of men in their service from the dangers incident to the employment in which they are engaged. That legislation of Mr. Mowat was excellent legislation, so far as it went, and if that Act was copied by this Parliament and made the law of the Dominion, it would be excellent legislation, if it went no further. I think that this House, if they thought proper, could expunge the objectionable clauses of this Bill and compel the railway companies to protect, as far as they can, their employes by packing the frogs, and thus prevent many an accident resulting in death or injury to limb. If this House had not interfered with the railway charters granted by the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario, if they had not confiscated the railways that we in Ontario have paid for with our own money, the employes of the railway companies would have the right, under this law, to compel the railway companies to compensate them for injuries they have sustained by neglect to comply with the provisions of this Act. But, Sir, this Legislature, in its wisdom, thought it was necessary that the railways we built in that Province, should be taken away from us and brought under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament. Railways extending only a few miles, and that could by no process of reasoning be held to be for the general advantage of this Dominion, were taken from us. The result was that railways which cost the Province of Ontario well nigh the \$30,000,000 have been taken away from the Province, and control over them has been assumed by this Parliament. The consequence is that thousands of men who were in the employ of those companies find themselves to-day without remedy or redress for injuries which under the law that incorporated those companies would have given them compensation. It has been held by our courts in more than one case, and in one case of a peculiarly painful character, that the Dominion Parliament having assumed control of the road, having declared them to be for the general advantage, the laws of the Province of Ontario did not apply, and men who would have been entitled to damages under that law were thrown out by the courts in consequence. If this Parliament takes control of these roads, I say in all

Mr. SHANLY.

fairness and honesty we are bound to give the workmen employed by those companies the same protection they had when this Parliament took control, if we go no further; and if there is one thing about railways more dangerous than another it is an unpacked frog. Year after year, almost month after month, life has been lost, men's prospects have been ruined by injuries which they have received. Within my own knowledge and within a year past a young man, the support of an old woman and several relatives, lost his life by having his foot caught in a frog. It was caught and he was unable to extricate himself before a train came along and he was killed. His friends had no redress. In another case a young man lost his leg; and these injuries are going on almost monthly. Shall it be said that this House, which poses as the protector and defender of the working classes, refuses to give to those men a measure of protection they had when we assumed control of those railways? I say it is unfortunate that the hon. member who introduced this Bill is not here to-night to promote it. If this Bill is referred to the special committee which has been proposed, what does it mean? Why, it is a delusion and a snare. The workingmen are led to believe that the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill is the champion of the workingman, and if it is referred to a committee it means that the Bill will never be crystallised into law during this Parliament and probably never. I am not here to attribute motives to any hon. gentleman. He may be interested in railways or he may not; but as a legislator, as a member here for the purpose of passing law in the interest of the community at large, I say that the interest of the railway companies should not for one moment interfere with the protection which the people of the country are entitled to receive as against those roads. We give the companies great privileges and great rights, and it is the privilege of the people to see that in return the companies give the people an ordinary measure of protection. That is what this Bill asks, and it will be compatible with the dignity of this House, with what we owe to ourselves, to strike out every section except the third section, and say that that section shall become law, and that the railway companies shall be obliged to pack the frogs as is provided in that section.

Mr. SHANLY. I did not at all touch upon the question of packing the frogs. I quite agree with my hon. friend in regard to that matter. I touched upon the points respecting which I said we could not practically legislate, the interchange of trains between this country and the other side of the line. As regards protection with respect to frogs, we can do as we like. I quite agree that that clause should stand if it stands alone.

Mr. LISTER. I say, then, we should get legislation by degrees. If that clause is passed and becomes law we have done a great deal, because we shall make our law almost the same as that in Ontario, with the exception of the section relating to overhead bridges. I know nothing practically about running boards—of course, I know what they are, and presume they are exceedingly dangerous—but if some means could be devised for the purpose of reducing the danger it would be a very great benefit. But I can readily understand that, perhaps, the passage of this law immediately might throw burdens upon the railway companies and disarrange their affairs in a manner that would not be at all desirable. This matter should be referred either this Session or another Session to a committee which could hear evidence and consider the whole question, and devise some method to ensure the safety of the men on our railways; but so far as the third clause is concerned, I say again there should not be the slightest hesitation, we will be faithless to the duty we owe to the public if we do not make that the law during the present Session. That would not throw burdens on the railway companies and it is some-

thing that will add greatly to the safety of the railways, not only for the men employed, but the people who may be upon the track for business or otherwise. I trust so far as that clause is concerned, it will become law. I am glad beyond measure that the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) takes the view he does of this matter, because he is a man of great experience and his utterances are entitled to great weight upon such subjects. I think, as I stated a moment ago, we owe it to ourselves, to the people of Ontario at all events, to make the law as it was when the Dominion Parliament assumed control of the Provincial railways.

Mr. TISDALE. I think if the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), had confined his enquiries with a view to arriving at practical conclusions, it would have been more desirable. In dealing with these matters, it should be the aim of hon. members to deal with them so as not to be adjudged as attributing motives, and thus be enabled to approach the subject in a proper manner. Surely we would then be able to approach subjects of this kind respecting which there is no shadow of partyism, and where no Dominion or Provincial rights would come into consideration. I regret this, because in a large part of the remarks of the hon. member I think the whole House will concur. I regret he should have deemed it necessary to speak as he did about the promoter of the Bill. As I understand, the promotion of a Bill of a public nature is this: as soon as a public Bill is introduced into the House it becomes the property of the House, and the introducer of the Bill must be considered as having discharged a greater duty than the balance of the House because he has taken the responsibility and trouble of putting it into practical shape and submitting the result to the House. I hold that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) is now as responsible for this Bill as is the introducer, and if he is equally capable, as I believe he is to perfect it, then I think he should confine himself to improving the Bill, and if this course were followed we would get along a great deal better. In the few remarks that I feel called upon to address to the House I propose to try and act in that spirit. I do not agree with the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), that referring a Bill to a special committee means burying it. If the hon. gentleman is not satisfied that the members named on the committee will do their duty and report promptly to the House, it is within the right of the hon. member, and I would support him in it, to change their names and substitute a committee who will report. I know that in the Railway Committee and in the Banking and Commerce Committee when special committees are appointed they report in a day or two. If these gentlemen who have been named are not of that sort he can move, and I will second him, that members be appointed on the committee who will discharge their duty. As I understand it, the reason for appointing a special committee is to expedite and not to delay the proceedings of the House, and I have no doubt that the gentlemen named on this committee will take that course. I fully concur in the very practical remarks of the member for Grenville (Mr. Shanly) as to the care which should be taken in endeavoring to legislate upon a matter which we understand so little of. I think it would be a great mistake for this House to endeavor to deal with the subjects mentioned in this Bill in any other way than by a special committee. There, the practical men connected with the railways should be given an opportunity of informing us from their experience and from their practical knowledge as to their views upon these subjects. They need not rule nor control the committee but hon. gentlemen must all admit that those who spend their life time in the management of such matters are those best capable of giving information on which we can form our ideas. Let

me say this, that although I have nothing to do with railways, no more than most hon. gentlemen here, if you take this continent and this country and see the great progress that has been made in the safety and all other appliances of railways, we ought not to insinuate and I do not like to hear it insinuated as it were, in the House that the railway companies are against those improvements. Look at our Patent Office or go to Washington and see the thousands of models of patent rights, such as the hon. gentleman from East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) mentioned, and you will wonder how railway men know what to choose from, there are so many things which come under the notice of railway managers, enlightened, intelligent, as a rule merciful as they are, which it would be their own interest to adopt, or as the hon. member for East Elgin said, it was a matter of pounds, shillings and pence to them if those appliances could be adopted. There is no doubt that all those approved appliances if found practical when put on a railroad are a saving of money to the companies, because they are in some way or other liable for compensation for loss of life or property. I believe that the special committee is the only proper way to deal with those questions, except perhaps the question of improved frogs. I think it is wise that a special committee should, as far as they can, investigate it and report to the House. With regard to running boards I venture to say that if you ask a brakeman on one of those trains of mixed cars whether he would like a change of this sort or not, it is doubtful if he would say that he would like it. I will tell you why. If you get a man used to one set of appliances with a broad running board and supports he gets as it were to trust in them, and the first thing he knows, if the night is dark or in a moment of danger or excitement, when he has all he can do to manage the brakes, he strikes another car that has not got the same appliances, and he is sure to go down at once. He had relied upon the appliances upon one car and this led him to trust to them when he got on the car they were not on. These are matters that should be considered. I am not speaking against the principle of the Bill. I believe we ought to get such light as will enable us beyond peradventure to legislate in a way that will make our legislation an improvement and not simply an experiment. I do not believe in theories in these matters. Take for instance putting oil cups in the cabs of locomotives. Some of the railway companies object to putting them in the cabs. If you enter into any railway furnishing shop in this country, or in the States where there are so many thousands of miles of railway, you will see all kinds of patent oil cups, but the trouble with them is that sometimes they won't work, and the machinery on which the safety of not only the engineer and fireman on the train, but the lives of the passengers and the property depend will get out of order. Within my own knowledge in running a small private railroad we had those oil cups, and we found that we had to take them off, because they would not work. The men never could tell whether the oil went into the machinery or not, and although great expense had been incurred we had to remove them and return to the old-fashioned way. I mention that as an illustration why our Parliament should not exercise its power—and it is all powerful—in legislating about matters without having sufficient knowledge of them to legislate upon. It would be well, I think, that a special committee should examine this matter and let us have prompt action and report on which we can decide whether we should take the responsibility of recommending some of those appliances. If we say to the railway companies that this thing must be done it is a very serious matter. Suppose for instance that this Parliament should say those oil cups should be put on the trains and suppose the oil cups do not prove effective and lead to a disaster we take the responsibility of this by relieving the

railway companies. We should not touch anything except simple matters about which there can be no discussion without having the opinions of the people who are responsible for the management of those great railways. It is a most dangerous thing to interfere in those matters without a proper knowledge of the subject and I think it would be highly improper for us to take any action without a special examination before a committee who understand what legislation should take place upon the matter.

Mr. BARRON. I have listened carefully to the remarks of the hon. member of South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) and I was a little disappointed to find that he made no reference to the fact of the Dominion of Canada confiscating the railroads of Ontario. I think, Sir, as the representative of an Ontario constituency he should have dwelt somewhat on that fact.

Mr. TISDALE. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he thinks that that is part of the discussion. If he does I can say a good deal about it, because I think the matter was not fairly put by the hon. member who preceded me. I said I proposed to discuss the matter in question without bringing anything into it which might stir up feeling on the opposite side of the House so long as it is not pertinent to the question before us.

Mr. BARRON. I will agree with my hon. friend, who sits to my right, in saying that it is a pity the Dominion of Canada confiscated the railways bonused by the Province of Ontario.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. BARRON. I am coming to the question. Because by their so doing they deprived the employés and the workmen of the railways of Ontario of a law which gave them certainly more protection than they have under any Dominion Act. As my hon. friend to my right says they have no protection at all under any Dominion Act. I agree with my friend to my right that it is a pity that the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill is not in the House to-night to promote it. I recollect last Session a similar Bill was introduced by the hon. gentleman towards the end of the Session. Why it was not introduced till late in the Session cannot be understood, except for the reason that it was not desirable it should become law. It does appear to me that by referring the Bill now to a committee, such as is proposed, that the intention is that it shall not become law this Session, and that employés on railroads shall not have that protection that they had under the Provincial Act before the railways of Ontario were confiscated by the Dominion. Now, Sir, different gentlemen who have spoken have pointed out some defects that exist in the Bill as introduced. One thing that the Bill does not provide for at all is overhead bridges. It is a fact, I believe, at all events the cases in the Province of Ontario have shown, that in the case of probably one-half of the railway lines the brakemen have no protection from overhead bridges. Take for instance the Midland Railway. The Grand Trunk Railway Company is the lessee of that road, and has escaped the obligation to raise the overhead bridges to the proper height above the tops of the cars by reason of the statute requiring the owner of the bridge to do so. Then again the statute requires the railway company to raise the bridge to its proper height within twelve months after the passing of the Act; but that provision does not meet the case of the Grand Trunk Railway, as lessees of the Midland Railway, because the Grand Trunk acquired that road more than a year after the passing of the Act. Thus we find that a cause of serious injury and sometimes death exists on the great lines of railway in the country, and there is no remedy provided by law. Therefore I think it is a pity that the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill this Session, and the same Bill last Session, is not in the House, because

Mr. TISDALE.

he would have recollected that I drew his attention to this matter last Session in order that he might introduce into the Bill some legislation to meet the serious case I have spoken of. I find that the Bill is also defective in not providing for a sufficient space in the switches. I believe that the Bill provides that they shall be opened three inches. It must be apparent to any hon. gentleman that danger is as likely to result from these switches as now results from frogs. We know how numerous railway employés are at the present time. Our whole country is honeycombed with railroads, and there are necessarily a great many employés, and their occupation is a very dangerous one indeed. Therefore, I think that this Bill, involving as it does such an important matter as the safety of human life, should be taken up by the Government. Let them follow the example set by the Government of the Hon. Oliver Mowat, as they have done on other occasions, and let them take control of and assume all responsibility for this very important measure.

Mr. TISDALE. The General Railway Act regulates all the bridges.

Mr. BARRON. If my hon. friend will take the trouble to read the case of *McLaughlin vs. the Grand Trunk Railway Company*—

Mr. TISDALE. I am not speaking of cases; I am speaking of the law. The hon. gentleman has induced the House to believe that we have no law to regulate the height of overhead bridges; and he is finding fault with this Bill because he claims that it should do that. The General Railway Act provides that bridges must be so built as to be free from danger.

Mr. BARRON. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the General Railway Act does regulate overhead bridges, but unfortunately that Act has been held not to apply to the Grand Trunk Railway as lessee of the Midland, for the reasons I have stated. Thus it was that in a case where the Grand Trunk Company was morally responsible for the loss of a man's life, it escaped that liability by reason of our legislation not being sufficient to meet the case.

Mr. TEMPLE. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has not spoken to a single section of this Bill. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), I think is the only one on that side of the House who has spoken to any section of this Bill. He speaks in favor of having the frogs closed up to a certain extent. I agree with him and with the Bill on that point, and I had that done myself years ago when I was connected with a railroad. With regard to the running boards, I think the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Shanly) is perfectly right. I do not see how you are going to have running boards with all the different cars that are in use. There are thousands of cars passing backward and forward over the international boundary for thousands of miles; and though you might have all the cars in this country built with the running boards in one form, all the cars from the other side of the boundary would have another kind, and these cars are mixed together in almost every train. Therefore, it is a matter of impossibility to make any change in the running boards, and there would be more danger and more loss of life in having different systems of running boards on different cars in one train than there is at the present time. Therefore we should condemn that part of the Bill. With reference to the oiling of the cars, it is done by this system with a great deal of danger, and the system is in fact not practicable, so that it is given up by different railways. You cannot tell by this system whether the lubricator is working or not, and all the machinery may be broken up for the want of oil. There is therefore only one section of this Bill that can be recommended, and I think the best plan would be to refer the whole Bill to a special committee.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I did not understand the hon. member for West Lambton to cast any reflections on the promoter of the Bill for his absence to-night. I understood him simply to say that he regretted it, and I say that I regret it too, because I believe that hon. gentleman has made a special study of the matter, and it would be to our advantage to-night to have the result of his study and information. For that reason and no other, we regret his absence. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) has told us that there were plenty of patents of invention in the patent office to secure everything wanted. I know there are numerous inventions there, but I know also that not one in fifty, in railway matters as in others, is practicable, and the best evidence of this is that they are not adopted for use. It is time that we were doing something in this matter. I was happy to hear that a far higher parliament than this has taken the matter in hand and that we might expect to see the whole thing settled. It is refreshing to know that the highest intellect in the land are considering this matter, and that, when they see fit, they are going to remedy all the evils; but I would simply say they have been a mighty long time about it. Thousands of lives have been lost within the last thirty-five years. In fact not a week passes but we hear of the death, or the wounding, or maiming of some railway employé, yet these demi-gods have been asleep or on a journey all that time, and it is only now, when there is an attempt to do something, they tell us to keep quiet, and that they will soon settle the whole difficulty. I cannot help thinking that it will not do for us to shelter ourselves behind their gigantic intellects. Although our intellects may be limited and our experience small, yet we have a great responsibility resting upon us, and that responsibility becomes the more apparent when we consider who the parties are that require protection. These men whom we desire to protect are the employés of rich and powerful companies; they are men who have not the means nor the influence to protect themselves, they are men who are exposed to the greatest dangers. So well known is this that insurance companies charge the highest premiums to brakemen of any class in the community, and it is a well known fact, established by statisticians, that the average life of a railway brakeman is the shortest of that of any class. It is therefore high time that this House took some action in the matter. Reference has been made to the fact that the Dominion Government has taken over almost all the railway lines in the country. In most of the Provinces, as in Ontario I believe, they have passed laws to protect the employés of railway companies. By the taking over of these railways by the Dominion, these Acts have become inoperative, and it seems strange to me that the Government should have neglected all this time to make some provision for the protection of these people. In view of this fact, I think it is a great pity that the matter was left to be dealt with by private members of the House. It certainly was one with which the Government should have dealt, as they have access to more sources of information than have private members, and it was their duty to deal with the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. The Bill before the House is too important to be dropped, even though the hon. gentleman who proposed it is not here. I am sure he is as much disappointed as any hon. gentleman here can be, having to be absent. I had a conversation with him some time ago about this measure, and I am quite satisfied that some of the amendments suggested by hon. gentlemen were intended to be introduced at the proper stage by the promoter of the Bill. I think there would be a better outcome for the Bill if it were referred to a special committee with power to call witnesses and papers. I do not think any hon. gentleman who has ever given consideration to the question, or

has ever gone into the yards where a large number of cars are standing and seen the narrow spaces men have to travel on in fair weather and foul weather, in daylight and darkness, will fail to admit that in the interest of humanity it is important some change should be made. When we remember that these railway employés are obliged to travel in daylight and darkness on these freight cars, with a very narrow board, in some cases not more than twelve or fourteen inches wide, and often covered with a sheet of ice, and that these narrow spaces on the tops of the cars are not guarded by any railing to which the brakeman can possibly catch on, we cannot wonder that the number of accidents is so large. It is therefore of great importance that we should, if possible, devise some means of removing this evil and saving a large number of lives. One clause of the Bill provides for making the board of a certain width, sufficient to allow a man to pass along conveniently; in addition it provides a railing and also for the running boards coming as close together as practicable, so that men can pass from one car to another without running the risk which they must now run. If there was nothing else in the Bill, it is important that it should become law, but there are other important amendments that could be introduced in the select committee, and that select committee should be enabled to take evidence and to look into the matter more closely. There was another question brought up by hon. gentlemen opposite, and they seemed to hold that it was a drawback in connection with our control over railways in this country, and that is the fact that the Dominion Government has said that certain railways are in the interest of the Dominion, and therefore come under Dominion control. If I understand anything about law, I think that is an advantage to the employés on the roads, because they are passing constantly from one Province to another, and an accident may happen in one Province today and in another Province to-morrow under the old system. That necessitates carrying on the action for damages under different laws. The law in one Province may be different from the law in another. Now, no matter in what Province the accident occurs, the prosecution is always conducted under the same law, and therefore the people are able to understand and to interpret the law and are able to understand the responsibilities of the company and what redress they may have in the event of accidents. I believe it was intended to go further in this law and to provide also for compensation for all accidents to employés on the road no matter from what cause. Some may hold that it would be unwise to make such a provision, but other countries have adopted it and have found it to be not injurious to the railways and to be beneficial to the employés; and I think, remembering the large number of accidents which occur from year to year and the causes of the accidents and remembering the careless indifference which is generally exhibited by railway companies as to the safety of their employés, it becomes all the more important that the Legislatures of the country should take up the subject and pass some such imperative law to compel them to provide for the safety of human life where provision for it can be made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have listened with very great attention to the very interesting and important discussion we have had. I am quite certain it would be very difficult to find any question which would appeal more to the feelings of members on both sides of the House than this, which is a matter of vast importance. I regret exceedingly that the promoter of this Bill is not present. The very fact that he has from time to time moved in it shows that his attention has been drawn to it, and that he has given it a very considerable amount of consideration, but I am certain that every member of the House must have been very much impressed with the very practical observations

made by the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Shanly). It is a great advantage to this House, when questions of this kind come up, to have gentlemen whose profession has directed their attention to matters of this importance, and whose great ability is recognised throughout the country as fitting them to give advice to the House on questions of such transcendent interest. I feel the force of what has been said by several members on both sides of the House as to the great responsibility that must necessarily devolve upon the Government in relation to a matter of this kind affecting the safety of human life and the prevention of a great number of very deplorable accidents, and, I think, under the circumstances, in the absence of the promoter of this measure, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Railways has an important Bill on the paper, which I trust his restored health will enable him in a short time to present for consideration, the best course to take would perhaps be to adjourn the debate, and allow the question to rest on that adjournment until the railway measure for which the Government is responsible is laid before the House. Then this Bill can be brought forward, and gentlemen who have taken an interest in it, who have investigated the subject, and who may be prepared to offer valuable suggestions, will have the opportunity of presenting those views, and we would be in that way enabled to incorporate any feature of this Bill or any suggestion, having in view the attaining of the important object at which this Bill aims, in the Bill for which the Government is responsible. I trust, therefore, I shall meet with the approval of gentlemen on both sides of the House if, with that object, I move the adjournment of this debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

AID TO WRECKED VESSELS BILL.

Mr. HAGGART (for Mr. KIRKPATRICK) moved second reading of Bill (No. 7) to permit American vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters. He said: The object of this Bill, as I understand, is to give similar privileges to American wrecking vessels to those which are allowed us on the other side. I believe legislation has been passed in the United States which allows our vessels to assist wrecked vessels in United States waters on condition that similar legislation is passed in our country which will allow American wrecking vessels to enjoy similar privileges.

An hon. MEMBER. Reciprocity, is it?

Mr. HAGGART. True reciprocity.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry that the mover of this Bill is not present. It is a Bill of very great importance, and one which, I think, ought not to be proceeded with by the House on the very brief statement of the hon. gentleman who has been kind enough to move it in the absence of the hon. gentleman who is responsible for it. The measure is one of great public importance, which I think should not be hastily or summarily dealt with. The question has been before the House, it has been made the subject of a good deal of diplomatic intercourse between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada. A measure somewhat similar to this has, I think, been put on the Statute-book of the United States, providing that, in a certain contingency, there should be reciprocity in regard to this matter. It is very well known that the Government of Canada have for a very long period been extremely anxious to expand that reciprocal action between the Government of the United States and the Government of this country, and to place it upon a very broad basis in connection with the coasting trade. A standing offer, as the House is well aware, is upon our Statute-book inviting the reciprocal action of other countries, and a number of countries have taken advantage

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

of it. We stand in the position that we are quite prepared to offer the great advantages of the enormous coast which we possess and the very valuable coasting trade of Canada to any country in the world which is prepared to give to Canada the like privileges in its waters. I hope the time will come when the great country to the south of us will be prepared to meet us on that question, and when we shall have an opportunity of registering Canadian built vessels in the United States of America and giving similar privileges to vessels built in the United States to have registry in Canada, and that under the same arrangement vessels under the flag of the United States will have the same coasting privileges that our own vessels have, while we on the shores of the United States will enjoy the same privileges which we are prepared to extend to them. I think, Sir, under these circumstances, we have reason to look forward to a much larger measure of reciprocity than the limited one involved in this question of wrecking. But apart altogether from the general question of reciprocal trade between the United States and Canada, there is the coasting trade of the inland waters. I believe it is very well known that the Government of Canada have again and again proposed to the Government of the United States, that if they were not prepared, on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of the two countries, to have mutual reciprocity in coasting, we have invited them to have reciprocal action in regard to the coasting trade of inland waters; and reciprocal action in regard to the coasting trade of the great lakes and the inland waters, would at once dispose of all the difficulties connected with this question of wrecking. I did not intend to offer a single remark upon this subject until I had heard what was to be said by the advocates and the opponents on this measure, if it has any opponents; but I could not allow the second reading of this Bill to pass accompanied only by the few observations of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) who was not responsible for the Bill. I, therefore, rose simply to prevent the question being put to the House until we could have an opportunity of hearing what was to be said for and against this measure. Therefore, if it is intended to proceed with the Bill, as the promoter of the measure is now in his place, I would like to be allowed to rest my observations at this point, until I hear what that hon. gentleman has to say in regard to this question.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I am sorry I was not present to relieve my hon. friend of the duty of moving the second reading of this Bill. I intended to listen to what was to be said by hon. gentlemen, and to offer some remarks at the close of the debate; but as the Finance Minister has asked me now to explain the object of this Bill, I shall take the opportunity of doing so. The Bill, Sir, is a very simple one in form, but it is far reaching in the principle it involves. The question of reciprocity of wrecking is one which interest a very large number of our citizens. When I tell the House that the number of vessels navigating the inland waters of Canada is upwards of 4,000, that there are 35,000 seamen employed on those vessels, and that the capital invested in our inland marine amounts to many millions of dollars, the House will perceive the great importance of the subject dealt with by this Bill. The question of preventing vessels, either American or Canadian, from assisting others which may be stranded, or in distress, or wrecked in the waters of either country, seems to have been of somewhat recent date. I believe it is only within a few years that any attempt was made to prevent Canadian vessels from rendering assistance to American vessels or Canadian vessels in American waters, and *vice versa*. In 1842, the question of the free navigation of the inland waters was dealt with by the Ashburton Treaty, as stated by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) the other day; but I do not think that treaty gives the

right to aid vessels wrecked or distressed. It does not give that right explicitly, and it is only the common law of humanity which would compel us to claim that right. But the customs law as enforced now, distinctly says that American vessels cannot afford assistance to Canadian vessels or American vessels in Canadian waters. The law was so interpreted by the late Government in 1878, and the then Minister of Customs issued a circular to all the custom houses informing them that American vessels were not to be allowed to render assistance to vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters, and that if any American vessels did so, they were liable to be seized. In consequence of that circular some American vessels rendering assistance to vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters were seized, and now application has always to be made to the customs authority for permission. The hon. Minister of Customs stated the other day that such permission was never refused if it was shown that no Canadian tug or Canadian wrecking vessel could go to their assistance. But, Sir, I submit that before that information can be obtained, before it can be ascertained whether there are any Canadian tugs that can go to the assistance of a vessel in distress, great injury to life and property may occur, and the critical moment may have passed when assistance could be of any avail. The American Government seeing this, and having such a large number of vessels—because American vessels far outnumber Canadian vessels on our inland waters—desirous of having reciprocity in this matter, they passed a Bill in 1878, declaring that Canadian vessels of all description :

“ May render aid or assistance to Canadian or other vessels wrecked or disabled in the waters of the United States contiguous to the Dominion of Canada, provided that this Act shall not take effect until proclamation by the President declaring that the privilege of aiding American or other vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters contiguous to the United States, has been extended by the Government of the Dominion of Canada, and declaring this Act to be in force.”

Now, Sir, that Act has remained on the Statute-book of the United States ever since 1878, and no action has been taken by this Government. An opportunity now offers for us to put in force the principle which was recognised by both sides in this House; the other day, one side asking for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States in everything. If they ask for unrestricted reciprocity, surely hon. gentlemen will be glad to take partial reciprocity as a means towards that end. Every hon. gentleman, I take it, on that side of the House who voted for unrestricted reciprocity, will be prepared to vote for this very important measure of partial reciprocity. Those hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who voted for a resolution declaring that they always have been in favor, and were still in favor, of reciprocity with the United States, provided it did not interfere with the National Policy, must, I think, favor this Bill also; because the National Policy is not in any way affected by this Bill. In fact it helps the National Policy. The National Policy was adopted for the purpose of fostering the shipping industry, among others, that large interest which we want to develop and strengthen; and everything that would tend to the prosperity of that interest ought to receive favor at the hands of the friends of the National Policy. We find all the shipping men of the country in favor of a measure which will render them assistance and help to protect their property when in jeopardy. The insurance men, who derive a large income from our marine interest, are all in favor of this measure. Every facility should be given to parties who will invest money in wrecking appliances and in bringing, as quickly as possible, wrecking vessels to the aid of vessels in distress. I think, therefore, both sides of the House should favor this motion. I said that this stipulation or restriction upon the right of common humanity to render assistance to vessels in distress and to save life and property was first passed by the

late Government. I have here a copy of the instruction issued, and I will read it. It is a circular issued on 8th March, 1878, addressed by the Commissioner of Customs to collectors of customs throughout the country, and is as follows:—

“ SIR,—I am now instructed by the Minister of Customs to call your attention to the bearing of the customs law upon the treatment of wrecked vessels or property in Canadian waters, which provides in effect that no vessel, foreign or Canadian, has legal right to interfere with vessels or material in Canadian waters, unless permitted by the collector of customs at the nearest port after reporting to him. And no foreign vessel should receive such permission, as it is contrary to customs law, and should be placed under detention in case of violation.”

I can hardly believe the statement I read in some of the papers published from the Secretary of State at Washington, alleging that actually where an American tug went to an American vessel and removed the frozen bodies of the captain's wife and others from the wreck and saved part of the cargo she was actually fined for rendering such assistance.

Mr. CHARLTON. What case was that?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. That was the case of the *Augustus Ford* driven ashore near Grand River in November, 1874. The vessel *Bryant* which was passing near the place at the time took off the frozen dead bodies of the captain's wife and others and saved part of the cargo of the wrecked vessel, and was fined for doing so. It is true that part of the fine was remitted afterwards, but the fact remains that for rendering that service in the hour of distress an American vessel was actually subjected to the laws of this country and was fined. It is hard to believe that there should be such a want of common humanity and neighborly feeling between these two countries as to permit such a thing to be possible. I hope now that the United States has shown a desire to have reciprocal action in this matter, that she has held out the hand of neighborly good feeling, we will have a similar law placed on our Statute-book to that in the United States. It has been objected that we would be giving away a great deal by doing so, that we should insist upon some other reciprocal right being given to us, for instance, that of the free navigation laws or the free right of towage. But if the United States will not give us this, let us not insist in dragging in something not germane to the subject and which will destroy its whole effect. Let us in the cause of common humanity, as they term it, provide that the first person that shall come to the aid of life and property in distress shall have the right to do so. It has been stated a large portion of the wrecks are in Canadian waters. I hold in my hand a statement which disproves it, a statement of the wrecks of last year, and it will astonish hon. members. I am sure, to know that last year there were 204 lives lost in our inland waters, and not less than \$2,500,000 worth of property was destroyed; the total losses comprise 73 vessels, representing over 20,000 tons. Out of those 73 vessels which became a total loss only 11 were lost in Canadian waters. We have been told that the reason for enforcing the customs law was that the wrecks were in American waters as four or five to one; but here is this statement that of 73 vessels that proved a total loss only 11 were wrecked in Canadian waters, and of 100 vessels that were a partial loss only 12 were in Canadian waters. This shows that we will not be giving up a great right for the benefit of Americans. We are opening up to our own wreckers and those who have wrecking vessels and appliances a large territory in which to ply their vocation. Moreover, it must be remembered that of those vessels which are navigating the lakes the largest and most valuable of them are American vessels, and they ply more especially in American waters. The wrecks that are most valuable to the wrecking companies are American vessels and the greatest losses are in American waters. I contend, therefore, that it would be a distinct advantage to our Canadian

wrecking companies and wreckers if we had in this matter a reciprocal right of free wrecking.

Mr. COOK. What proportion of the mercantile marine of the great lakes belongs to Canada ?

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. A very small proportion at present. Out of four thousand vessels a very large proportion are American, and they are the most valuable. But I may tell the hon. gentleman that I have good reason to believe that this is going to be rapidly changed, owing to the opening up of our North-West, and the large crop of wheat which is coming down to Fort William and Port Arthur, to be shipped from those ports either to the St. Lawrence or by Buffalo to New York, which will require Canadian vessels to bring it to the St. Lawrence. That has caused a great demand for Canadian tonnage, and to-day we know there are two large vessels coming from England across the Atlantic to be employed in this grain trade. Mr. Marks, of Port Arthur, and Messrs. Crandall & Grasset of Toronto, have each ordered a large steam vessel of over two thousand tons burthen, and these are only the forerunners of the large fleet that will be required to carry the grain crop from Port Arthur and Fort William. In a very few years the Canadian tonnage will bear a very fair proportion to that of the United States, but at present American tonnage is much larger and altogether out of proportion to Canadian tonnage. When the Americans not only offer reciprocal wrecking to us but press it upon us, and in the despatches received from Washington which have been printed and brought down in the papers, it appears they express a very great desire that the common right of humanity, as they express it, should be accorded by this Government and we should have free wrecking, and that the right to render assistance to life and property when in distress should be as free as the air we breathe or the sunlight. If the House will give the Bill a second reading, when it comes up next week I will propose that some changes can be made which shall make it applicable to all the points that may be raised. It now does not provide, I think, sufficiently to meet the wants of the case, but I would prefer to make those amendments later on and I hope the House will give it a second reading.

Mr. SHANLY. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance just now referred to this Bill as limited in its scope. It certainly is very limited, but the cases for which it is proposed to provide are almost certain to be of a very urgent character indeed. When our house happens to be on fire we do not generally ask where the firemen came from with their engine before we allow them to couple on the hose. Therefore I hope when the matter comes up for debate again the Government will not ask that this Bill should be postponed, until a larger scope of reciprocity in other cases will be decided upon.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Bill receives its second reading, if it does receive its second reading, I desire to address a few remarks to the House in connection with the consideration of this question. Reciprocity in wrecking is rather a captivating term, and upon the surface it would seem that the proposal made by the American Government in their statutory offer of 1878 that there should be reciprocity in wrecking between the two countries was a reasonable proposal. But I think, Sir, when we examine into the question a little deeper, that facts will present themselves for the consideration of the House which are not apparent on the surface of the question. We have a very skilful use made of the humanity cry, and I shall be able to show a little later on that the course of the Canadian Government in that respect cannot be called into question at all, and that the action of this Government has been invariably humane in every case of emergency. In every case where

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

there was danger of loss of life or danger of loss of property that could be averted by prompt action, the Canadian customs authorities have always promptly granted a permit for American vessels to act. I will come to that more fully later on. This policy of restriction, with regard to wrecking upon the coasts of our great lakes, whether right or wrong, is a policy that was not inaugurated by this Government, but it was inaugurated by the American Government. They initiated the orders of which my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) complains, and our Government was simply forced, in self defence, to issue orders of the same character protecting our own interests from the attack made by this order of the American Treasury Department. This course, Sir, which was rendered necessary by American action happens to have proved to be a course which has redounded very largely to the advantage of Canada, and in consequence of that fact we have the American Government applying to us through its statutory offer of 1878, and making applications in various ways, to induce us to give reciprocity in wrecking. They are going back on their own action, retracing their steps and asking us in point of fact to enter into an arrangement that would give them nearly the whole business, which I shall proceed to show later on. The way the thing has worked has been this: It is true as my hon. friend says that the greater part of the tonnage on the lakes is American tonnage; it is also true as is shown by the report made by Mr. Lewis (which unfortunately was lost between some two departments of this Government, and never was published and which is alluded to only in the records) that up to that time a large portion of the wrecks on the great lakes had taken place on Canadian coasts. It is this fact that leads the American Government, the American shipowners, the American insurance companies and wrecking companies to desire the alteration which my friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) also desires should be made in reference to this policy. The hon. gentleman tells us that surely if we cannot get all we want in unrestricted reciprocity it would be a good thing to take a little. Well, that depends entirely upon the circumstances of the case. If that little is something entirely to our disadvantage I am not in favor of taking it. If I may be permitted to refer to the matter, I may say that the hon. gentleman referred to the little we took the other day in the shape of the admission of trees and fruits and so forth. So far as I am concerned I think we took that little with rather a bad grace, and had it not been for the unfortunate offer which we had made which forced us into rather an unfortunate position and rendered it expedient to take these, I think that most of the members of this House would not have taken that small measure of reciprocity we took the other day. I am not much in favor of taking another dose of the same kind when the circumstances are so much different. Now, the business of wrecking pertains to the coasting trade. Wrecking is an incident of that trade. We have upon our Statute-book an offer, which is also a statutory offer, made in the year 1870—eight years before the American offer was made—which is contained in chap. 14, 33 Vic., sec. 2, and in that section we extend to the Americans this offer. The statute goes on to make provisions with regard to the coasting trade, prohibiting in the first section any but British vessels carrying passengers or freight from one port on our coast to another. The second section contains this offer:

“The Governor in Council may, from time to time, declare that the foregoing provisions of this Act shall not, while such Order in Council is in force, apply to the ships or vessels of any foreign country in which British ships are admitted to the coasting trade of such country and to carry goods and passengers, from any port in such country to another, and may, from time to time, revoke or alter such Order in Council.”

As I said, wrecking is an incident in the coasting trade, and I am not in favor of allowing the American people or

Government to select that particular incident of the trade, in which reciprocity will be a great advantage to them, and drop all the rest where reciprocity in trade may be of some advantage to us. If they desire reciprocity on the great lakes let them give us reciprocity in the coasting trade as well, of which wrecking is an incident, but to allow them to select this one thing in which we had the advantage over them—an advantage acquired by their own act, for their own act forced upon us the course that we took, and which resulted to our advantage—would not be fair. If they desire that incident of the coasting trade let them open the whole question as to trade on the waters of the great lakes.

Now, Sir, with regard to the orders issued by the Customs Department in this country, and with regard to the assertion that the policy pursued by this Government has been an inhuman one, and one not characteristic of the spirit of this age of civilisation, I wish to point out what those regulations have been. I have here Vol. No. 9 of the Sessional Papers of the year 1880-81. This subject of wrecking had been made a subject of communication between the Governments at that time, and Sessional Paper No. 50 of this volume contains the correspondence in relation to that matter. I have selected from this correspondence some portions which will clearly show in what spirit our Government had treated this question. The first paper is the copy of a report of the Committee of the Honorable the Privy Council for Canada, approved by His Excellency on the 6th of June, 1879:

"The Committee have had under consideration a despatch from Her Majesty's Minister at Washington to Your Excellency of 18th December last, and enclosures, relating to the regulations in force on the lake coast of Canada, respecting the treatment of wrecked vessels and property in Canadian waters.

"The Honorable the Minister of Customs, to whom the above mentioned despatch and enclosures were referred, reports that the question appears to be misunderstood by the authorities at Washington, owing, he believes, to the fact that the action of the Customs Department has been presented to them not only in an exaggerated but a very erroneous light.

"That as it respects the Department circular of 8th March, 1878, a copy of which he submits, it was, he states, addressed to collectors of customs only, and was intended to remind them of the proper bearing of customs law upon wrecked property actually stranded upon the Canadian shores, and this they thoroughly understood. That no Canadian officer ever interpreted the circular or the law, as justifying interference with the efforts of vessels of any nationality to succor any vessel in distress and save human life or property, while there was a possibility of preventing their loss, nor has any case of such interference ever occurred.

"That in the matter of the steam tug *Sarah Bryant*, wrecked in November, 1874, alluded to by Mr. Everts, it is plain that the circular could have had no influence upon the officers concerned, as it was not issued until about 3½ years after the occurrence, and that the assertion made by the master of the *Bryant* that he took off the frozen dead bodies of the captain's wife and others is not justified by facts, there being living witnesses and documentary evidence, of the most unquestionable character, to prove that the living and the dead were taken from the wreck by a Canadian boat's crew, before the tug arrived at the scene of the disaster. The correspondence upon which point he also submits.

"That in the case of the *Champion* it has been freely admitted that the officer who seized her, did so under a mistaken impression as to the nature of the Act, and that he was simply, as he supposed, enforcing the law prohibiting foreign vessels from towing in Canadian waters. That this description of work has never been allowed by the United States Customs to Canadian vessels in their waters. That the vessel, however, was not detained an hour, and the only inconvenience suffered was leaving a deposit for a short time with the collector of customs of the sum of \$400, which was promptly returned as soon as the Commissioner of Customs became acquainted with the facts of the case.

"That the desire of the Government of Canada has always been, and still is, to effect a mutual arrangement by which the coasting laws might be so ameliorated on both sides, as to enable them to dispense entirely with the present unpleasant and inconvenient restrictions upon the movements of the vessels of either nation, but that in the meantime the laws must be respected, and while the claims of humanity have been, and always will be, duly recognised, it is the special duty of the Department of Customs to protect the rights and interests of the Canadian commercial marine against the encroachments of all parties.

"That the Government of Canada is not only willing but anxious that the most liberal interpretation shall be given to laws relating to the navigation of the inland lakes and rivers, and are ready to enter into negotiations with the Government of the United States, with the view to the adoption of a more liberal policy in this respect, but that they

cannot consent to any measure which would give United States ship owners privileges in Canadian waters not secured in equal proportion to Canadian ship owners in United States waters, nor can any partial system of reciprocity be accepted, which in its practical operation would favor the latter at the expense of the former."

That is exactly what is asked here, a particular system of reciprocity that will favor the United States at the expense of Canada; that is the partial application of the system of reciprocity that is asked by my hon. friend. Then, we have in a circular (No. 231) the following addressed to the collector of Customs:—

"CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT,
"OTTAWA, 19th September, 1879.

"SIR,—Referring to the departmental circular No. 210—3, of 5th of March, 1878, on the subject of wrecking by foreign vessels in Canadian waters, I am desired, by the Minister of Customs, to inform you that the circular is not to be understood as having any application to cases wherein life may be endangered, or where property may be jeopardised by delay, such, for instance, as the grounding of a vessel in circumstances in which immediate assistance would prevent a wreck. Nor is there any possible case in which vessels of any nationality should be prevented from going to the rescue of persons in peril of their lives, or of vessels in danger of being lost.

"You will understand the terms 'wrecked vessels or property in Canadian waters' as referring to vessels and cargoes cast upon the Canadian shores, and stranded or wrecked requiring apparatus for their removal or discharge of cargo into other vessels, and to goods which may have been discharged or floated off therefrom and cast upon the coast, and in either case coming within the provisions of the revenue laws.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"J. JOHNSON."

In reply to this we have the following from the State Department at Washington, dated 2nd October, 1879:—

"SIR,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 30th ult, transmitting a copy of circular issued by the Customs Department of Canada, defining the terms of circular No. 210, of 5th March, 1878, in relation to wrecking by foreign vessels in Canadian waters, and to express to you the gratification with which this Government has learned of this measure of relief.

"I have, &c.,

"W. HUNTER,

"Acting Secretary.

"The Right Honorable

"Sir E. THORNTON, K.C.B., &c., &c."

So that we see that the character of the interpretation by the Customs Department of their regulation was satisfactory to the authorities at Washington. Then we have, in the foregoing Minute of Council, the actual facts regarding the tug *Sarah Bryant*, referred to by my hon. friend, from which it appears that the dead bodies were removed from the wreck at the mouth of Grand River by a Canadian boat's crew before the tug *Bryant* arrived at the scene of the disaster, and that the allegations are without foundation. Now, I have here some other documents to show the nature of the charges made against the customs authorities of Canada. Here is one, referring to the case of the *Jane McCloud*, addressed by Hon. Wm. M. Everts to Sir E. Thornton on the 3rd of February, 1880:

"The case of the *Jane McCloud* is, in particular, notable. That schooner went ashore at the mouth of the Six Mile Creek, near Wilson, on the morning of 2nd November last, and was towed off by a Canadian tug, which later was not only not detained and heavily fined, but was permitted to accomplish her humane work without her name being even ascertained. I need scarcely advert to the treatment which an American tug might, under similar circumstances, have met with in the waters of the Dominion, inasmuch as past correspondence has served to familiarise both of us with the aspect of the subject, and to make clear the difficulty which in such a case might attend the exercise of the discretionary power of deciding whether life or property was or was not imminently endangered within the meaning of the recent explanatory circular of the Dominion Government."

In reply to this we have this communication contained in a copy of a report of a Committee of the Honorable Privy Council on the 19th November, 1880:

"The communication of Mr. Everts to Sir Edward Thornton, of the 3rd February, refers to former correspondence on the same subject, and transmits for Sir Edward's information a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the United States Treasury, with reports from the customs officers of the United States stationed at Wilson and Olcott, in the

district of Suspension Bridge, in the State of New York, relative to the cases of certain Canadian vessels which went ashore on United States coast of Lake Ontario during the month of November, A. D. 1879, and to the assistance rendered on those occasions by Canadian tug boats, calling special attention to the case of the *Jane McCloud*, which went ashore on the 2nd November, 1879, at Six Mile Creek, in the State of New York, and was towed off by a Canadian tug boat without, 'Mr. Ewatts observes,' the tug boat being detained or heavily fined by the authorities, but permitted to accomplish her humane work without her name or nationality being ascertained.

"The Minister submits that the aid in this case afforded to the vessel in distress without the nationality of the tug boat which accomplished the 'humane work' being enquired into, was an act which, if performed by a United States tug boat towards a vessel in like distress on the Canadian coast, would be treated in the same manner and with the same consideration as was shown on the occasion referred to by the custom house officers of the United States.

"The Minister observes that the cases of Canadian schooners, *Gold Hunter* and *Wave Crest* sunk in harbor of Oldcott seem, from the statement of the deputy collector of Oldcott, to have been substantially as follows:—These vessels having been sunk were respectively raised and floated without any assistance having been rendered by Canadian tug boats, but they were afterwards towed to ports in Canada by Canadian tug boats, towing in this character being by usage a recognised right of vessels of either nationality, being quite consistent with the coasting regulations both of the United States and Canada."

So much for those charges. Upon examining into them, we find they are without foundation. Then a very serious charge was preferred in the case of a raft of 2,000,000 feet of timber in the tow of the tug *John Owens* which was driven ashore on a point below Pelee Island. Representations were made to the Department of State that this raft was in imminent peril, that the American tug having it in tow was not allowed to do anything for the relief of the raft, that other American tugs were not permitted to engage in the work of relief, and that the raft lay in a position of imminent peril for thirty hours before aid could be obtained. We have a communication from the State Department to the Canadian authorities on the subject, dated 13th June, 1879. I will not take the time to read it, but will show that the charge was entirely without foundation. In the first place, the assertion that a timber raft would be in imminent danger after going ashore was preposterous. It would make no difference in danger to the raft whether it lay there thirty hours or thirty days, and there could have been no emergency or danger of loss of life on that score. But in a report by the hon. the Minister of Customs, of November 7th, 1879, contained in a report of the Committee of the Privy Council of November 12th, 1879, the following facts are set forth:—

"First, that the raft was actually in the condition of being towed by the two United States tugs above named at the time it was injured.

"Second, that the cause of the injury was a heavy storm which prevailed, combined with the fact that the two United States steam tugs exerted too much force in endeavoring to prevent the raft from being driven on shore by such storm, the consequence was that the raft was torn to pieces by the said tugs.

"Third, that no Canadian officials refused to allow any United States tugs to proceed to the assistance of the raft.

"Fourth, that no application was ever made to any custom house officer in Canada for permission to allow any United States vessel to give assistance in the case, and that at the date of the occurrence there was no Canadian custom officer located on Pelee Island.

"Fifth, that the masters of the tugs *John Owens* and *Kate Williams* submitted that they were not interfered with, and that Mr. S. P. Bliss, the owner of the raft was not only no party to the complaint, but repudiates the idea of his knowing any complaint or cause of complaint against Canadian customs officials in that case."

That was all there was of that case. Then we had another very serious complaint, in the matter of the seizure of the American tug *Relief* with a raft in tow, by the Canadian tug *Prince Alfred*, and it was asserted she was seized in American waters nearer the American shore than the Canadian, at the head of the River St. Clair. When that complaint was examined, it was found the tug *Relief* had gone contrary to law to a Canadian harbor without reporting at any Canadian port, and had taken a raft of timber at Georgian Bay, and was trying to escape the payment of export dues and of timber dues. She was seized in consequence of contravention of the Canadian law. When we

Mr. CHARLTON,

examine the charges against the Canadian Government, they prove in all these cases to be entirely baseless, and I repeat the Canadian customs authorities have dealt with this question in a broad humane spirit from first to last, and that the American Government and vessel owners have no cause of complaint against us. The system is one inaugurated by themselves, and which we have simply followed; and the regulations of the Customs Department, at Ottawa, throughout have been of a character to compare most favorably with the conduct of the American Government, as I will proceed to show.

I have here the Executive Document No. 204, 50th Congress, 1st Session, which contains the correspondence with regard to the wreck of the *Algoma*, and the application of the manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for permission to use their own plant in rescuing that steamer, and which shows the course pursued by the American authorities in reference to that matter. The case was briefly this: The *Algoma* was wrecked upon Greenstone Island, near Isle Royale, during a snowstorm in November, 1885. The manager of the line, Mr. Beatty, of Port Arthur, applied to the proper Department at Washington for permission to send for the plant belonging to the owners of the boat, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to rescue the boat. The tugs of the company were sent to recover the dead bodies and the purser's safe; but they were not permitted to pursue their work. Then formal application was made for permission to use the company's wrecking plant, and the fact was set forth in the application that Duluth was 200 miles distant while Port Arthur, where the company's plant lay, was but 50 miles distant and almost within sight. The correspondence then shows that the Duluth collector informed the authorities at Washington that there were no means procurable on Lake Superior, within American jurisdiction, for the performance of this work, and after a correspondence extending over a number of months, the Canadian Pacific Railway were finally compelled with their own plant in sight of the wreck, to go, not only to a distant point, but to go beyond Lake Superior to the other end of Lake Huron, to the city of Port Huron, Michigan, to get plant. There cannot be a case pointed out in the history of the Customs of Canada in which so rigid an interpretation of the law has been insisted on, and the owners of wrecked property compelled to go such a distance to obtain relief, when relief from the other side was near at hand. I shall read a report on the correspondence because it places our own Department of Customs in the most favorable light in contrast with the Department at Washington. The first letter is from Mr. Henry Beatty, manager of the traffic lines:

"TORONTO, 27th November, 1885.

"DEAR SIR,—Upon the morning of the 7th November, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's steamship *Algoma* was wrecked upon Greenstone Island, off Isle Royale, Lake Superior. The survivors were brought into Port Arthur the evening of the 9th, and it became necessary to take immediate steps to secure the mail, the purser's and ship's books and papers, and the bodies of the drowned. It was impossible to make arrangements for American tugs, and I, therefore, ordered the company's tug *Liskieut* to the scene of the wreck, with instructions to spare no pains to find all the bodies possible and return with them to Port Arthur. I also telegraphed my chief clerk in Port Arthur to be particularly careful to do nothing to contravene the United States Customs regulations. The tug returned on the morning of the 22nd, having succeeded in finding four of the bodies. I am anxious to make arrangements to raise the boilers, machinery and such cargo as may be secured, consisting of steel rails, bridge material, &c., early in the spring. Will you be good enough to let me know if boats belonging to this company may be employed, or, failing this, if I may arrange for boats belonging to Port Arthur which may be suitable. I desire, of course, to secure what remained of the vessel worth saving at as little expense as possible, and shall feel extremely obliged if you can consistently with existing regulations, favor me with the necessary information.

"Yours obediently,

"HENRY BEATTY,

"Manager Lake Traffic.

"HON. DAN. MANNING,

"Secretary of the Treasury."

Here is the reply from the commissioner, Mr. Patten :

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,
"WASHINGTON, D. O., 11th December, 1885.

"DEAR SIR,—This office received on the 9th instant, by reference from the Secretary of the Treasury, your letter of the 27th ultimo, relative to the wrecked steamship *Algoma*, and the employment of certain vessels to raise the boilers, machinery, cargo, &c.

"As an answer to your enquiry whether the tugs of your company and boats belonging to Port Arthur, which are suitable, may be employed in the business, I transmit, herewith, a copy of a letter dated the 4th instant, addressed to the collector of customs at Duluth, instructing him in regard to the matter.

"It is suggested that you communicate with him on the subject.
"Very respectfully.

"JARVIS PATTEN,
"Commissioner.

"HENRY BEATTY, ESQ.,
"Toronto, Canada."

Here is the communication to the collector :

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,
"WASHINGTON, D. C., 4th December, 1885.

"SIR,—This office is in receipt of your letter dated the 24th ultimo, stating that you have noticed that two or three Canadian tugs from Port Arthur have been engaged about the wreck of the steamship *Algoma* in picking up bodies, &c., and enquiring if vessels have the right to collect the cargo, and what action shall be taken by you in regard to the matter.

"No authority of law exists under which they can pursue their business in waters of the United States, and the masters or the persons employing the vessels should be advised accordingly.

"It is understood that, in this case, the tugs were employed in the first instance by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

"A notice from you to Manager Beatty, of said company, that the employment of the vessels is not in accordance with the regulations upon the subject, would probably serve to cause the persons responsible for the vessels to refrain from any violation of the law.

"Please give him notice without delay, and take such other measures as on further investigation you may find to be necessary in the premises"

"Yours respectfully,

"JARVIS PATTEN,
"Commissioner.

"COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS,
"Duluth, Minn."

Then we have, following this, a letter from Mr. Beatty, dated the 14th December, addressed to Jarvis Patten, commissioner, making further application with regard to the desire to obtain permission to use Canadian wrecking plant, and in reply to that on 16th December, we have another letter from Jarvis Patten, refusing the application. Then, on the 18th February, we have a letter from Mr. W. C. Van Horne, to which I call particular attention, because Mr. Van Horne relates instances where the Canadian Government have permitted the use of American vessels in the case of wrecked vessels in Canadian waters :

"CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY Co.,
"MONTREAL, 18th February, 1886.

"SIR,—I beg to inform you that on the 7th November last the steamship *Algoma*, belonging to this company, and laden largely with steel rails and fish plates, the property of the company, was wrecked on Greenstone Island, near the eastern extremity of Isle Royale, in Lake Superior. The wreck lies in such a position that the engines and other valuable parts of the steamship may be recovered, as well as the rails and splices above mentioned. The nearest American port from which tugs and wrecking outfit can be obtained is Duluth, about 200 miles distant from the wreck, while this company has tugs and wrecking outfit of its own at Port Arthur, only 50 miles from the wreck, and almost within sight of it. I beg, therefore, to ask permission to use the tugs and appliances of the company in recovering its property from the wreck; and in doing so I would respectfully direct your attention to the fact that in numerous instances permission has been accorded by the Canadian Government to use American tugs and outfit, among which the following comparatively recent cases may be recited :—

"May 22, 1883, schooner *Ellsworth*, ashore near Sarnia, was permitted to use American tugs.

"September 12, 1883, schooner *Winslow*, ashore near Point Edward, was permitted to use American tugs.

"October 18, 1883, International Wrecking Company were permitted to use American tugs at Southampton.

"November 13, 1883, International Wrecking Company were permitted to use the American tugs *Balize* and *Smith*, wrecking at Southampton.

"November 22, 1883, schooner *Carter*, ashore near Kincairdine, was permitted to use American tugs.

"May 7, 1884, American tug *Smith*, with wrecking outfit, was permitted to work at the wreck of the steamer *Manitoba* at Southampton, and schooner *Carter* at Kincairdine.

"April 9, 1885, permission was given to American scow, with wrecking outfit, to raise the tug *Heron*, sunk in Georgian Bay.

"March 18, 1885, permission was given to one J. Donnelly to use American tools, &c., in relieving propeller *Owen Sound*, above Sault Ste. Marie, in Canadian waters.

"May 30, 1885, permission was given to J. Donnelly to use United States tugs to relieve the *City of Owen Sound*, above Sault Ste. Marie.

"October 10, 1885, permission was given to the steam barge *J. H. Fairwell* to relieve the schooner *Godfrey*, ashore at Stag Island.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"W. O. VAN HORN,

"Vice-President.

"HON. DANIEL MANNING,
"Secretary of the Treasury of the U.S.,
"Washington, D.C."

Now, Mr. Van Horne cites these numerous instances, among many others which he might have cited, where the Canadian Government had allowed the use of American wrecking plant, American tugs and American lighters, to relieve vessels which were ashore on the Canadian coast, and yet we have the refusal of the American Government to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to use its own plant 50 miles distant to relieve its own vessel. We find it was driven, not to Duluth, 200 miles away, but to Port Huron, 600 miles away, to get the plant to relieve that wreck. On the 19th April, 1886, the following communication was sent to the Collector of Customs at Duluth, from Jarvis Patten, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Navigation at Washington :—

"SIR,—This office is in receipt of your letter dated the 13th inst., transmitting a communication from the United States' consul at Winnipeg relative to an application by George A. Priest, in which he requests permission to use certain wrecking plant owned in Canada, in raising railroad iron and machinery from the wreck of the steamer *Algoma*, now lying on Isle Royale. You are doubtless aware that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made a similar application, and that special exception in its favor to the regulations upon the subject was not authorized. This office is not advised whether reasonable facilities can be obtained at your port or elsewhere in the vicinity, in the United States, for doing the work. Where such facilities exist, it has been the practice to require their use in ordinary cases. It does not appear, therefore, that any special additional instructions to you in regard to the matter are now necessary. In this connection, reference is made to the communication addressed to you on the 4th of December last relating to the vessel.

"Respectfully yours,

"JARVIS PATTEN,

"Commissioner."

Then we have Mr. Patten's letter to Mr. Van Horne :

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION,
"WASHINGTON, D.C., 28th April, 1886.

"SIR,—This office received on the 26th instant your letter dated the 18th of February last, relative to the use of certain wrecking material in the case of the steamship *Algoma*. The matter has been considered by the Acting Secretary. It does not appear, however, that, as the regulations now are, special instructions can well be given to the collector of the district in which the vessel lies. A copy of your communication has been forwarded to him, for such action as may be requisite under the general regulations upon the subject.

"Respectfully yours,

"JARVIS PATTEN,

"Commissioner.

"W. O. VAN HORN, ESQ.,
"Vice-President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company,
"Montreal, Canada."

Then we have this communication from the collector at Duluth to Mr. Patten, the Commissioner of Navigation, on the 24th May, 1886, and I call particular attention to this communication :

"SIR,—In reply to yours of 19th instant, relating to the wrecking of the steamer *Algoma*, would say that upon enquiry I cannot learn that reasonable facilities exist on Lake Superior for doing the requisite work. There are no such facilities here or near here.

"Very respectfully,

"H. B. MOORE,

"Collector."

And we have a letter on the 8th June from Mr. Patten, the commissioner to the collector at Duluth, as follows :—

"WASHINGTON, D. C., 8th June, 1886.

"SIR,—Referring to previous correspondence, I have to state that the manager of lake traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company informs this office that facilities for wrecking in the case of the steamer *Algoma* have been found at Port Huron, Michigan"—
"and that a contract has been made accordingly."

"Respectfully yours,
"JARVIS PATTEN,
"Commissioner.

"COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS,
"Duluth, Minn."

The owners of that steamer were driven to Port Huron, a distance of nearly 600 miles, though they had their own wrecking apparatus within 50 miles of the wreck, and the commissioner was informed by the collector at Duluth that there were no appliances on or near Lake Superior fit to perform that work. Then, on the 5th March, 1887, we have an enquiry answered by the Commissioner of Navigation:

"SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 5th instant, you are informed that this office is not aware of any law preventing foreigners wrecking in American waters, subject to the disabilities imposed by the tariff and navigation laws; that is to say, articles imported by them or vessels brought by them, would be subject to duty in the usual manner."

The foreign vessel could engage in wrecking if the owner would pay duty on his vessels and on his wrecking plant which he took in just for the purpose of engaging in the operation at that particular time.

I have here besides a communication from Parker & Millen, of Detroit, enquiring of the Treasury authorities at Washington as to regulations, and, as this correspondence is short, I may as well read it:

"DETROIT, MICH., 27th September, 1887.

"DEAR SIR,—Can a Canadian steamer clear from a Canadian port and go to an American vessel which has run aground in American waters and release her, either by pulling her off, or by lightering a portion of her cargo, and take her to a Canadian port? An early reply will much oblige.

"Yours respectfully,
"PARKER & MILLEN.

"HON. O. S. FAIRCHILD,
"Secretary of the Treasury,
"Washington, D. C."

And this is the answer:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., 30th September, 1887.

"GENTLEMEN,—This office is in receipt of your letter dated the 27th instant, stating a hypothetical question relative to the rights of certain foreign vessels in American waters. The answer to your enquiry would depend upon the facts surrounding the case, which are not fully stated by you, and you are informed that it is the practice to decline answering hypothetical questions. If you have any particular case in view, in which there has been a violation of law, the bureau will give the matter full consideration on receipt of a statement from you showing the facts in detail.

"Respectfully yours,
"C. B. MORTON,
"Commissioner.

"MESSRS. PARKER & MILLEN,
"15 Atwater St. West, Rooms 3 and 4,
"Detroit, Mich."

"15 ATWATER ST. WEST, ROOMS 3 AND 4,
"DETROIT, MICH., 10th October, 1887.

"DEAR SIR,—Your letter of 30th September is received and noted. It is to avoid violating the law that we ask a question. We want to know what the law is relative to Canadian tugs wrecking and towing in American waters. The facts are these: We have a large fleet of steam vessels navigating the lakes, and they very often get aground in Detroit and St. Clair Rivers and Lake St. Clair. The majority of those grounding are in Canadian waters, and in order to release them quickly, we have provided ourselves with a Canadian steam lighter which is capable of lightering a portion of their cargoes and then pulling them off the bottom. Now, it sometimes happens that they ground in American waters, and we want to know if this same steam lighter can clear from a Canadian port, go to these vessels aground in American waters and pull them off and tow them to a Canadian port, and if unable to pull them off without lightering, could she lighten a portion of their cargo and replace it again when the vessel got into deep water?

"Respectfully yours,
"PARKER & MILLEN.

"C. B. MORTON, Esq., Comr., Treasury Dept.,
"Washington, D. C."

Mr. CHARLTON.

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF NAVIGATION.

"WASHINGTON, D. C., 13th October, 1887.

"GENTLEMEN,—This office is in receipt of your letter of the 10th inst., stating that you have a large fleet of steam vessels navigating the lakes and enquiring whether you can use, in connection therewith, the Canadian steam lighter which you own, in lightering and wrecking said vessels should they get aground in American waters. In reply, I have to state that this office is not aware of any authority of law for such a proceeding. These questions are usually acted upon, in the first instance, by the collector of the district in which the work is to be done.

"Respectfully yours,
"C. B. MORTON,
"Commissioner."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I leave it to the House to say whether the American regulations, as shown by this correspondence in reference to the wreck of the steamer *Algoma*, and as shown by this correspondence with Parker & Millen, of Detroit, and another letter that I omitted to read, to a collector on Lake Ontario in answer to the enquiry, which stated that permission had never been given in that district for Canadian tugs or vessels to do any work upon the American coast—I say I submit to the House, in view of these facts, whether the regulations of the American Government have not been more stringent than the regulations of the Canadian Government, and whether their conduct in matters of wrecks has not been, if we are to use the term, more inhuman than the conduct of the Canadian Government; and I hold that the conduct of our Customs Department contrasts most favorably with the conduct of the Treasury Department at Washington in regard to this matter. Now, Sir, the investments made by Canadians in wrecking plant and outfit, which amounts to a large sum, would, on the upper lakes, be rendered practically valueless from the passage of the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac. The effect of this species of reciprocity would be to give to American wrecking companies nearly the entire business. In brief their position is this: we ask you to rescind a regulation which you passed in retaliation for a similar regulation passed by us; we ask you to rescind that regulation which you passed in self defence and to abandon the advantage which that regulation gives you, and to abandon to us the entire wrecking business of the upper lakes, of which you have now a large portion. That is simply what it amounts to. It may be questioned whether the result would be as I state. Now, Sir, while appliances for wrecking are just as good upon this side as upon the American side, and while the prices for relieving vessels are just as low as those quoted by American companies, I wish to draw attention to this fact, that the principal part of the tonnage is American tonnage. The underwriters insuring these vessels have their offices chiefly in Chicago, Detroit and Buffalo. Now, in case of the wreck of an American vessel, when information is received at the underwriter's office, or in any office where she is insured, the most natural thing in the world is for that underwriter to make arrangements with the wrecking company who is, perhaps, at his door. There is a system of commissions, not exactly bribes, which the underwriters receive from these companies, that make it to their pecuniary interest to give these contracts to American companies, and the result would be, I repeat, that if this proposition of the hon. member for Frontenac is accepted, nearly the entire wrecking business upon the upper lakes would pass into the hands of American companies and the large investments made by Canadian citizens for tugs, for diving apparatus, steam pumps, hydraulic jacks, chains, and pontoons, and for the various appliances in wrecking, would be rendered practically valueless. I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that no necessity exists for this step; I have pointed out what our customs regulations distinctly say, that in case of danger of loss of property or loss of life, the utmost latitude is given, that applications are never refused. And I can testify from personal knowledge that applications of that kind are

not refused. Not only is that the case, but the Customs Department has gone still further, and has dealt in a most liberal spirit, as was shown by those cases quoted by Mr. Van Horne, in granting application for the use of American tugs and appliances on the upper lakes.

Now, Sir, my position in this matter is this: I say that the advantage we enjoy in the matter of wrecking is a very great advantage; I say that advantage does not accrue to us from the inception of a policy by ourselves, but that advantage was thrust upon us by the action of the American Treasury Department; that they themselves inaugurated the system for the purpose of protecting their own interests. They are placed in the position of the Irishman who was crossing a pasture one day, and was attacked by a bull. He got the bull by the tail in running around a stump, and took his shillelah, and beat the animal until he bellowed and was glad to get away. The Irishman said: "Bellow, you murderin old villain; who commenced this scrimmage? Now, we did not commence this scrimmage, the Americans commenced it, and it has worked against them, as a majority of the wrecks occur upon our coast, and they are excluded from the wrecking of their own property. They complain, it is true, but this alleged advantage accrues to us in consequence of their own act, and I am not in favor of giving up the vantage ground we possess unless the Americans will make further concessions. Now, we have a standing offer of reciprocity in coasting contained in chap. 14, 33 Vic, made in 1870, previously alluded to, in which we offered to the Americans, or any other nation, reciprocity in the coasting trade. Now, if the Americans want reciprocity in wrecking upon the great lakes, let them go further and propose reciprocity in coasting *in toto*, and I shall be very much in favor of it. If they will open the coasting trade on waters contiguous to Canada, on the great lakes, wrecking and all, that is all right; but if they want to select one incident of coasting in which they can secure the advantage and retain all the rest, where some little advantage would accrue to us, that is not reciprocity, gentlemen, and we will not accept the proposition. Either go the whole thing or nothing. That, I think, is a reasonable position to take. These are my views, I think them reasonable and common sense views, with reference to this question. As I said before, I repeat again, that we are not in the position with regard to a statutory offer here that we were the other day, when we felt compelled, in order to avoid any semblance of bad faith on our part, to accept an offer from the United States that was not much to our advantage. We are not in that position now. We have here a statutory offer that says, not "any or all," but it says all coasting trade. This offer covers wrecking, but cannot be made to appear to mean wrecking alone, and if the Americans want to come to that statutory offer, all right; and if they don't want to come to that, let them stay where they are. That is the proposition I have to make. I believe we are entitled to stand upon that proposition, and if we do we will get concessions from the Americans that otherwise we would not get. They are actuated generally, I think, by considerations of their own interest, and we may as well be actuated by the same considerations in dealing with this question, and perhaps by following that policy we may get more than we otherwise would. I shall not trouble the House longer at this time. I was intending to submit an amendment offering reciprocity in the coasting trade of the great lakes, wrecking and all, but I shall not do so at the present moment.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I have never in my short parliamentary experience listened to anything with so much pleasure as to the remarks of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). It certainly is something new in our parliamentary experience when a leading member of the Opposition comes forward, and in such glowing and sensible terms defends a department of this Administration from attacks made upon

it by one of his own supporters. And it is still more delightful after the very contradictory opinions we have heard on the subject of reciprocity to find the hon. member taking precisely the same ground with respect to this matter that the First Minister took with regard to the reciprocity treaty. I think the ground he has taken is a perfectly correct one, and I hope the same ground will be taken throughout whether it is in regard to reciprocity in wrecking or in natural products or in anything else. The hon. gentleman has just said we are not to take one particular thing and agree to reciprocity upon that, simply because it happens to suit the Americans. That is precisely what was said at the beginning of the reciprocity debate by the First Minister, and I wish the same contention had been kept up throughout on this side of the House. I am not in favor of reciprocity; I think that the country can manage its own affairs and can do what we think will suit us best whether in regard to wrecking or natural products or anything else. That is a subject I shall not discuss, but I could not resist the temptation to congratulate my hon. friend upon the remarkable spirit which has been manifested by him in the speech he has just made, and of which, I hope, we shall have many instances before the Session is drawn to a close.

Mr. CASEY. I can agree with a great many of the premises advanced by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and those advanced by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), but I cannot agree in their conclusions. I have to confess that I am in favor of reciprocity pure and simple, and in favor of reciprocity in wrecking as well as in other matters. There are two sides to this question. There is the position of the man who owns wrecking plant, and that of the man who owns a vessel that may be in distress, and I think, taking the two together, the chances of injury to Canada are more by refusing the privilege of American vessels assisting Canadian vessels than by admitting that assistance. I think Canadian interests would gain more by supporting the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) than by opposing it; that it would be more to our interests to allow American wreckers to assist Canadian vessels in distress in Canadian waters and allowing Canadian vessels to assist American craft in American waters than by the present system of non-intercourse. I have always held that position. The present system is not due altogether to the Government in power. If I am not mistaken, it came into existence before this Government obtained office. I have always held, and I hold now, that reciprocity in wrecking is to the interest both of the American marine and our own marine, and for that reason I am in favor of the principle of the present Bill, and will therefore vote for the second reading. When we come to consider its present details in committee I may have something to say, but so far as the principle is concerned I am in favor of it, and I believe that the interest of those who own the vessels which may be in distress, and which may have an opportunity of being assisted by United States wrecking tug, is to be even more considered than the interests of those who own wrecking crafts on our own side of the lakes. I do not like to differ from the hon. gentleman for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and other hon. gentlemen who have laid before me powerful arguments in favor of their view of the case; I do not like to appear to be acting against the interests of my own section of the country. It is well understood that on Lake Erie, at all events, most of the wrecks occur on the Canadian shore. It has been urged upon me that because most of the wrecks occur on the Canadian shore we who live on the shores of the lake, and represent the counties bordering on the lake, should not support this Bill. I say that is the reason why we should support the Bill, because the interests of owners of Canadian vessels likely to be wrecked on

our shores should be considered before the interests of those who own wrecking craft which would be called into requisition. The present system is a purely protectionist system, it involves protection to those who own wrecking craft, it involves protection of the most odious and unpleasant kind, a protection which involves possibly loss of property and life to Canada. Consequently I feel bound by my duty to my constituents, who are to a considerable extent owners of vessels navigating the lakes, and by my duty to other Canadians who own vessels navigating the lakes, to support the principle of the Bill, which provides that whenever a Canadian vessel is in distress a United States tug may be solicited on the condition that the Americans will allow our Canadian wrecking tugs to enjoy the same right in their waters. In regard to Lake Erie I believe the extension of this privilege will be rather in favor of the American owners of wrecking craft. In regard to Lake Ontario it might be in favor of the Canadians. I do not care whether these wreckers should gain more or ours should gain more, but I am of the opinion that our people interested in lake shipping would gain more by the adoption of the Bill than by its rejection and the continuation of the present system. For this reason I support the Bill in principle, and I reserve my opinion as to details until we go into committee.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). I observe by the remarks of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) that the effect of the Bill is misunderstood by him as it is misunderstood by several members of the House. In order that fuller information may be placed at their disposal, and that the Government may be prepared to deal with this question in the manner in which they deal with all questions that come under their consideration, I hope they will assent to adjourn the debate. In making this suggestion I refer to one point. The hon. gentleman is entirely in error if he supposes that at any time the operation of the existing wrecking regulations interfered with assisting vessels in distress. I have never known a case where the Department of Customs has refused permission to American tugs to work in Canadian waters when there was a question of imminent danger to life or property. I would therefore not go into the question to-night if the Government would consent, in compliance with my request, to agree to the adjournment of the debate in order that fuller information may be had for their own satisfaction and the satisfaction of members of this House so that the question may be intelligently discussed on its merits. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must say that I think the course proposed by the hon. gentleman will meet with the views of gentlemen on both sides of the House. It is a very important question of public policy as I ventured to remark in the few words I said before the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) addressed the House. I am sure after the very interesting discussion that we have had it will be considered only desirable that in a question of such an important policy the Government should have an opportunity to carefully consider the statements made on both sides of the House before the matter is disposed of.

Mr. EDGAR. I understand the hon. member for Essex moved the adjournment of the debate, and not the adjournment of the House, because I have something to say on this question.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). Yes, the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debated adjourned.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Mr. CASEY.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 13th April, 1888.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CHIGNECTO MARINE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that on Tuesday next the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the time for the completion of the works of the Chignecto Marine Railway Company, shall, as respects their title to receive the subsidy heretofore authorised, be the 1st July, 1890, instead of the 1st July, 1889; also that the company may be accorded a further delay of twenty-four months for such completion, on the condition of the payment of a monthly penalty of \$5,000 for each month during which the works remain uncompleted after the first above-mentioned date, and also that the amount of capital mentioned in section 2 of the Act, 49 Victoria, chapter 18, as that on which the payment of the subsidies limited so as to make up the net earnings to seven per cent. per annum, shall be \$5,500,000 instead of \$5,000,000.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE—NEW YORK, WADDINGTON AND OTTAWA RAILWAY.

Mr. HICKEY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a portion of an editorial in last evening's *Evening Journal*, speaking of a railway charter which I have before the House. After a good deal of nonsensical verbiage, this paragraph occurs:

"In this new scheme, Dr. Hickey has associated with himself, several members of the Dominion and Local Houses, the applicants being J. F. Wood, M. P. for Brockville, George Taylor, M. P. for South Leeds —"

Along with others. I wish to say that neither Mr. Wood, nor Mr. Taylor, nor any other M. P. has anything to do with this charter. They are not applicants at all. These two gentlemen signed the petition out of courtesy to me, with others, for leave to introduce the Bill into the House, but they have no association with it whatever.

REPORT OF THE RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. HOLTON. I wish to enquire of the Government if it is intended to distribute among members of this House, copies of the report of the Royal Commission upon Railways, and the evidence taken before that commission? It seems to me that we cannot pretend to consider intelligently the Railway Bill that has been introduced by the Minister of Railways, without having these papers in our hands.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The other day another hon. gentleman called the attention of the Government to the fact that this report had not been printed or circulated among the members. Upon enquiry I found that although a printed copy had been brought down, it had been printed by the action of the Railway Department, which had had a number of copies printed some time before, and one of those copies was laid on the Table as the return, to be printed in the ordinary way. I have enquired as to the reason of the delay in the printing of that return, but I have had no satisfactory answer. I will call the attention of the chairman of the Printing Committee to the matter.

Mr. LAURIER. If that report has been laid upon the Table, it has been printed, I suppose, and there is no use of having it printed again.

THE BEHRING'S SEA FISHERIES.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works when we may expect the correspondence

in reference to the American claims of sovereignty in Behring's Sea, and the seizures of Canadian whaling and sealing vessels in that sea?

Mr. FOSTER. I may say with reference to the Behring's Sea papers, that in the present state of diplomatic negotiations it is not thought advisable to bring them down.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper for second reading of Bill (No. 65) respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, in resuming the adjourned debate on the Bill now before the House, asking us to give effect to the treaty lately passed at Washington between the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America, I desire to discuss it in the sense in which the hon. Minister of Finance recommended it to the consideration of this House. I desire to say that in a matter of so much importance to the people of this country, in which the peace and welfare of 70,000,000 of the people are concerned, there are two considerations involved. The first is in its national character, the second is in its commercial character and the aspect which it bears with respect to the commercial interests of the people on this side of the line. I am free to admit at the outset that a measure of this kind, calling for a settlement of some of those questions, which have been vexed questions between the British Government and the American people for so many years, was highly desirable. I am prepared to admit that, as composing part of the Empire, the people of Canada might be called upon, if necessary, to make a certain amount of sacrifice to bring about a satisfactory settlement in that regard. If the hon. Minister of Finance, in introducing his Bill, had brought it down with the statement that it was purely in the interests of the Empire; if he had made the statement, which we all believe to be the case, that, if not at the dictation of England, at least in compliance with the strongly expressed desire of England and her representative at that congress, concessions were made to the American people which the Government of this country had previously refused, that we were called upon in fact as part of the Empire to make those concessions in the interest of peace and good neighborhood, I think he would have fairly laid the ground of his action before this House. In that case we would, perhaps, have been able to discuss it in a different line, yet at the same time we would have been compelled to point out to the Government, to Parliament, and to the people, how the changes which had been made under that treaty were going to affect the people most immediately concerned—that is to say, the people of the Maritime Provinces of this Dominion. Looking at the Bill from the beginning to the end, and regarding it very carefully in the light of the explanation given by the hon. the Minister of Finance, and the hon. the Minister of Justice, I have arrived at the conclusion that every concession which the Americans demanded in 1886, under Mr. Bayard's proposal to Lord Salisbury, has been granted. Those demands made by Mr. Bayard in that year were indignantly rejected by the Canadian Cabinet in language strong and emphatic, as has already been read to this House by the member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies). We sustained the action of the Government on that occasion, we sustained them in defending the fisheries, and in every word I ever uttered in this House or out of it I guarded myself against using any language which might be used by the Americans or their advocates in depreciating the value of our fisheries. The Government we felt, and I felt, were dealing with a question of so much

importance in the general interests of the country, that they required and had a right to be sustained by every person who was in a public position, who by his voice or by his influence could strengthen their hands in the negotiations, and therefore in this House and on public occasions elsewhere I always, I repeat, guarded myself so far as to use language which the Americans never could use against us when the fisheries question was considered. The questions which were submitted by Mr. Bayard in 1886 were of a character which formed part of the present treaty and negotiations. We find that under this treaty all those demands made by Mr. Bayard have been yielded. The hon. Minister of Finance asked us the other day not to press him in this discussion to compel him to say anything in defence of the treaty which might be used against its adoption on the other side of the line. The hon. gentleman need not have been laboring under any anxiety on that account. Ingenious as the hon. Minister of Finance is in his public discussions, with all the fertility of his imagination and resources, and I admit they are great, the hon. gentleman was not able, during that long and able address with which he favored the House on that occasion, to point out one single or solitary advantage which the people of Canada would gain if this treaty was put into effect, except that it removed doubts on certain points for which the Americans were contending, but which we on this side, and the British Government behind us, had always as steadily maintained. If it was negotiated to surrender points in favor of which we had been contending, which international law and treaty obligations showed we had a clear right to demand ever since 1813, if it was to give up those treaty rights to the Americans under the operation of this treaty, I do not think the Minister of Finance could point to them as any advantage to the people of Canada in this direction. He need not have been afraid of using any language which could have injured it. He pointed to the Treaty of Washington in 1872, and he said that the language which he and the leader of the Government used in defending that treaty in this House had been cited in the American case before the Halifax Commission. That was quite true, because in their great anxiety to carry the Washington Treaty, they made statements which could not be corroborated, and which were in contravention of the actual established facts of the case. Moreover, he said that all things come to him who waits, and the Washington Treaty which was assailed by parties in this House, and by myself among the number, was now looked to as a measure to which we would gladly resort. There was just this difference. I opposed the Washington Treaty on the ground that the right hon. gentleman who negotiated that treaty had been untrue to the interests of the Province which I represent. The right hon. gentleman during the negotiation had been offered free admission of coal and lumber and salt, in addition to free fish, but in his anxiety to obtain other advantages and not being able to gauge the American plenipotentiaries, he threw away the offer which was so advantageous to the interests of the people of Nova Scotia for the moment, and when it came to be brought up again, the American plenipotentiaries withdrew the offer altogether. Subsequently he was obliged to accept a treaty much less favorable to the people of Nova Scotia than the one which had been previously offered by the American people. Now, Sir, it was on that ground, and on that ground alone, that I opposed the Washington Treaty, and if it were to be renewed to-day under similar circumstances, I have no hesitation in saying that my course would have been the same. The hon. the Minister of Finance says that Mr. Bayard and the Government, in 1886, made a proposal for a commission to consider the whole position of their relations with Canada. It was not solely with regard to the fishery question, but with the prospect of negotiating for the development and

extension of trade between the two countries. Mr. Bayard said that:

"Entering into a temporary arrangement whereby the American fishermen were allowed the privilege during the remainder of the season of 1885, that the President would bring the matter before Congress next Session and recommend a Joint Commission of the Governments of the United States and Great Britain to consider the question in the interests of neighborhood and friendly intercourse between the two countries."

Then we had the prospect of negotiating for the development of trade between the United States and British North America. Mr. Bayard's idea, it will be observed, at the very commencement of the negotiations seemed to look not only to a settlement of the fishery question, but to look to some arrangement whereby the commercial intercourse of the two countries could be extended and enlarged. The second commission, which was so happily inaugurated by the hon. the Minister of Finance and suggested by Mr. Wiman, led to a similar expression on the part of Mr. Bayard. In that letter, which has been so frequently quoted during the recent discussion, Mr. Bayard again renewed the same idea when he said:

"He was confident that we both seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to secure it, and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries."

Here, again, we have Mr. Bayard's reiteration of his desire to consider the whole trade relations of the countries, as well as the settlement of the fishery dispute. The hon. the Finance Minister, in reply to that, expresses his desire in very nearly the same language. He expresses his willingness to negotiate in that spirit, and when this position was arrived at and the Washington plenipotentiaries met, the Minister of Finance, as he has told us, and as we know before, made the proposal to the American plenipotentiaries. Now, there is something very suggestive in this letter of the hon. gentleman, because, when you come to read it, and read it carefully, you will see it contains more than would appear on the face of it: He says:

"Sir Charles Tupper begged leave to submit that, with a view of removing all causes of difficulties in connection with the fisheries, it is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries that the fishermen of both countries shall have all the privileges enjoyed during the existence of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington."

That is to say, that we were to have free fish for free fisheries, although it will be remembered by hon. gentlemen that the hon. the Minister of Justice, in his remarks the other night, most indignantly denied the idea and repudiated the idea—and I suppose he spoke for the Government of which he is such a distinguished member—that he would be willing to resort to the old principle of free fish for free fisheries. But the hon. the Minister of Finance goes on to say that:

"They were to have enjoyed during the existence of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington, in consideration of mutual arrangements for greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada."

Therefore the hon. gentleman, as he frankly said, seemed to have had in his mind the idea at the very earliest stage of the negotiation, that the fishery question was one by itself, but it was desirable to use the fishery question as a means whereby we were going to secure a greater freedom of commercial intercourse between the United States and Canada and Newfoundland. In pursuance of this idea the hon. gentleman told us with frankness that he made the offer of unrestricted reciprocity. He made that offer to the hon. gentleman, and he said:

"The offer was unrestricted reciprocity and I intended it should be so. I intended to give the Government of the United States the fullest opportunity to state just how far they were prepared to go in reciprocity of trade with Canada."

Was the hon. gentleman in earnest? I would be sorry to say that he was not. Was the hon. gentleman sincerely desirous
Mr. JONES (Halifax).

of testing the opinion of the Government of the United States when he made the offer of unrestricted reciprocity? I hope he was. But, Sir, if we may gauge the opinions of his Government and his supporters, who during his unfortunate illness and during the long debate, which I hope it is not improper to refer to, that idea of unrestricted reciprocity which was only asked for by the motion of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), was repudiated by every speaker on the other side of the House, and by every member of the Government who spoke on the question, although the hon. the leader of the Government did not commit himself further than by his vote. I say that the idea of unrestricted reciprocity, which the hon. the Minister of Finance made, was either in earnest or was in jest. It would be a poor compliment to the Minister of Finance to suppose that he went to Washington to jest on such a serious subject. I shall not do him the injustice to suppose that he would be so far regardless of his own dignity and the dignity of the country and of the Government he represented on the Commission, as to have asked that the Government should have considered the proposition, which remember if they had met in a fair spirit, if they had turned around and said: Yes, we will meet you in a spirit of unrestricted reciprocity; would have compelled that hon. gentleman to have brought down this Session a measure of unrestricted reciprocity similar and in accordance with the resolution of my hon. friend from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) which he and his party have just voted down. In that connection I cannot understand the position of the hon. the Minister of Finance in making that proposal; and I should be very unwilling to suppose for one moment that he was not serious in doing it. He replies over and over again that he did Canada great service in ascertaining the views of her Government in regard to a matter in which we were all materially interested. Well, Sir, what did the resolution call for which has been voted down by the Government and party to which the hon. gentleman belongs? It only said this:

"That it is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted reciprocity of trade therewith."

I ask any fair-minded man if there is any difference between that resolution which hon. gentlemen opposite voted down the other night and the declaration the hon. Minister of Finance has made here, that he offered unrestricted reciprocity to the American plenipotentiaries when he was at Washington? But the hon. gentleman would say that Mr. Bayard gave an answer adverse to his proposal. That is quite true; but he should have stated with equal frankness the grounds on which Mr. Bayard based that refusal. He might have stated to the House, so that it might form part of his very able speech when it went to the country, that the reason, and the only reason, assigned by the American plenipotentiaries for not considering his proposal for unrestricted reciprocity was that it was not consistent to do, by an executive act, that which was the peculiar power and privilege of Congress alone. Congress alone could deal with a matter of revenue and tariff; and while the American plenipotentiaries gave that as an explanation why they could not entertain the hon. gentleman's proposal, because it was beyond their power to deal with a question of revenue and tariff, yet, so far as we can gather from the information that has been laid before us—and I regret that it was not more full—they do not appear to have expressed themselves as hostile to the proposition of my hon. friend for unrestricted reciprocity. Therefore, we may, perhaps, gain this consolation from the discussion that has taken place between the hon. gentleman and the American Government, that that question may still be considered in abeyance, and that we may hope at no very distant day

—perhaps when those changes are brought about which the hon. gentleman intimated to us the other day—to see the hon. Minister of Finance come down with a measure of unrestricted reciprocity as large and full as any member on this side of the House, during the last three weeks, has called for. But, Sir, it was not very consistent, I think, in the hon. gentleman to cover up the ground in the way he sought to do, and it does not reflect any great credit on him in the distinguished position he filled on that occasion, to come back to this House, and after having made this proposal for unrestricted reciprocity, and after having read it to the House, to tell us, with regard to the debate that took place here, that for nearly three weeks we had wasted the time of the House and the time of the country in discussing a measure that was about as practicable as the idea of building a railway to the moon. I say, after the hon. gentleman had proposed unrestricted reciprocity at Washington, and because we were seeking to give effect to the same idea through the representatives of the people in this House, the hon. gentleman came here and almost says: I was only jesting, I was not in earnest, and you are wasting the time of the House in discussing a matter which is just about as unreasonable as a proposal to build a railway to the moon. I think it was not a very dignified position for the hon. gentleman to assume. The hon. gentleman says he was instructed to obtain a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, for reciprocity in natural products, and a renewal of the Treaty of 1871 relating to our fisheries. In this connection the hon. gentleman said that he found that the Americans did not want our inshore fisheries. I was very sorry to hear it. I do not wish to undervalue our inshore fisheries at all. On the contrary, I am disposed to attach a great deal of value to them; but the value of an article in a market is always just that much that you can obtain for it in open competition; and if the Americans do not value our inshore fisheries to the extent of desiring the use of them, it is pretty strong evidence to my mind that our inshore fisheries are not quite as valuable as I had always hoped and still hope them to be. The Americans are pretty good judges in these matters; they have as large an interest in the fisheries as we have; and they know very well, from the information they had been able to obtain, how valuable our inshore fisheries would be to them, and if they were not anxious to obtain them it only shows that they did not regard them as being as valuable as we had hoped. I look upon this as very unfortunate—as the more unfortunate, because we thought them of such a valuable character that they would form the most important factor in future negotiations. But it seems that the Americans have taken a different view, and they came to the conclusion that they only wanted the privilege of purchasing bait, the use of our ports, and the privilege of transshipment for their cargoes; and they have got all these by the provisions of this treaty. And now, in any future negotiations we may have, looking to further trade relations with them, we have nothing whatever to offer them in return for any concession we may ask from them. Therefore, the moment the hon. gentleman found that the Americans did not value our inshore fisheries, from that very moment he should have held on with a firmer grip than ever to those privileges which they did value, such as shelter and transshipment of cargoes. The hon. gentleman said he found that there were 65,000,000 of people embittered against us, the people and press of both sides of politics, in consequence of the action of this Government in defending our fisheries. That was a very unfortunate condition of affairs, no doubt. It was a very unfortunate condition of public opinion in the United States, and I have no doubt that, to a certain extent, the hon. gentleman is right; but the hon. gentleman is well aware, as are other hon. members of this House, that that was not the primary cause of hostility against the people of Canada. The real cause and the beginning of

the trouble arose when the Tory party, in 1878, led by the right hon. gentleman, laid down a policy of retaliation against the people of the United States. From day to day, in this House, by hon. gentlemen opposite, and in the public press of this country favoring their views, and in public speeches in all parts of the Dominion, by their supporters, it was represented that we could force the Americans into trade relations by means of the National Policy; the people were misled into believing that if we adopted the National Policy, that policy would have the effect of keeping out American products from the Dominion, and would force the Americans to adopt reciprocity in a very short time. I repeat that that was the commencement of irritation on the part of the United States; and in order that there may be no doubt as to the views entertained by the leaders of the Government, I will quote a speech made by the Minister of Finance, in 1878, at Charlottetown, P. E. I. The hon. gentleman was then dealing with the position of the country; he knew how anxious the people of Prince Edward Island, and, in fact, the people of all the Maritime Provinces, were to secure a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty; he knew there was no other subject which would go home so directly to their individual interests and into their everyday life; he knew, when addressing the farmers of Prince Edward Island, whose produce found a market in the United States, and in the United States alone, that there was no argument he could address them so potent and so likely to lead them to favor his policy as the argument that, by adopting it, we could secure a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty, and on that occasion the hon. gentleman said:

“All that you have to do is to support the protective National Policy of Sir John Macdonald, in order to obtain reciprocity with the United States within two years.”

All they had to do, he said, was to sustain the national protective policy of Sir John Macdonald in order to obtain in two years a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty. The people were suffering for want of communication with the United States, and it was not unnatural that when they were listening to a gentleman of the persuasive eloquence of my hon. friend, and believing that the American people were crowding our markets with their products, while at the same time they were shutting out our products from theirs—I say it was not unnatural, under these circumstances, that they should have taken him at his word. But years passed by, and the National Policy, instead of having the effect of bringing Americans to their senses, as was predicted by its authors, had the effect, as we have seen—and as the hon. gentleman has admitted, though he gave some other reasons—of embittering the public mind of the people of the United States against the Dominion of Canada, and they said: Here are four and a half millions of people on our northern border, who are going to adopt a fiscal and commercial policy of their own, which is going to teach sixty-five millions of Americans how to conduct the business of their own country; we will let them severely alone. They did so, and, probably, but for Mr. Wiman's interference, we would be let alone until the present moment. But time went on, and we came to 1886, and again the Minister of Finance spoke at Charlottetown, on 7th September of that year. The hon. gentleman no doubt felt that he was called upon to explain to the people, whom he had addressed eight years before, the reasons why this Reciprocity Treaty, which was to have been the result of the National Policy, was not obtained. He said:

“Since the expiration of the Washington Treaty we have shown our American neighbors that we intend to stand up for our rights and interests, by adopting that policy which will obtain a commercial treaty with the Americans at no very distant day, and I have every reason to hope that within two years we shall have such a treaty.”

The hon. gentleman here again had to explain to them that by the continuance of such a policy we were going to

bring the Americans to their senses. I did not, and I do not now blame the Government for carrying out rigidly the harbor regulations, except when they were carried out by incompetent men in an offensive manner. If we had our fishing rights under treaty, I hold it was the duty of the Government to insist upon their being carried out in a dignified manner. But what I found fault with was that the irritation, which was constantly growing between the American fishermen and the incompetent men who had charge of our small cruisers along the shore, added to the irritation which arose under the threat of the National Policy crystallised public opinion in the United States against us and was the cause of that hostility to the people of Canada which we always regret. I say that I have always been anxious for a renewal of the treaty, and on more than one occasion I have been spoken to with reference to it. While the Commission was sitting at Washington, I was interviewed with reference to the possibilities that might result from it. I saw the difficulty the Commission might have to encounter with regard to coal and wheat, and I suggested that if by leaving coal and wheat out of the question, an arrangement for other natural products might be arrived at, it would be satisfactory. I said :

"If by leaving coal and wheat out of the question, you could conciliate the coal and wheat interests of the United States, is it not possible that a treaty embracing all other natural products might be made acceptable to both countries. The Americans want our fish, lumber, potatoes, barley, and possibly oats, which, after wheat, are our chief products, and they also take many articles, such as cordwood, &c., which even now find a market across the line. This appears to me a reasonable and a rational *modus vivendi*, and if commercial union is found to be impracticable at present, such an arrangement as indicated might, for a time, be satisfactory. The commercial intercourse in this exchange of natural products would doubtless pave the way for larger concessions on both sides in the future, and lead in a natural way to commercial union, which, in the opinion of so many of our people, it is desirable to obtain as soon as possible. Any concessions to the Americans giving them the use of our ports for shelter, bait and transport, without concessions from their side of a satisfactory character in return, would, I feel confident, never prove acceptable to our people or be ratified by Parliament."

I was then apprehending just what has taken place. I was then fearing that the hon. gentleman was pressed, as I believe he was—for it is all very well for him to stand up here and say that he was nobly sustained by his co-plenipotentiaries from Great Britain—I believe that he was sustained so long as he kept in the line of their desires; I believe that there was a strong, steady, persistent desire manifested by those plenipotentiaries for the settlement of this question, and I believe that the hon. gentleman was forced to yield to an arrangement which, under other circumstances, he would never have given way to. I say, with all due deference to that hon. gentleman, and without any desire to exalt him in the opinion of this country, that I would rather have had one Sir Charles Tupper at that Commission alone than ten Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlains that England ever produced. The one was familiar with the wants of our people. He understood the condition of affairs, and, if he could have acted independently in regard to Canadian interests and Canadian sentiments, alone, I believe he never would have conceded these points, which are all the Americans want, and obtained nothing whatever for the fishing interests of Canada in return. I repeat, with all due respect to those distinguished gentlemen who were on the Commission with the Minister of Finance, that their desire was, and their sole desire was, to bring about a settlement of questions which had been of an irritating character between the United States and England; and we have been told by Mr. Chamberlain publicly since his return to England, that he came out here to make a treaty, that he had effected it, and had brought about a peaceful solution of a difficult question which he believed was going to extend for many years between the two countries. The view I take from this evidence is that the hon. gentleman was

Mr. Jones (Halifax).

pressed to yield these points which otherwise he would not have done. Now, referring to the treaty, we are told in Article 10 that :

"United States fishing vessels entering the bays or harbors referred to in Article 1 of this treaty shall conform to harbor regulations common to them and to fishing vessels of Canada or Newfoundland. They need not report, enter, or clear, when putting into such bays or harbors for shelter or repairing damages, nor when putting into the same, outside the limits of established ports of entry, for the purpose of purchasing wood or of obtaining water; except that any such vessel remaining more than twenty-four hours, exclusive of Sundays and legal holidays, within any such port, or communicating with the shore therein, may be required to report, enter, or clear; and no vessel shall be excused hereby from giving due information to boarding officers. They shall not be liable in such bays or harbors for compulsory pilotage; nor, when therein for the purpose of shelter, of repairing damages, of purchasing wood, or of obtaining water, shall they be liable for harbor dues, tonnage dues, buoy dues, light dues, or other similar dues."

There is a difficulty in this matter which I think must have escaped the notice of the hon. gentleman, and which I hope it is not, though it may be, too late to remedy. I have gone very carefully over the treaty, and I do not find that, while the treaty gives to the American fishermen the right to enter our ports without paying any harbor dues or light dues or other similar dues, or pilotage, the same privileges are not extended to our fishermen in the ports of the United States. That is a very important omission, if I am right, because our fishing vessels visit Portland and Boston very frequently, and they should at least have the same privileges in American ports that American fishermen have in our own. I speak with reserve, but I have looked over the treaty pretty carefully. I know it says :

"Fishing vessels of Canada and Newfoundland shall have on the Atlantic coasts of the United States all the privileges reserved and secured by this treaty to United States fishing vessels in the aforesaid waters of Canada and Newfoundland."

But it does not say that there is any exemption from harbor dues or light dues.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would that be a privilege?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). No, it would be an exemption.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would not that be a privilege?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Whether it would be a privilege or not, this provision is indefinite. I hope I am wrong, but this should be so distinctly understood that there should be no difficulty about it. Then, the other day, I noticed that the Minister of Marine, in reply to a question put by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), with regard to the dues paid by our fishermen, lays down the law on that occasion, and says :

"In Halifax, harbor masters' dues are not paid by any vessels under twenty tons, nor by coasting vessels, which include fishing vessels. At Pictou and Sydney, harbor dues are, by Acts of Parliament, exacted from all vessels over forty tons register; whether, in practice, fishing vessels are exempt when over forty tons cannot be stated without correspondence with the harbor masters of these ports."

I call attention to this because, while the treaty would exempt American fishermen from these dues in visiting the harbors of Pictou and Sydney, the Nova Scotia fishermen would be obliged to pay the dues if the hon. gentleman's answer is according to the law. These are important places. Pictou is often visited by American fishermen en route to the North Bay, and to Prince Edward Island, and Sydney harbor is also an important place of call, and if our fishermen are obliged to pay all those dues which the hon. gentleman says they are on all vessels over 40 tons register, and the American vessels are exempt under the operations of the treaty, it follows as a matter of course that our own fishing vessels are placed at a very considerable disadvantage. The question with regard to bait is one of the greatest possible importance. It is one which lies at the root of the fishery question, and the Americans justly understood and appreciated its value when they secured the privilege of

obtaining bait under this treaty. The result of the operation of this will be that the bankers going to the Western Banks commonly use clam bait, but those going to the Grand Banks, where they get the fish which are suitable for the larger markets, cannot expect to catch those fish without the use of fresh bait. They are a long way away from their own home, and their fresh bait will only last a short time, and if they are compelled to return to their own ports to get fresh bait if they can, and the supply is doubtful, and they cannot always get it, they would, practically, be almost compelled to give up the business altogether. But, now, all they have to do is to run into any near port on the Nova Scotia coast, from Cape Breton all along the coast to Halifax, and they will get their bait and be out on the fishing grounds again in a few days competing with our own people. This is still further a disadvantage to our own fishermen, though I do not say it is a disadvantage to our people, because they double the price of bait to our own fishermen.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you say they get that privilege under the treaty?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). They would. They get it under this proposal.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way?

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Under the *modus vivendi* and under the treaty also. We are discussing both. They can to-day come into Nova Scotia coasts and ports and buy bait from our fishermen along the coast, and in consequence of their coming there the cost of that bait is nearly double to a Nova Scotia banker. Now, I repeat, there are two interests in this matter. There is the interest of the man who sells bait, and there is the interest of the Nova Scotian or American who buys bait; but I am, in this connection, only discussing the way in which it affects our fishermen. I say, therefore, that the bait alone, which is a very important item in that connection, will be largely increased in expense to our Nova Scotia fishermen. These people then go out on the banks again, they return just as often as they like and get bait. Now, Sir, I was interviewed two years ago by the representative of a Boston paper on this very subject. Of course, I endeavored, as I always do, to maintain our own view of the subject, and to show our rights and the value of our privileges in this connection, and generally in regard to our position. I said to the reporter of that paper:

"Another very important point that should not be lost sight of in this connection is that under this treaty the American fishermen could enter our harbors and bays, get their own nets and catch their own bait. The value to them of this privilege can scarcely be overestimated. As some idea of the value, I may adopt their own view. It will be remembered that, some five or six years ago, the fishermen of Fortune Bay, Newfoundland, forcibly prevented American fishermen from taking bait for one day. Of course, under the treaty, the American fishermen had the right, and the Newfoundland fishermen were wrong in attempting to prevent them, and the result was an immediate demand from the United States Government for compensation for interference with their rights. This interruption was continued for a day or so, according to my recollection, and the American Government estimated the damage done the interest of their fishermen at \$15,000 to \$25,000. I do not at this moment remember the exact amount, though I am pretty confident it was the latter sum. But adopting the lower sum for one day's interruption, it would show conclusively the vital importance of the privilege of the Americans. The English Government settled the claim for very nearly the amount claimed, and although at the time it was generally regarded as a most preposterous demand, still looking at the effect it would have upon the interests of the fishermen lying there for bait, I scarcely think that the amount was more than it ought to have been."

Now, I was speaking at that time of the right of the Americans to set their nets and take bait themselves, which is not permitted under the present regulations, I admit, but the principle still applies. If they can come in and buy bait it is just the same thing to them, although it may cost them a little more—probably not very much, however. If they can come in, I repeat, and buy bait, and go out on the

banks, and compete with our own people, the privilege to them is just as great as was estimated by themselves, at from \$15,000 to \$25,000, for one day's interruption in securing bait, at only one point, remember, along the extensive coast of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. Therefore hon. gentlemen must see that in this matter the question of bait was one of life and death to them. The exclusion of Americans from the privilege of obtaining bait was having its natural effect, together with the protection of our fisheries; and one only has to take up the report of the Boston Fish Bureau for 1888 to see what a gradual decline has taken place in that great industry in the United States since 1883. In the year 1883 the total catch of fish was 1,061,698 quintals; in 1884, it was 1,001,303 quintals, a gradual decline; in 1885, 902,455, still declining; 1886, 828,572, still further declining; 1887, 676,723, showing an enormous decline. That is to say, that, whereas in 1883 the catch was 1,061,698 quintals, in 1887 it was only 676,723. The number of vessels employed decreased proportionately from 746 in 1883, showing a gradual decline through all the years to which I have referred, down to 1887, when there were only 560 vessels engaged in that business. In the same way the number of men employed gradually declined from 8,601 in 1883, down to 7,700 in 1887. Therefore hon. members will see that under the operation of the protection of our fisheries, and the exclusion of the Americans from our ports for the purpose of buying bait, they suffered to a very great extent. Now, if the plenipotentiaries had had that report of the Fish Bureau in their hands when they were negotiating this treaty, and been able to point out to the American plenipotentiaries that under the operation of this treaty it was a question of life or death to them, whether they have a right to enter our harbor and take our bait—I say that our plenipotentiaries would have been able, in my judgment, humble though it be, to obtain a very different result from that which they ask us to accept now. Then, again, take the mackerel fishery during the same time. In 1878, the catch amounted to 196,468 barrels; in 1879, 220,599; 1880, 349,674; 1881, 391,657; 1882, 378,863; 1883, 226,000; 1884, 478,076; 1885, 329,943. In 1886, remember, under the operation of the exclusion, when it became most effectual and rigid, the number of barrels of mackerel instead of being at the point of 1885, during the time they had the privilege of entering our ports, amounted to only 79,998; in 1887, it was 88,382. Therefore, again, in respect to their mackerel as well as their cod fishery, this book shows incontrovertible evidence, produced by themselves, that under the operation of this treaty and their exclusion from our ports, their fisheries were gradually declining in the number of vessels and the number of men employed, and in the number of quintals of fish and barrels of mackerel that were taken. So, I say, that if hon. gentlemen had been in possession of a book or a table like that, from American sources, and had been able to point that out to the American plenipotentiaries, I think it would have been as strong an argument as they could use. Now, Sir, Article 11 provided:

"United States fishing vessels entering the ports, bays and harbors of the eastern and north-eastern coasts of Canada, or of the coasts of Newfoundland, in distress of weather, or other casualties, may unload, reload, tranship or sell—"

I need not read the whole of that paragraph. The next paragraph says:

"Licenses to purchase in established ports of entry of the aforesaid coasts of Canada or of Newfoundland, for the homeward voyage, such provisions and supplies as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels shall be granted to United States fishing vessels in such ports promptly upon application and without charge, and such vessels having obtained licenses in the manner aforesaid, shall also be accorded upon all occasions such facilities for the purchase of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels; but such provisions or supplies shall not be obtained by barter, nor purchased for resale or traffic."

It will be observed that in this section it says they should be offered facilities for the purchase, not that they shall purchase. That is to say, that the authorities cannot interfere with them; and the authorities will not be able to interfere with any fishing vessel coming in there, as was stated by the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance, in explaining that section, took a very different view from that of the Minister of Justice, who was disposed, the other night to be rather facetious in regard to this matter, indeed he was rather facetious all though, and I thought treated a very important subject in a very jocular manner. However, the Minister of Finance says that they could purchase any supplies, including salt. The Minister of Justice said, the other night, we could not for a moment allow them to purchase bait, because bait was not an article usually granted to a trading vessel. I would ask the hon. gentleman what is the difference between bait, which the Minister of Justice says they may not obtain, and salt, which the Minister of Finance says they may obtain? They are necessarily supplies under the circumstances, and equally necessary for the prosecution of their industry and their voyage. The Minister of Finance said he would be glad to believe that the article would meet with the hearty approval of the House and the country:

"Would feel that he only acted with wise judgment and due regard to the best interests of Canada, for the sake of removing an international unpleasantness in putting those provisions into this treaty."

The whole thing seems to have been a sacrifice to peace, not a sacrifice in the interests of our people, but a sacrifice to conciliate the Americans, who raised their hands, after all that had taken place and after they have been irritated to such an extent that they threatened—that is the word—the Dominion of Canada if we did not withdraw what they thought interfered with their people along the coast, that they might retaliate in a manner which would be unpleasant to us. I say this clause, with regard to purchasing supplies, is one that is likely to lead to a great deal of misconception. I contend that under the operation of that clause vessels may come in, as the Minister of Finance says, and may procure their provisions, including their salt, and if they take salt, why not take barrels, and if barrels, why not take bait? We have the word of the Minister of Justice, it is true, but I am disposed in this matter to accept the opinion of the Minister of Finance in preference, because the Minister of Finance doubtless is aware what was the intention of it, and the intention evidently appears to be that the Americans are to get those supplies under those circumstances. I say that Mr. Bayard asked for all those privileges two years ago. In a schedule attached to his proposal for the settlement of all questions in dispute in relation to the fisheries on the north-eastern coast of British North America, he lays down certain propositions. First, he asked to have the headland question settled in favor of the Americans. The Government have yielded, and have given up a contention which the British Government have made for the last 70 years, and which the Americans have practically admitted under the treaties which have been made since that time, and which they practically confirmed by the decision in their own courts with regard to the seizure made by a Confederate vessel in the mouth of one of their own bays—all of which bore out the contention which the British Government put upon the headland question. I am not saying whether it was right or wrong to have yielded it, but it was asked by Mr. Bayard in 1886, and the hon. gentleman has yielded it and has given the Americans just what they asked. The Government on that occasion answered in very strong and very emphatic language. The Government, in a paper called "Observations on Mr. Bayard's Memorandum" on page 251 of the Fishery papers, say:

Mr. Jones (Halifax).

"Article 2 would suspend the operation of the statutes of Great Britain and of Canada, and of the Provinces now constituting Canada, not only as to the various offences connected with fishing, but as to Customs, harbors and shipping, and would give to the fishing vessels of the United States privileges in Canadian ports which are not enjoyed by vessels of any other class, or of any other nation. Such vessels would, for example, be free from the duty of reporting at the Customs on entering a Canadian harbor, and no safeguard could be adopted to prevent infraction of the Customs laws by any vessel asserting the character of a fishing vessel of the United States."

Section 3 of Article 15 of the treaty provides with respect to bait that it may be secured by barter. I think the hon. gentleman will find it difficult to enforce the Customs laws under such an arrangement. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are well aware that all along the coast of Nova Scotia, from one end to the other, there are ports frequented by our own fishing vessels as well as the American vessels. Take the port of Sambro', twenty miles from Halifax. An American fishing vessel will come there for bait, and under the privileges of this treaty it may secure that by barter. To what will that lead? Will it not lead to a violation of the Customs laws, in fact to smuggling? Will the Government be able to have custom house officers at all these different points to watch American vessels and see that the Americans do not smuggle when they come in for their supplies? The privilege given to them of giving barter for bait will lead, in my judgment, to an immediate, open and direct violation of the Customs laws every time such a transaction takes place. This treaty was undoubtedly undertaken with a view of settling difficulties on various points, of explaining away difficult points in the Treaty of 1813. I would ask anyone in reading this present treaty carefully to compare it with the old one. If there was one uncertain expression, or one point that could be taken advantage of in the old treaty, there are fifty in the present one. There is nothing but what may lead to future trouble; and so far as I can see the cause of irritation between the United States and Great Britain, so far from being removed will, in effect, be more likely to be increased year by year. Take for instance the privilege of entering our ports for bait and for reshipment. What does that mean? It means simply that you cannot seize an American vessel when she is within the three-mile limit. If she is fishing or preparing to fish of course she is subject to seizure, but there may be a dozen cruisers there, and though they may go to that vessel and ask her what she is doing there she can reply simply: We are going to enter for bait, or supplies, under the provisions of the treaty. I say that that very clause will lead to complication of a most serious character, and not only that, because if our inshore fisheries are of any value—and I contend they are—these American vessels going in and out of port under the sanction of the treaty, will violate that treaty whenever they get the opportunity, within the three-mile limit. Does anyone imagine that an American vessel, going in or out of one of our ports along our coast, and meeting shoals of fish, is going to sail through them, out of any respect for treaty obligations? Not at all; they do not know the fishermen if they think so. Fishermen will take fish whenever they come to their net, and those American fishermen, as they go in and out of port and find our fish, whether inside or outside of the limit, unless there happens to be a cruiser there—and it is impossible to have a cruiser in every port—those people will practically have the whole use of our own inshore fisheries, valuable as the hon. gentleman says they are. In effect, you concede to them the right to enter our ports, you concede to them the right to obtain supplies, you concede to them the right of transshipment of their cargoes, which is a most important one, and I say, Sir, you have given up your whole case, you have given up the whole value of your fisheries to the American people. Let us understand it, for if that is the object the hon. gentleman has in view, if that is

what the Government desire to give to the Americans under the operation of this treaty, not directly, I admit, but practically, the value and privileges of our inshore fisheries, let them say so, and let us understand it, because that and no other will be the result in reality. I say it is utterly impossible for the Government, by their fishery and custom house officers, and by their cruisers, to watch along our Atlantic coast and keep American vessels off the three-mile limit, when they have a right, under the treaty, to go into port through that very water which is contraband for the purposes of taking fish. Take the privilege of reshipment. That is one of the most important privileges that you can give to the Americans. I confess that I always thought it was very hard, on the face of it, that while our vessels could go into the United States and reship their cargoes, the American vessels had not the privilege of coming in and reshipping their cargoes in this country. Still that was the treaty; those were the words of the treaty and they could not do so. But understand now what the advantage of this is. If one of those vessels is bound to the North Bay, up the St. Lawrence, for mackerel fishing, and she has been successful, she can transship her cargo in Canada. Before this treaty if she had her full cargo on board, she had to go back to the United States and land it there. She could not land it in Prince Edward Island, or in Canso, or in Halifax. And the time that she occupied in making the voyage from the fishing ground to a port in the United States and back to the fishery ground again, exhausted a large portion of the season, which is very short on that coast. Now, in the privileges granted by hon. gentlemen the American vessels can land their cargoes in Charlottetown under the operation of this treaty, and put their fish on board a steamer going to Boston, or she can run into Canso and put it on board a steamer bound for Boston, and the fish is in the market at once. This I contend is a most important concession to the fishermen. We have only to look at how the Americans themselves regard it to see this. The hon. gentleman fairly stated that the treaty was opposed for political purposes by a certain political section of the American people, and in this connection it appears to me that the question naturally arises whether we are doing a very wise thing in passing this treaty before we know what is to be its fate in the United States. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that if this Parliament deliberately accepts the treaty, that our hands for all future time will be tied, and we never can in any future negotiation go beyond the points which have been yielded in this treaty. We never can raise any objection to any demand which is conceded under the operation of its various clauses. But if the Parliament of the Dominion did not in its wisdom ratify this treaty, or if the Government did not ask Parliament to ratify it until it receives the sanction of Congress, then the Government and the people of this country will be able to say: It is quite true a treaty was agreed upon by plenipotentiaries from Great Britain and Canada, embodying certain concessions to the people of the United States, but that treaty never received the sanction of Parliament. It will then stand in a very different position in the future from what it will if the Americans in any future negotiations are able to point to the fact and say that the treaty under which we yielded those concessions was deliberately accepted by your people. In any future negotiations between us those concessions must be taken as the starting point, and although I know the hon. gentlemen will not adopt my suggestion I do think that it is a matter of policy which it would be wise for them to consider, whether they would not be acting in the interests of the country to let this matter stand for a later stage in the Session and see what action is taken in the United States—whether it is merely passed over for reconsideration

in December, or whether, as it is stated it may be, thrown out of the United States Senate altogether. If it is thrown out of the United States Senate altogether, I think our position would be a very unenviable one. If it is only carried over to the December Session of Congress, then I admit it would not be quite in the same position; but if we pass the treaty here, and if the Senate throws it out, I think we will feel rather cheap at the offers which we have made and which the Americans have not, for political reasons, it may be thought, fit to accept. The fishermen of this country are those who are most interested, and my anxiety is on their account, for I see plainly that having yielded to the Americans all that they wanted we have no prospect, and we have no probability, nor does it seem within the range of probability in the very near future, that there is any chance of our having fish admitted free into the United States. They have the use of our ports for their operations, for purchasing their bait, and for landing their cargoes; and under these circumstances our fishermen will continue to labor under the disadvantages which they are under to-day. A large portion of their catch must go to the United States, because we have no other market. That is well understood by the hon. members of this House, and was very fully explained by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1871, when he spoke as follows:—

"It seems to me that, in looking at the treaty in a commercial point of view, and looking at the question whether it is right to accept the articles, we have to consider mainly that interest which is most peculiarly affected. Now, unless I am greatly misinformed, the fishing interests in Nova Scotia, with one or two exceptions for local reasons, are altogether in favor of the treaty. They are so anxious to get free admission for their fish into the American market, that they would view with great sorrow any action of this House which would exclude from them that market; that they look forward with increasing confidence to a large development of their trade, and of that great industry, and I say that that being the case,—if it be to the interest of the fishermen, and to the advantage of that branch of national industry, setting aside all other considerations, we ought not wilfully to injure that interest. Why, Sir, what is the fact of the case as it stands? The only market for the Canadian No. 1 mackerel in the world is the United States. That is our only market, and we are practically excluded from it by the present duty. The consequence of that duty is, that our fishermen are at the mercy of the American fishermen. They are made the hewers of wood and the drawers of water for the Americans. They are obliged to sell their fish at the Americans' own price. The American fishermen purchase their fish at a nominal value and control the American market. The great profits of the trade are handed over to the American fishermen, or the American merchants engaged in the trade; and they profit to the loss of our own industry and our own people. Let any one go down the St. Lawrence on a summer trip—as many of us do—and call from the deck of the steamer to a fisherman in his boat, and see for what a nominal price you can secure the whole of his catch; and that is from the absence of a market, and from the fact of the Canadian fishermen being completely under the control of the foreigner. With the duty off Canadian fish, the Canadian fisherman may send his fish at the right time, when he can obtain the best price, to the American market, and thus be the means of opening a profitable trade with the United States in exchange."

The right hon. gentleman there most correctly interpreted our position. But what position are we in to-day? We are still shut out of that market, and have no prospect of getting into it. The concessions made in this treaty, I might almost say preclude all possibility of the Americans ever opening their market to our fish; and how are we to compete with them in the same sea when they have all the advantages of our ports and of our proximity to the fishing grounds given to them, and when, in addition to that, they can take their thousand barrels of mackerel to the United States and sell them for \$2,000 more than our fishermen can get for a thousand barrels in the same market? It is only by opening the markets of the United States that our great fishing industry can be extended. Our market is there, and the Americans know it as well as we do. They have been told it by the hon. First Minister and by others again and again. All our fish must go there, and we have to pay the duty on what we send, because their fishermen take the largest portion, and our fish must go in at the market value minus the duty they impose on us. I say, looking at the position of our fishermen at the present

moment, I regard this treaty as a most fatal blunder and as an injury to our fishermen which they will not be able to survive very long. They have been hoping year after year that as soon as they gave up those advantages which they possess in the fisheries, they would be placed on an equal plane of competition with the Americans; but they see all these advantages swept away, and they are obliged to compete with the Americans with these disadvantages against them. Under these circumstances, I am very sorry I cannot give the hon. gentleman that credit which has been given to him from Imperial as well as colonial sources. If, in the interest of the Empire, it is absolutely necessary that we should make these concessions, let us understand it, and I shall be prepared to make them and to take my share of the responsibility. But let us not put the matter under any false pretences—and this treaty has been submitted to this House under false pretences, if I may use such an expression, and if it is not unparliamentary,—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. JONES. I do not think it is out of order. This treaty has been submitted to this House with the representation that it is in the interest of our own people, and I say it is against the interest of our own people who are engaged in that industry. It is in the interest of peace, I admit, and I admit that as part of the Empire we are obliged to make some concessions; and if the hon. gentleman will put it on that high level, and appeal to the people on the ground that we are obliged to make sacrifices for the sake of Imperial interests, and to maintain a good understanding between two great peoples, I would be with him to a certain extent. But he has taken another ground; he has defended the treaty on the ground that it is in the interest of our own people, which is not the case. I repeat that if it would bring about a better understanding between the United States and the people of this country, which is very much to be desired, that is one point in its favor. It is the only point in its favor. If there was no other point that would commend this treaty to me, but if it would remove all causes of difference between the Americans and ourselves—if it would remove all those causes of irritation which have been brought about by the unwise fiscal policy of the present Government—if the Americans are led by it to see that there are five millions of people in this country who are anxious to establish trade relations with them which would be of mutual advantage to both countries, and are willing to make concessions under this treaty in order to obtain unrestricted reciprocity, then I say the sacrifice, injurious as it is to the fishermen along our coasts, if it leads in the future to those greater advantages of wider commercial relations between the two countries, will possibly not have been made in vain.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Speaker, the question now under the consideration of this House is to my mind the most important one that has been under discussion since I have had the honor of a seat here. The measure now before the House provides for the settlement of the only question which has ever caused a misunderstanding between the people of Canada and the people of the United States. It contemplates the removal of the barrier which now stops the way to our freer commercial intercourse with the people of the American republic; it heals all old sores, and will lead to a more healthy condition of feeling between the peoples of the two countries; it establishes friendly relations between them; and I believe, Sir, if the treaty is adopted by both countries, they will go hand in hand, each under their own flag, in the paths of peace, prosperity and progress. Believing that these results will follow the adoption of this treaty, I think I am warranted in saying that the question now before us is the most important one we have had to consider during the present or past Session of this

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

Parliament. It must be remembered, in considering this Fishery question, that it was not the fault of the people of Canada that the happy relations which existed between the countries, while the Treaty of 1854 and the Treaty of 1873 were in force, that is from 1854 to 1866 and from 1873 to 1885, ceased by the abrogation of those treaties. Those treaties, which disposed, for the time being, of the conflicting opinions that existed on both sides of the line as to certain sections of the Treaty of 1818, were both cancelled by the Congress of the United States, so that the people of Canada are not responsible for the retrogression from 1885 to 1818, and for the altered state of public feeling existing since 1885 between the two countries with reference to fishery matters. For that retrogression, from 1835 to 1818, the Congress of the United States is, in my opinion, solely responsible. The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 was evidently more in consonance with the spirit of the age in which we live, and with the changed condition of both countries than was the ancient Treaty of 1818. It disposed of the troublesome fishery question, and also permitted the interchange of certain commodities on terms fair and reasonable and advantageous to both countries. I find, on looking into this matter, that during the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty, from 1854 to 1866, there was a large trade between the two countries. That was before Confederation, and to arrive at the exact figures, I have had to take the trade of each Province. I find that the imports of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, during those years, from the United States, amounted to over \$319,000,000, and that the exports of those Provinces amounted to some \$252,000,000, leaving a balance of trade in favor of the United States of over \$67,000,000, and yet, notwithstanding that very favorable financial result of the working of the treaty, the treaty was abrogated by the United States in 1854, and we were compelled to revert to the Treaty of 1818. Subsequently, under the fishery clause of the Washington Treaty, the disputes or differences of opinion which existed between the people of Canada and the people of the United States, as to certain clauses of the Treaty of 1818, were silenced, to the very decided advantage of the people of both countries. That amicable arrangement was also brought to a close by the action of the people of the United States, and we were again driven to the Treaty of 1818. At the termination of the treaty in 1885, it will be remembered that Canada, at the suggestion of the Executive of the United States, and to show her friendliness and sincerity in her negotiations for the renewal of a reciprocity treaty, refrained for six or nine months from enforcing the conditions of the Treaty of 1818, and waited until the President of the United States submitted his Message to Congress. When Canada found that the Senate of the United States refused to act on the suggestion of President Cleveland, and refused to appoint a commission to consider this question, Canada adopted the only course open to her, and that was to revert to the Treaty of 1818. It was the only course consistent with her own self respect and with the interests of her fishermen. I contend, therefore, that for the ill-feeling to which the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) has referred, as existing in the United States toward Canada since the abrogation of the treaty in 1885, the Congress of the United States is alone responsible. That ill-feeling originated, of course, in the enforcement on our part of the conditions of the Treaty of 1818, and yet that was the only course open to us; and it seemed to me a mockery and an absurdity, that after we had those pleasant relations with our neighbors under the treaty which expired in 1885, we should have to go back to the ancient Treaty of 1818. It is not creditable that two friendly nations, two adjoining peoples, who have so much in common as we have with the people of the United States, should be wrangling and quarrelling over a document that was brought into existence over 70 years ago. No matter

how clear the conditions of that agreement may be, it is not creditable that in the present day we should be wrangling over it. It is much more sensible that we should come together, discuss the points in dispute, arrive at some mutually satisfactory solution, and then make a fresh start. That has been accomplished. The representatives of all the parties interested met at Washington, and after long and careful deliberations have placed their labors before us in the form of a treaty, and have submitted it to us for approval. We know that the treaty has also been sent to the Senate of the United States by President Cleveland, accompanied by his recommendation in favor of its adoption, and he has pronounced it a fair and an honorable agreement. I admit that Canada, in negotiating this treaty, has made certain concessions. As regards the full scope or precise value of those concessions, it is impossible to-day to estimate them, but we knew, when we submitted this matter to a commission or an arbitration, that palpably and inevitably concessions must follow. And I was a little surprised to find my hon. friend and colleague, the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), complaining of these concessions. I was under the impression that he had himself recognised that it was absolutely necessary that some concessions should be made on both sides in order to arrive at a happier state of feeling than has existed during the past twelve or eighteen months, because I find that my hon. friend is reported in the *Halifax Chronicle* of July 1st, 1886,—I believe he quoted a portion of the interview, but I did not catch these words—as having said:

“Nothing but mutual concession and a determination on the part of both Governments to avoid cause for open disagreement can prevent the most irritating consequence; and our friendly relations might be strained to a degree that could scarcely bear further tension.”

I think my hon. friend there has laid down the doctrine that mutual concessions are necessary even to preserve peace between the two countries. As regards the matter of concessions, we all know that, in the ordinary affairs of life, if there is a dispute between neighbors the most expeditious and satisfactory way of settling it is to call in parties acceptable to the disputants and to ask them to consider the matter in dispute and adjudicate upon it, and what is beneficial in private life is equally salutary in national life.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Not for one to give up every thing and the other nothing.

Mr. KENNY. I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman; but I do not object to this interruption. The hon. gentleman knows well that as soon as a matter is submitted to arbitration, or to a commission, that is a recognition of the fact that concessions are necessary on both sides. Now, looking at this question nationally, I say that, when I am called upon to vote on it, I consider that I am called to vote upon the most important question which has been submitted to Parliament since I have had the honor of being a member. But as my hon. friend and colleague has mentioned, it is especially important to the people of the Maritime Provinces, and notably to the Province of Nova Scotia. The whole fishery product of Canada in 1886 amounted to \$18,679,233, and of that amount Nova Scotia's share was \$3,415,361. Hon. gentlemen will recognise at once how much more concerned we are in that Province in all that relates to fishery questions than is any other Province of this Dominion. It will also be found that whilst in the whole of Canada, there were 55,731 men engaged in fishing, of these 27,435 belonged to the Province of Nova Scotia; and while the tonnage engaged in that industry amounted to 44,000 tons, 29,000 belonged to Nova Scotia. While the total value that Canada had invested in fishing boats, ships, nets, &c., amounted to \$6,814,295, of that amount Nova Scotia possessed nearly \$3,000,000, or almost half. Of the whole fishery product of Canada, it will be found that we exported in that year \$6,843,388, and that

Nova Scotia exports of fish amounted to \$3,899,077. I find that, of that amount, although my hon. colleague says the American market is the only market for our fish, of our exports of \$3,899,077, only about one-third, or \$1,358,024, went to the United States. As regards the condition of our fishermen, in whom we all take a very great interest, and who form a very large and important factor in our population, their condition to-day is, in my opinion, more satisfactory than it has been for many years. I believe that, at least as far as the fishermen of Nova Scotia are concerned, and I do not presume to speak for the fishermen of any other part of the Dominion, their condition as a whole is more satisfactory at present than it has been for many years. My hon. colleague has referred, in the course of his remarks, to the inshore fisheries of Canada, and has also called attention to the retrogression which has taken place in the general fishing interest of the United States of America, and he instanced the small product of mackerel for the year 1887. I think he could not have given us a better proof of the value of the inshore fisheries than that instance, because, if he had taken the trouble to enquire—and there are few gentlemen better informed on the subject than my hon. friend—he would have discovered that the last season was a poor mackerel season, especially for the Americans. The fish was caught principally inside the three-mile limit. The fish would not school off shore, so our fishermen caught mackerel by the old method of hook and line, and they did well, and that fish was almost all caught within the three-mile limit. My hon. friend knows that the Americans have exhausted their own fisheries by improper and injudicious fishing, and that there is certainly a risk of their doing the same, if they are not prevented, in our waters. The United States fishermen ignore the Canadian regulations, as far as they are permitted, and have the habit of throwing overboard the offal and fish they do not want, and thus help to destroy the inshore fisheries. I regret that, when this treaty was under consideration, means were not adopted, by international agreement, to put a stop to purse seine fishing. That method is more destructive than any other mode of fishing, and, if it be persevered in, will destroy the fishing on our coasts. It is known that, by the system of purse-seining, large quantities of fish are caught which are considered valueless by the American fisherman, because he only wants the mackerel, and he throws the other fish overboard, to the great injury of our fishing banks. I regret exceedingly that it was not possible to arrive at some international mode of putting a stop to this injurious system of fishing. While it is persevered in by the Americans, our own people, to a certain extent, are almost compelled to adopt it in self defence. My hon. colleague, in the course of his remarks, has referred to the fact that under the *modus vivendi*, the Americans are permitted to come into our harbors for the purchase of bait. The hon. gentleman must be aware that they can only exercise that privilege by paying for it, and that under the *modus vivendi*, they can frequent our harbors, on paying a tax of \$1.50 per ton, for the purchase of bait and other supplies. Why, Sir, it was only a few days ago that the *Halifax Morning Chronicle*, with which the hon. member is familiar, found great fault with the conditions of the treaty, because it did not permit American fishermen to come into our harbors for bait. That is one of the charges brought against the Minister of Finance, of excluding the American fishermen from our harbors and preventing them from acquiring bait. My hon. friend says that Mr. Bayard considered the “fishery question as one by itself,” and he found fault, as I understood him, at least, with the hon. Minister of Finance for not going further and using this opportunity for negotiating a reciprocity treaty. Well, Sir, as I understand the state of feeling which prevails among the statesmen and politicians of the United States, it is their desire and determination that the first question that shall be disposed of is

this fishery question, and they will not entertain any trade negotiations on the part of Canada, any offers on the part of Canada, for freer commercial intercourse with them, until this fishery question is settled; therefore my hon. friend is right in saying that "the fishery question is one by itself," and it must be disposed of before any other negotiations can be opened between the United States and Canada. And I notice, also, that my hon. friend has found fault in respect of the headland question; he says everything has been given away in the headland question, and that Mr. Bayard got exactly, in that matter, all that he asked for. Sir, I suppose I can hardly expect my hon. friend to praise the Government for this treaty, or for anything else they do; but I find that he took an interest in this headland question many years ago. In the *Globe* of May 16, 1872, I find that my hon. friend, in addressing the Parliament of Canada when the Washington Treaty was under discussion, found fault with the right hon. gentleman who was then leading the Government and advocating the treaty, because the headland question had not been settled. On that occasion he was reported to have said:

"The first question the arbitrators would have to decide would be the headland question, whether from headland to headland, or along the coast. It was, therefore, of the greatest importance that the High Commissioner should have settled definitely the question of headlands, so that the arbitration would have a basis on which to make their valuation."

Now, Sir, my hon. friend found fault in 1872 because the Government had not provided for a settlement of the headland question, and now he finds fault with them because they have settled it. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his remarks, states that in order to judge of the merits of this treaty, we should see how it is considered on the other side of the line. Well, my hon. friend knows that this very opinion which exists in the United States, and to which he has referred, as to the value of our inshore fisheries, gained importance and gained notoriety in the United States from the fact that a commission was held, and that certain of the public men of the United States visited the districts that were interested in fishing matters, Massachusetts especially, and held a commission in Boston and Gloucester, and received the evidence of those who were interested in the trade, and the general consensus of opinion in those places was that our inshore fisheries were comparatively of little value—that evidently seemed to be the opinion. He must also have noted that this fishery treaty has been frequently assailed by people of the United States, and by those who are most interested in fishery matters in that country, because, they say, that it concedes every thing to Canada, while my hon. friend takes the stand that everything has been conceded to the United States. Now, Sir, I think that impartial people will arrive at the same conclusion as has been pronounced by the President of the United States, that this treaty is a fair and honorable settlement of the difficulty. My hon. friend has not told us whether he is going to vote against the treaty or vote for it. He reminds me very much of what I read in the *Biglow* papers, of a man "that he cooled off" when he came to understand it." Now that my hon. friend and some of his neighbors have come to understand the question, they very likely have "cooled off." But the organ of opinion which represents him in the lower Provinces, the *Halifax Chronicle*, informed us the other day that the House should be divided on this question, and that the treaty should not be ratified by this Legislature. With that I cannot agree. I regret exceedingly, Mr. Speaker, that it was not within my power to arrive at Ottawa in time to have heard the very able, the very eloquent, the very exhaustive speech with which the hon. Minister of Finance introduced this important measure to the Parliament of Canada. I may say, Sir, that the criticisms which I have read of that speech in the public press, and the comments which I have heard from

Mr. KENNY.

hon. gentlemen who had the pleasure of listening to it, very much add to my regret. I was also sorry that I had not an opportunity of hearing the very brilliant and very incisive speech of the hon. Minister of Justice on that occasion. After those two distinguished statesmen have discussed this question, I think I almost ought to apologise to the House for taking up its time in referring to it, but the importance of this question to Canada, and to Nova Scotia particularly, must be my excuse. Sir, assuming that there will be a division of the House, I am prepared to say that I will vote for the treaty for several reasons. I will vote for it because I believe it is the best answer this House can give to the retaliatory Edmunds Bill of the United States, because Mr. Bayard says this treaty grants to American fishermen all they can reasonably ask from Canada. I will vote for the treaty because I believe, when it is calmly and dispassionately considered and judged on its merits by the people of Canada and of the United States, it will recommend itself to their sober judgment and approval. I believe that the adoption of the treaty will improve the relations between the two countries and establish such friendly feelings as ought to exist between us, and that they will be lasting. I believe that the adoption of the treaty will remove every possible cause of misunderstanding between the people of the United States and the people of Canada, and that it will unite in the closest ties of mutual esteem and respect all the members of the great English-speaking races. For these reasons I will vote for the treaty.

Mr. EISENHAEUER. As the treaty now under consideration will very largely affect the county which I have the honor to represent, I desire to offer some remarks on the question. I think it will interfere very seriously with the rights of a large class of our population, especially the deep sea fishermen, and I am of the opinion that it will press most unjustly on our fishing interests. Several hon. gentlemen who favor the treaty have endeavored to lead the House to believe that it will in no way press injuriously on that class of our population. I, however, think otherwise. We have a very large fleet of vessels engaged in what is called the deep-sea fishing. The fleet from the town of Lunenburg alone comprises from 80 to 90 sail averaging 80 or 90 tons each, besides about half as many more which come from other ports in the county. Most of these vessels are engaged in the trawl mode of fishing and are obliged to use fresh bait, in fact that is the only bait they can use. During the years of the treaty when American fishermen were allowed to come on our coasts and purchase bait, the price of bait to our fishermen was very much enhanced. I know that in some seasons our fishermen were obliged to pay as high as \$1 to \$5 for a barrel of herring. During the two or three years that have elapsed since the abrogation of the treaty, they have obtained their bait for about 50 per cent. less, and in some cases at even a greater reduction. The cost of bait for one of these vessels for a season during the existence of the treaty would average from \$600 to \$800, and in some cases it has cost even higher. During the last two years, however, the cost of bait for a vessel has not averaged more than \$300 or \$400. The price of bait again will be enhanced to what it was during the operation of the Washington Treaty, if the Americans are allowed to come in and purchase bait. It has been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that no surrender has been made by Canada, and that the concessions made were of a very trivial character. I should like some of those hon. gentlemen to come down to my county and endeavor to make the fishermen believe that such is the case. Those hon. gentlemen, even the Minister of Finance, have sought to lead the House to believe that Canada has made no concessions. For what, then, were we contending; for what reason were the Government so rigidly enforcing the fishery and customs laws and regulations? Nothing is to

be gained by ratifying the treaty at the present moment. In case the treaty was ratified by us and not ratified by our neighbors across the border, we would stand in a very much worse position than we would occupy if we allow the matter to drop. I think the Government would be acting in the true interests of the country, and the fishermen especially, if they would consider this matter seriously before the treaty was ratified. The chief reasons given for the arrangement arrived at are that it was entered into to prevent the United States carrying out their policy of retaliation. I cannot help saying that, in my opinion, the Government are somewhat to blame for the irritation that has been aroused among our neighbors across the border. In my humble opinion the Government have been too rigid and too severe. I may give an instance or two in which I was somewhat interested to show how very rigidly the Government have enforced all the regulations. The master of a vessel in which I was interested happened to fall in with an American vessel 14 miles distant from any headland. The American schooner was short of provisions and the men had scarcely anything left to eat, and the captain of the Nova Scotia vessel supplied the American with a barrel of flour and other small articles. The vessel, which was the *Scylla*, was seized and a fine of \$400 imposed for what I consider was only a humane act. The Government were, however, obliged to retract and refund the amount. In another case the master of a vessel in which I was interested borrowed 12 or 15 barrels of salt from a brother in command of an American vessel the year previous to the abrogation of the treaty, and in 1886 those vessels fell in with each other and my captain returned the salt. That vessel was again seized and fined \$100, of which the department remitted \$300. I think that hon. gentlemen will admit that this was very severe and rigid, but these are only a few of the examples which have come under my own personal knowledge. I think there is a good deal of truth in what the hon. the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) stated with regard to the treaty, for there are many points in it that will be open to contention and dispute, and instead of the treaty settling all former disputes I think it will just be the reverse. The hon. gentleman is also correct in his view with regard to several charges from which American vessels are exempt under this treaty, and which our vessels are obliged to pay. I think that is very unfair and bears very harshly on our fishermen. In my view it is impossible to carry on the fishing industry of our country, especially as regards pickled fish—mackerel and herring—when we are met with a heavy tariff of \$2 in the United States. It seems to me that under this treaty we have given away the key of the whole situation. It is said by some gentlemen on the other side that this treaty will be the means of removing all difficulties between the two countries and will gradually lead up to wider trade relations. I hope that that may be the case, but I very much fear we have given away the key we had in our hands and which we could use in order to bring about this very desirable result. As was pointed out by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), the provisions of the treaty will enable American fishermen to secure larger quantities of fish for their market, and it will consequently reduce the price for our fish. The privilege of transshipment of their fish in our ports enables those vessels to catch larger quantities of mackerel than they were formerly able to do, because the time they lost in going to ports in the United States with their fares and coming back to the fishing grounds will be saved to them. I do seriously think, and believe, that this treaty will work very injuriously to our fishermen. I must say that I anticipated the result of this Washington commission all along. I knew very well that the Home Government was very anxious to have this matter settled, and that they would be quite ready to settle it in a manner

very much contrary to our interests, so that I am not at all surprised at the result. That is very unfair to us; we were the weakest party of the three and we got the worst of it. It has been very properly stated here by a number of gentlemen that the American market was the only market for our best qualities of mackerel. We have four qualities of mackerel that find their way to the United States, besides a large portion of all the poorer qualities. During the year 1886 I think it was, the price for our best qualities of mackerel in the United States was very low, as low as \$3 or \$3.50 a barrel. On this fish we were compelled to pay a duty of \$2, as well as commission and other charges, so that the poor fishermen had not enough remaining to pay for barrels and salt, while the Americans had, at all events, the \$2 duty. During the treaty many of our vessels could take their fares of cod direct into the American ports from the Banks, and they got their return almost immediately. If this treaty is ratified they will not be able to do that, because the duty upon a fare of codfish equal to 2,000 quintals when dried would amount to \$1,700 or \$1,800 at a duty of half a cent a pound on green cod. We are, therefore, to a certain extent prevented from getting rid of the surplus of our codfish in the American market on account of the duty. This drives a large quantity of fish into the West India markets—a much larger quantity than those markets are able to consume, and consequently it lowers the price there as well. I think it would only be just and fair to those poor toilers by the sea, if the Government should increase their bounty to the amount they will receive from the American Government for licenses taken out by their fishing vessels. This treaty if ratified will injure the county which I have the honor to represent more than any county in the Dominion that I know of, for the reasons I have already given, and I think it would be only well that the Government should pause before ratifying this treaty, which will work so injuriously to all our deep-sea fishermen. There are a small number of fishermen who use the hook and line, and do not use fresh bait, who would not be much injured, but all others would be injured to a very large extent. Now, I am quite free to admit that the privilege of selling bait will be a benefit to our inshore fishermen, but I am quite sure that if our inshore fishermen had the choice they would prefer to remain as we are at present, provided by doing so there is any reasonable hope of getting rid of the American duty on our fish. After all, it is only a comparatively small portion of their catch which our inshore fishermen sell to the deep sea fishermen for bait. A very large portion of their best herring and mackerel are shipped to the American market. In the later part of the season nearly all their catch of mackerel finds its way into the American market, and they have to pay a duty on it of \$2 a barrel. Now, I do not wish to take up the time of the House, but I would repeat again, in the interests of the fishermen of the county I represent, and in the interests of the fishermen of the country generally, that I consider that the Government has made some very valuable concessions. The junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kenny), who has just taken his seat, seemed to think that the concessions do not amount to much. Well, if that hon. gentleman goes down into his county, I think he will find that the fishermen there will tell him a different story. I think the concessions are very valuable; in fact, I think the Americans have got almost all they wanted, while we have got nothing in return. The hon. member said there were concessions on both sides, but he failed to point them out, and I have failed to hear any hon. member point out the least concession which we have got from the Americans. Therefore, I would very strongly urge on the Government to stay their hands from ratifying this treaty, for the present at all events, for I believe it will prove most injurious to a large class of our fishermen. I am sure that no arrangement that can be made between the two countries will satisfy

the fishermen that does not provide for the free admission of fish into the American market. I am very sure that the whole of those engaged in the deep sea fisheries, if they gave expression to their feeling, would be against the ratification of the treaty. For these reasons I do hope the Government will take into consideration the advisability of withholding the ratification, at all events for the present.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Tobique Gypsum and Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. Weldon, Albert.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 91) to amend the Act to incorporate the Board of Management of the Church and Manse Building Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada for Manitoba and the North-West.—(Mr. Daly.)

FISHERIES TREATY.

House resumed debate on proposed motion of Sir Charles Tupper for second reading of (Bill 65) respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States.

Gen. LAURIE. The hon. the Minister of Finance took the House with him through a long and eloquent retrospect of the history of the fishery question; but there was one point to which the hon. gentleman did not allude, and I feel that he will not object to my supplying the omission. When the Washington Treaty was abrogated, and it became necessary that we should protect our fisheries, cruisers were sent out to do duty along our coasts, and a large expenditure was incurred in the protection of these fisheries. After two years of this protection a general election took place, and I say it with pride, and it must appeal, I am sure, to the national sentiment of every hon. gentleman in this House, upon whichever side he may sit, as showing that we are not any longer purely a paper nation, that we are not any longer Canadians by Act of Parliament, that, at a time when it was most desirable in the interests of party to make every point score against the Government, I did not find, from one end of the Dominion to the other, especially in the western part of the Dominion, where certainly no direct benefits accrue to the population by protection to the fisheries, that any voice was ever raised against this expenditure for the protection of our just rights. I feel that this is a thing of which we may well be proud, because when I go back to the history of the United States, I find that, even after they had existed as a nation; as a confederation of States for twenty years, after the war with Great Britain in 1812, when the matter was brought before the commissioners appointed to arrange terms of peace, the feeling grew so intense on the question of the fisheries, which were claimed by New England in their entirety, and which the other States did not trouble themselves much about, that a breach nearly occurred, and it was a very serious question whether the New England States would not separate themselves from the rest of the Confederation. I mention this as pointing to the fact that I think our national sentiment has already grown to a point when we may claim that every portion of the Dominion feels a patriotic interest in what concerns any other portion. It is a matter of pride, I must say, that when we compare our progress with that of the nation to the south of us, we find that even twenty years after the confederation of the different Provinces of Canada into one Dominion, we have

Mr. EISENHAUER.

formed a true national spirit and are prepared to co-operate with each other in every respect in defending the interests of our people in whatever parts of the Dominion these interests may be affected. Our national spirit leads us to cultivate and protect the interests of another portion of the community rather than see it go by default and suffer, and in that sense we show that a national spirit has already taken root amongst us. In connection with the question before us, I am happy to say that, although, of course, being detained by my parliamentary duties, I have not been able to go amongst my constituents and hear their views, I am in constant communication with them, and I am pleased to learn from all parts of the constituency that the people have not made this a party question, but very generally approve of the provisions of the treaty. With reference to the remark of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) that this treaty is composed of concessions made in favor of the United States, that may be the case. It is the case undoubtedly, but I would ask if those concessions made to the United States are not injurious to the interests of our fishermen, why should we object to them. If we find that the concessions made by us are in no ways inimical to our people, it is a triumph of statesmanship to have overcome by this means the difficulties of the situation and have arrived at a settlement satisfactory to both sides. There was some historical error in the statement of the hon. member for Halifax which I feel bound to correct. He said that under the Washington Treaty the interests of the Province of Nova Scotia were sacrificed, because the right hon. the First Minister refused to offer the United States plenipotentiaries free lumber and coal. I think that is undoubtedly an error, which I cannot allow to pass on the present occasion without correcting it. My impression is that the right hon. gentleman did not refuse to make this offer, but that the offer was declined at the request of the British plenipotentiaries, on the ground that the compensation offered to Canada was not sufficient to offset the advantages which the United States had obtained, and whilst the matter was under consideration, the United States withdrew the offer. I have called attention to this because I do not feel it right that this statement should pass unnoticed. The hon. gentleman regrets very much that we did not offer to the United States the privilege of free fish in Canadian waters, in return for reciprocity in natural products, and he says that was the lever which should have been used to obtain reciprocity. The hon. gentleman poses as a friend of the fishermen, but I hardly think it is consistent with that position which he assumes, that he should be willing to sacrifice their interests for the purpose of obtaining a concession which would benefit other interests. I do not think it is the duty of true friends of the fishermen to sacrifice their interests for the sake of others. The hon. gentleman went on to say that he regretted that the Americans did not ask for the inshore fisheries, and he has assumed therefore that they placed no value on our inshore fisheries. Whatever value the Americans may place on them, I do not hesitate to say that our people place a great value on our inshore fisheries. It is by means of those fisheries that a large portion of the population of the Maritime Provinces derive their existence, and were it not for this source of livelihood, they would be forced to seek a living elsewhere, as this is the only resource of the people living on those rocky shores. Were the Americans permitted to return to our fisheries as formerly, in a few years the fisheries would be fished out and destroyed by their reckless habits of fishing, and a large portion of our population forced to seek a living elsewhere. The hon. gentlemen referred to Article 11 of the treaty. Well, I could hardly follow his reasoning with regard to it. He referred to that question of licenses, to purchase for the homeward voyage such provisions and supplies as are sold to trading vessels. He assumes from that, although the hon.

the Minister of Justice set him right, that these vessels could come in and purchase bait and salt and barrels, and in fact everything they required, so as to make our coasts a base of supplies for their operations. I do not think that is the reading of the treaty and that it is so understood by the plenipotentiaries. He then touches on the headlands contention, and makes an assertion which I was a little surprised at, because if he had listened to the discussion across the floor, when the treaty was introduced, between the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), he would have had better information. He asserts that the headlands contention has been maintained by the British Government for the last seventy years. I think he might have heard that, on instructions from home, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), when he was Minister of Marine, thought proper to withdraw that contention, and not to instruct the cruisers to keep the Americans outside of that limit. The fact is that, in 1869 and 1870, as we have had already told us, the three miles boundary following the coast was all we were permitted to preserve, but now, under this new treaty, they have adopted the regulations applicable to the North Sea Convention and adopted by all the nations of Europe, and have protected all bays where the headlands are ten miles or less apart. It is a distinct gain. The Americans have now acknowledged this, whereas they formerly claimed that they could come within three marine miles of the shore at any point. He also objected to vessels being permitted to enter our harbors to purchase bait under the article of the treaty by which, under license, vessels can enter for certain purposes, and he went on to show that this would lead to smuggling unless a large addition was made to the customs staff. I am afraid that, as long as foreign vessels are allowed to enter our harbors, as long as duties are levied, there will be a necessity for that, and, whether those vessels enter our harbors to purchase bait or anything else, for barter or for gold, as long as people require certain goods, those goods will be landed on shore unless steps are taken to prevent it. He also says those vessels will fish within the three-mile limit, unless cruisers are there to guard against that. How is this to be prevented? We have a long coast, and whether vessels come in for bait, or drift in, as they claimed last year, they will come in. As has been stated by the hon. gentleman, if the fish are there they will come after them, and I do not think the fact that they can come in to buy bait is of any consequence in that connection. Then the hon. gentleman says that we ought to wait until the Senate of the United States have dealt with this question. I do not agree with him in that. I do not think it is desirable that we should place ourselves in the position of a subordinate Legislature to the Senate of the United States. I think, as far as this matter is concerned, we are a sovereign Legislature within ourselves in regard to approving or disapproving of this treaty, and it is for us to deal with matters of interest to our own people without reference to the Senate of the United States. He says we will feel cheap if the treaty is rejected there. I do not hold with him on that point, and I will give my grounds. We have been charged with carrying on our protective service in a barbarous manner, it has been charged that we have followed practices that would not be followed by any other civilised nation, and, if that is the case, if this matter should come to arbitration at any time, and that assumption prevailed, it is quite clear that we would have to surrender these points. So it is better for us to show that we are prepared to accept this rational and modern interpretation of the Treaty of 1818, and in so doing we shall have the sympathy of all nations outside. Should the matter be referred to arbitration later, the arbitrator certainly would not be prejudiced against us as a nation pursuing barbarous and irrational practices. I also fail to see the point which he tried to make in asserting that

the treaty as now made precludes further negotiation, and finally closes any possibility of the American market being opened for our fish, which he as well as I and every man who handles fish must desire, and everyone who is interested in the fishing community must equally desire; but, so far from that it seems to me that we have placed ourselves in the very best position possible for this further negotiation. The plenipotentiaries on either side were not permitted to make alterations in the tariff; they could only submit them but, while they stated that they were not authorised to negotiate on the basis of a tariff arrangement, they so made their arrangements that, until the fish are placed on the free list, the American vessels that fish off our coasts will be at a disadvantage in this respect, that, even if they have licenses, they will have to pay a license fee therefor, and, therefore, they will be at a greater expense than our vessels will be. The hon. gentleman produced a book, the report of the Boston Fish Bureau, which he appeared to think an authority on the matter of fish, and he said if the Minister of Finance had had this book which I hold in my hand, he would not have negotiated this treaty. Why not? What is there in this book to preclude it? I have also a copy of the book in my hand, and I do not find anything in this book to prevent the Minister of Finance negotiating this treaty. I find that the hon. gentleman stated some facts from this book, and also I regret to say that, no doubt entirely unintentionally on his part, he made some misrepresentations of facts. He quoted from a table and said that the total importation of mackerel into the United States in 1887 was 99,935 barrels, and he mentioned how much the catch of mackerel in the United States had been reduced since they were shut out of our inshore fisheries; but, when I examined this return a little more attentively, I found that that amount is the total receipts in the Boston fish market of domestic and foreign catch. Then he went on to say that, as our catch was small compared with theirs, the price of mackerel was regulated by the home catch there, and our importation had to pay the duty. Without going into that question more fully at the present moment, I find that the domestic receipts in the Boston market are 25,664 barrels, and the foreign receipts 51,643 barrels; so that the foreign receipts in Boston are twice as much as the domestic receipts, in mackerel. If his argument is good for anything—and I am prepared to endorse it on that point that, where there is a sufficiency of the article in the market the importer will pay the duty if he chooses to send in any more, but that where there is not a sufficiency the consumer will pay the duty, and the home producer will gain the benefit—here we see that the imported article is double the quantity of the home production; but that is only in the Boston fish market. There really was a larger catch than that in New England, amounting to 88,000 barrels, which was the smallest catch for forty years. I think that is a proof that our protection of our fisheries, as I maintain and as our fishermen maintain, and our keeping the Americans outside the three-mile limit allows the mackerel to find a home there, where they are less disturbed, and larger quantities will fall into the hands of our fishermen, who fish in a better and more methodical manner than the Americans, and the Americans will take a smaller quantity year after year. The fish have a sort of intelligence, and they will come within the three-mile limit where they are less disturbed. The hon. gentleman who preceded me, the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer), is a gentleman for whose opinions on the fishery question I have the highest respect. No man in this House is a better authority on fish than he is, and he deserves the highest credit for the impulse he has given to the county he represents, and for the intelligent way in which he has built up the trade there. All honor to him for it, but when he spoke on this point, he

naturally spoke from the point of view of the particular branch of the fishery trade in which he is interested. He has a special interest. The inhabitants of the county of Lunenburg are much more engaged in that business, as he said himself. He spoke most fairly on the subject. He told us that his constituents were deeply interested in the deep-sea fisheries, but he went on and told us, and I give him credit for that too, how they were interested. He said that when the Americans, under the Washington Treaty, were given entrance to our harbors to buy bait, the price of bait rose \$ per barrel for herring; that since the abrogation of that treaty the deep sea fishermen had been enabled to buy their bait for 50 per cent. less. He showed us that during the treaty, the fitting out of a vessel going to the Grand Banks for bait, would amount to from \$600 to \$1,000; whereas since the abrogation of the treaty, they could purchase the same quantity of bait at from \$300 to \$400. Well, Sir, who gets that money? Where is it spent? Why, they buy their bait from the inshore fishermen, and these get the money. You will observe by this that the protection of the inshore fishermen has conduced to their advantage. The permission is renewed, and the price of bait will again rise. But if it raises the price of bait, that bait will be bought from the toilers along our coast, and they will get the money for it; in that sense the treaty would not be an injury to the inshore fishermen. Now he also made the point that it is most desirable that the duty should be taken off all sorts of fish, including codfish, because the United States people were our best market for our best class of codfish; and if they took them off our hands, they would enable us to obtain a higher price in the market that takes the largest quantity of our fish, but a second class article, that is the West Indies. Now, Sir, I do not hesitate to say that it is most desirable that the duty should be taken off. He touched upon another matter in regard to the application of the license fee, assuming that the Americans are going to pay it, and from what I hear from my county they are already making arrangements to do so. The hon. gentleman from Halifax says that we got nothing and that the Americans Government got everything under the treaty. If we get nothing, and they get everything, I think the fairest way to ascertain is to ask, in the first place: What are the interests of our fishermen? We are dealing with a very divided interest. I do not say that the interest of the various classes of fishermen along our shores are antagonistic, but I do say they are diversified and different one from the other. They are all important. There is a large amount of capital invested in each of these industries. We will take, first, the shore fishermen. Now, how are our shore fishermen to suffer under this arrangement? Sir, when I had the misfortune, or the good fortune—I am not prepared to say which it was,—of running two elections during the last year, in a fishing county, as my opponent was opposed to the Government, I heard everything that could be said against the Government, and every point possible was made in order to throw discredit upon the Government. One of the points that was made in December last was that the Minister of Finance had gone to Washington and that he would palm off, he would surrender, the shore fisheries to the fishermen of the United States, and that no price we could obtain would be sufficient to compensate our shore fishermen for the surrender of those fisheries. The Finance Minister has come back, but he has not parted with our shore fisheries; and although the hon. member for Halifax says he is sorry that the Americans did not ask for them, I, Sir, am very glad they did not ask for them, and I am very glad they did not get them, because I consider they are of the greatest value to us. When I talked to our shore fishermen, and in all my communications and conversation with them, "whatever you do," they said, "keep the Americans outside the three-mile limit." Well, Sir, they are to be kept

Gen. LAURIE.

out, and not only that, but a very lucrative market is to be opened to our fishermen, if the treaty is ratified; and if, by-and-bye, the duty is taken off fish, or the *modus vivendi* is established a very lucrative market will be opened to them and they will be benefited by a vast increase in the price of bait that they will be able to sell, not only to our own fishermen but also to the Americans. Now, Sir, we have a second class, the deep sea fishermen, those in whom the hon. member for Lunenburg is particularly interested, and in whom I am largely interested and whom I largely represent. Their principal desire is that the duty be taken off fish going into the States. But, Sir, how can we compel the Congress of the United States to take that duty off? You recollect, Sir, the old story of a traveller with a cloak on; and the sun and the wind were contesting which should get his cloak off first. In this case the wind will not get that cloak off first; the sun may. We may succeed by offering them certain inducements, we may get that cloak off, we may get the duty taken off. In the first place let us show them, as we are doing, as we have done under this treaty, that we are animated by no hostile spirit, that we are prepared to meet them in a fair and reasonable way. When they come to pay their license fee year after year, they will see that, on the whole, it will be advantageous for them not to pay the license fee, that it will be as well for them to let us enter into competition with them in their market, as to continue the present system of competition. That being the view, I think we have adopted the very best plan, under the circumstances, of getting the duty taken off. Now, there is a third and a very important class, and that is the shore traders who supply the fishermen. To them it will be a very great boon that the American fishermen may come into our harbors, may come upon our coasts and purchase such supplies as they need under the treaty, or under the *modus vivendi*. It will tend to increase the consumption of the products of our soil, and other products, even our manufactured products and also stimulate trade among ourselves. One large and important industry there, is the collection of ice in winter. Now, ice is supplied now only to our own fishermen, but under this arrangement, it will be supplied, on a very much larger scale, to American fishermen as well. Frost is cheap in our country, and so is water, and we can make ice on a large scale, and sell an article that does not cost anything except in the labor of gathering it. Then we have a fourth class, that is the class who man the Gloucester fishing vessels. It is a common delusion among the people of the United States, which they manifested when they got up this cry about our shameful treatment of their fishermen. They said: This is an industry of extreme importance to us, it must be protected, because it is the only nursery for our navy in time of war. Why, Sir, men from the Provinces man the United States fishing vessels, and therefore they have to be considered too. That is a very important element in the consideration of this question. One of the great grievances of these men is that they cannot visit their home during the summer. Now, if this treaty is carried into effect, or if the *modus vivendi* is adopted, and they obtain a license, they will practically be able to visit their homes. They often run into port from the Roseway Banks and the Western Bank, to shelter on our coast, and in doing so one of their great grievances will be removed. I mention this because, even in the matter of duty half will come to our men, because, as a rule, the crews of vessels receive one-half the out-turn. Now, it is the impression that they are protecting American fishermen, that the duty is practically a bounty which goes to American fishermen as opposed to provincial fishermen; but, as a matter of fact, these fishermen, not wild harum-scarum young men, but for the most part fathers of families who have made a practice of going away to the United States, who own they do not do any better when

they go, but who go because they have been in the habit of going and do not like to change the system, obtain one-half of the present duty so long as the duty is imposed. So the duty, instead of going into American pockets, largely goes into the pockets of our own fishermen and is brought home by them at the end of the season.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh!

Gen. LAURIE. Perhaps, if the hon. gentleman will visit the Maritime Provinces he will find out that what I am saying is an actual fact; I am not speaking what I have read, but I am speaking what I know. There are, however, disadvantages in connection with shipping in United States vessels. They are more reckless in sailing than our vessels, and while they do make larger returns, they also make larger losses. I now refer to the book, which the Finance Minister was told he should have referred to more frequently, and I find that the losses of Gloucester vessels during the season of 1887 amounted to 22 vessels and 145 lives, of which I am sorry to say a very large proportion, far more than the majority, were those of fishermen from the Lower Provinces. I think, as I mentioned already, that the county which I have the honor to represent, where political feeling as a rule runs high, has not undertaken, I am happy to say, to regard the fishery question from a party point of view. The people regard it from the commercial and practical point as to whether it will be a benefit to them or whether it will be an injury, and the consensus of opinion, even by those who are on other points politically opposed to the Government, is that on the whole the new treaty will be a very great benefit. Their idea was, and their idea still is, as it must be the idea of every sensible man, that if in discussing the Treaty of 1818 with the United States we were to hold to our extreme position in regard to its interpretation and claim everything that we could claim under the treaty, no progress would be made. The United States did not contend that our position was a false one further than that our interpretation was not in harmony and consonance with the modern view, and, therefore, they were not prepared to abide by it. This is not the only instance of a nation refusing to abide by a treaty. We can go back to a time within the recollection of most of us when this occurred. After the Crimean war the Treaty of Paris was signed by France, England and Sardinia and by Russia, and under it Russia bound herself to certain conditions in the Black Sea; but when France was prostrated at the feet of Germany in 1870, Russia then thought it would be a good time to repudiate the treaty. She has done so. I say, therefore, it is all very well for us to assert that the treaty laid down such and such conditions, and, therefore, to the end of time, we are bound by them. Nations—it may be a matter of bad faith—need not do so; the precedent of violating treaties has been set, and being set it has been practically copied by our neighbors. It, therefore, was not wise for us to stand up and demand the full requirements of the treaty, like Shylock, but rather to obtain the best interpretation we could and satisfy the reasonable views of the Americans, so long as they were not seriously to our injury. I conceive that while the treaty does not fully satisfy either party, neither has strong reason to complain. It was charged against the Government time and again that they should have arrived at some reasonable understanding in regard to this matter some years ago. If it was wrong for them not to arrive at a reasonable understanding then, surely it is right to have arrived at a reasonable one now, on the principle at all events that it is better late than never, but at the same time the Minister of Finance has shown good reasons why this was not done, and I believe the majority of the people, judging from the expressions used throughout the country, are prepared to endorse the view that he expressed, that

the opportunity was not offered until lately, and that at the earliest possible moment our Government and the British Government availed themselves of the opportunity, with the result that we now know. I think it is all very well to say that the treaty is only a concession to secure the peace of the Empire. I think the Empire has a certain claim upon us and is interested in our keeping on good terms with our neighbors. The country from which we spring, the country that furnishes an army and navy to work with ours and that enforces our treaties and supports them is worthy of some consideration, and this reasonable and modern interpretation of the Treaty of 1818 has placed us in a position that, even if the United States Senate should refuse to ratify this treaty, we have the distinct pledge and guaranteed support of the mother country to enforce our contentions and enforce our rights. There is one further point on which I should like to touch; it is that dwelt on by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) and it is a matter worthy of consideration. The *modus vivendi* is to be introduced under a system by which a license is to be paid by the United States vessels for certain privileges, which are to be granted to them free when our fish can go in free to the United States. Until the United States abolish this import tax, practically a bounty is given to them in the shape of the duty when they carry their fares back to port, and which raises the price to the consumer. They benefit and our vessels suffer to that extent—they are in a worse position by the amount of the bounty. The contention of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) is a most reasonable one, and I hope the matter may receive the consideration of the Government. It is not a matter in connection with the treaty but a matter of municipal regulation, and the suggestion is that the amount of the licenses paid by the United States vessels shall go for the benefit of our fishermen, so as to compensate them in some degree for the duty that is charged on their fish going into the United States, so as to place them on an equal footing with those who fish on the same banks and carry, to a large extent, their fish to the same markets, but who have the advantage of that bounty in their favor. Under all these circumstances I feel, all things considered, that while we have made concessions to the United States, which I think will meet their reasonable requirements, I do not think our fishermen have suffered to any serious extent, and therefore, I feel it to be my duty as representing a fishing constituency to support and vote for this treaty.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I feel that on rising to address the House on this occasion I am speaking on perhaps one of the most important subjects that has ever occupied the attention of this colonial legislature since the Dominion was formed. It is not too much to say that perhaps no question has ever come before us which has caused so much agitation, so much public attention on the part of Her Majesty's Ministers at home and so much trouble and interest to Her Majesty's Ministers in the colonies as this fishery question. And, Sir, I am more than pleased to find that the gentlemen who have spoken upon that question on both sides of the House have spoken on it as I believe free from any influences of party politics and in a manner to show that we are prepared to approach the consideration of it and to continue the discussion of it in the same spirit. Sir, I listened with great attention to the very able and eloquent speech of the hon. the Finance Minister, and while I have always admired that gentleman's ability, and acuteness, and dignity and eloquence, perhaps on no occasion has he ever presented a case to the House in which a bad case was so well put as that put by the hon. gentleman on Tuesday last. Sir, I listened to him with great attention when he asked this House to believe that the Government of which he was a member

and the commission of which he was one of the representatives of England, in securing this treaty had performed a feat which would command the admiration of Canada, and ensure to the benefit of her people. Sir, on these points I differ with him, but though I may differ with him in relation to the praise that he takes for the Commission and the laudation which he gave to gentlemen connected with it on the British side, and to the conclusions at which he arrived in reference to the benefits it would be to this country I must say that, looking at it, and looking at it in the consequences which the perpetuation of peace with our great neighbors on the south will bring about, although I look at the treaty as completely giving away the interests of Canada in almost every particular, I must tell this House that "give away" as it is and whatever the consequences of it may be, we have got to confirm and to carry out the treaty. We have got to do that, Sir, not because it is a just or a fair treaty to Canada, which it is not, and before I sit down I think I will be able if not to satisfy gentlemen on that side of the House I will be able at all events to induce the hon. the Minister of Finance to say that he certainly has colored the advantages which he alleged Canada would receive rather too highly. I speak now not for the purpose of opposing the treaty, but I speak for the purpose of putting the case of Canada fairly before this House and before the country. I do it not, for the purpose of obstruction, or bringing into disrepute the efforts of the hon. gentleman whose work during that long and tedious negotiation of three months in Washington, I have no doubt they were in the best interests as he conceived of the country which he served. I speak, Sir, for the purpose of placing that gentleman and the Government he represents on this side of the water, and the Government on the other side of the water that accredited him to Washington in the position which I think they ought to be in, and to show that the credit they assume to adopt, for having accomplished the conclusion of a difficult question is not of that creditable character to them which the hon. gentleman assumes it is. Sir, these gentlemen believe that in accomplishing peace at any price they have accomplished a benefit for the country. Well, Sir, they have. Peace at any price is an advantage to Canada in her position in relation to our great neighbors to the south. Peace at any price is an advantage to Canada in the situation in which we are placed and in consideration of the way we have been deserted by Her Majesty's Ministers in England and by that British Government which the hon. gentleman has stated to us when he spoke the other day when he said: That when we appear at a commission or a convention or a public assembly of any kind our weight and our influence is measured by the power that is behind us, and I sitting at that commission in Washington as the representative of the greatest Empire in the world, felt that my statements and words carried with them a weight which I could not have assumed nor could have carried had I been simply a representative of Canada. Perhaps in some cases the hon. gentleman might be right. It is an advantage when we appear in a representative character to have power and influence behind us, to have a moral and material weight that can carry out our wishes or that can enforce our wishes with power if it is necessary, or with that moral weight which it is always desirable to have. But, Sir, when that moral power and that moral weight is simply a name, as it has been for forty years past, then, Sir, I think it is of little use to a man sent to represent the interests of a country like Canada, and is it not a fact to be proud of. That is the position which I assume, and before I sit down I think I will satisfy my hon. friend, and the gentlemen who sit beside him, as well as gentlemen on this side of the House, that I am right. In making that statement I am making a statement which the records of the

Mr. MITCHELL.

last forty years will sustain; and, Sir, when I come to that part of my speech, or rather my explanation, because I will not call it a speech, I will ask the forbearance of this House if I have to delay for some time, perhaps it may be too long, in reading authorities with regard to the statement I am making that the record of the last forty years has been a British desertion of the interests of her brightest and greatest colony. My hon. friend devoted a great part of his time to laudation of the gentlemen with whom he was associated. With that I will not pretend to find much fault, but I will say this with relation to Mr. Chamberlain, whom the hon. gentleman said: No man in England could have been selected more fit to represent England and to secure the interests of Canada at Washington than the Hon. Joseph Chamberlain. That Mr. Chamberlain is an able and a clever man no one will deny. That he occupies a prominent position in the political life of England is true, that he may have rendered services to the country of his birth and of his occupation is also true, but, Sir, when he was selected to come out and to represent Canadian interests—or rather nominally English interests, but practically Canadian interests—at Washington, I differ with my hon. friend when he says that the selection was a good one, and that no more fitting man could have been selected to occupy that position. Sir, surely Mr. Chamberlain showed before he left England that he wanted and lacked that discretion which a statesman should possess. At a public meeting, shortly before he left England, he boasted of the position he was going to occupy and said that he was going out and that he would conclude a treaty, and he particularly referred to the Canadian claims which had been made and which could not and ought not be sustained. Sir, what would you think of a jurymen going on a jury to try a man for his life, who told us before he went on that jury that he knew the man was guilty. Suppose you appointed a person as arbitrator what would you think of a man stating before he went on there that he was going to give a verdict against you. That is the position of Mr. Chamberlain. But there is another objection to Mr. Chamberlain and I think it is a subject of regret, because of it, that he was appointed. We know, Sir, that there is a very powerful section of the British Empire who have a great cause of grievance against the Government of that country. We know in Ireland where the people have been striving and struggling, whether rightly or wrongly—I believe rightly myself whatever difference of opinion there may be about that—I say whether rightly or wrongly they have been struggling for privileges which have been denied them, and Mr. Chamberlain has been one of those men who have taken a strong part against those national aspirations of the Irish people. Sir, when we look at the United States and find the composite character of its population, when we find the large number of seven or eight millions, if not more, of Irishmen and their descendants who are in that country and wherever Irishmen are you find them occupying prominent positions in the executive of the country, in the legislative halls and in the administration of the public affairs. Will anyone tell me if we desire to get that treaty passed—if it is a desirable treaty to pass—that the fact that Mr. Joseph Chamberlain was appointed to come out to endeavor to secure the treaty was calculated to recommend him to that important and influential class of people in America who have something to say about the passage of this treaty before the Senate? Sir, my impression is that Mr. Chamberlain made a mistake in his utterances, and my impression is that the British Government made a mistake on the part of Canada in selecting Mr. Chamberlain for the position. Perhaps I might have said nothing about that were it not that my hon. friend, with a generous desire to speak friendly of the men with whom he has been associated, felt it necessary to give Mr. Chamberlain an amount of laudation and credit to which I have grave doubts about his being entitled. That

is my justification for referring to him; and had the hon. gentleman not brought before this House Mr. Chamberlain's public services, his great ability, and his fitness for the position, and praised the Government who selected him, I should not have felt it necessary to refer to him in the way I have done. With regard to Sir Sackville West, I believe him to be a very respectable man. He also came in for a considerable degree of praise and laudation from the hon. gentleman. We know that in his association with other men, the great talents and abilities of our friend the hon. Minister of Finance command attention and respect. We know that Sir Sackville West is and has been all his life an employé in the diplomatic service of the British Government, and we know that his object is to serve the British Government. Serve Canada! What cares Sir Sackville West for Canada? What cares Mr. Joseph Chamberlain for Canada? What they desire to secure is the commendation of England and the English Government. That is the thing they have aimed at, and that is the thing they have obtained by this treaty, and it is the only thing. Sir, my hon. friend, in his speech of Tuesday last, gave an historical account of the fishery question for the past one hundred years. He pointed out what the arrangements were under the Treaty of 1783; then he came to the Treaty of Ghent; then he came to the convention of 1818; and he went on to tell us that the British Government had for the last forty years abandoned the view they had entertained as to the construction of the convention of 1818 for the previous forty years. The hon. gentleman noticed me shaking my head when he made that statement because I knew it was not true. I do not mean to impute wilful misstatements to the hon. gentleman. I would be sorry to do that, and if anything I say would seem to have that bearing, I know he will believe that I would not desire in the least to doubt his word, or suppose that he would make a statement to this House which he knew to be incorrect. But, Sir, I have been identified with this fishery question. Seven years of my life I spent in working it up. When I took it in hand the British Government was about to desert us; and for seven years my efforts were directed to trying to keep those men on the other side of the water, in the British Foreign Office and in the Colonial Office, up to their work, and preventing them from sacrificing and deserting Canada. Sir, I am making bold statements, but I will prove them before I sit down. The hon. gentleman next referred to the Treaty of 1854, effected by Lord Elgin, and he pointed out the great advantages which we had derived from that treaty, and I entirely agree with him. I believe that that treaty was the first entering wedge of free commercial intercourse between Canada and the United States. During the twelve years that that treaty lasted, to 1866, more real commercial progress and prosperity were developed in Canada, more farming industries were created, more mechanical employments were given to our people, than they had at any period up to that time. Sir, it was a matter of regret, not alone to the people of one section of this country—for we were then a number of isolated Provinces—Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, with separate Governments, Quebec and Ontario as old Canada united—but every Province sharing in the benefits of that treaty, regretted its abrogation at the instance of the American Government. Sir, the hon. gentleman stated rightly that efforts were made by the several Governments to bring about a renewal of that treaty. Their efforts failed, I am sorry to say. Neither one party nor the other of the political parties in this country was to blame for that failure. It arose from the fact, as the hon. gentleman rightly stated, that an unfounded prejudice existed, whether rightly or wrongly, based on the belief that we had favored the southern portion of the United States in the internecine struggle which had been carried on in that country for six or seven years.

Whether we did or did not may be a matter of opinion, but my hon. friend's statement was correct, I have no doubt, that a very large portion of the people of this country sympathized with the North, because for one man who was found in the southern army, six or seven or eight were to be found in the Northern. At any rate, the treaty was repealed, and the United States Government refused to renew it; and when Mr. George Brown and Mr. Justice Henry, who I am sorry is so low to-night —

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Better.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to hear it, for the country can ill spare a man like him, who has taken such a prominent part in this country, both in his political and judicial capacity. When he was sent from Nova Scotia and Sir Albert Smith from New Brunswick and the gentlemen from Canada went to Washington and failed to obtain a renewal of the Treaty in 1866, it was a matter of great regret in all the Provinces. Those who remember the history of Canada will remember the position the country was in at that time. Old Canada was so torn with political dissensions that there was scarcely a Government that could last a week with any degree of certainty. We found one of the old Provinces struggling against another, and it was then that the idea struck the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government and a number of hon. gentlemen connected with him, to form a confederation of British America. Sir, we did form it, and I am proud to say that I took some part in its formation. As the Premier of my own Province, after one defeat I was successful in bringing the Province into line and inducing it to enter the Confederation. When I came here and took the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, what did I find? I found that those gentlemen, in 1866, the year before we came here, had protested against the efforts of the British Government to induce us to allow the Americans to come in and occupy our fisheries for a year. I will say for the Government of that day that they wrote a most pungent dispatch, in which, although requested by the British Government, they refused to allow the Americans to come in and occupy our fisheries as they had done under the treaty. They communicated with the Governments of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and those Governments, out of deference to the wishes expressed by the British Ministers, consented, as did the Government of Canada, to an arrangement for allowing the Americans to come in on paying a tax of half a dollar a ton, but for only one year. That arrangement was agreed to in response to a despatch of Sir Edward Cardwell, then Colonial Minister. That despatch can be found in a return brought down in response to a motion made by Mr. Blake in 1872. Sir Edward Cardwell urged the Government of the Provinces to permit the Americans to occupy the fisheries on the same terms as they did before the repeal of the treaty, stating that if they would consent to that, before the year was out some new arrangement would be made. We did it, the several Provinces did it, and before the term came around again in 1867, we had formed Confederation, and the duty was imposed upon me of creating the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I did create that department, and I think that I can appeal with satisfaction to the House and to the people generally to say whether, during my record of seven and a-half years, I did not perform my duty faithfully and effectively. When, Sir, in 1867, we were appealed to again to renew the arrangement, I was called upon to enquire into and make a report on the matter, and I did make a report which is contained in the public records of this Parliament. In that report, while I disapproved of the policy, at the urgent request of Her Majesty's Government, I recommended an increase of duty and consented to a continuance of the arrangement, but only for one year more. That year passed away. The number of

vessels which took out licenses the first year was considerably larger than the second, and when we were applied, the third year, to allow the Americans to fish on the same terms, we resented the application. We increased the duty, but consented only to put it on for one year more. Before that year was finished, I found that the British Government had again weakened, and when I studied up the history of the question for the previous sixty or seventy years, I found that while the British Government had strictly enforced the headland question and the exclusion of Americans from the bays, and protected our inshore fisheries, about which there was never a dispute, for nearly forty years after the Treaty of 1818 was made, yet, when in 1854 the Elgin Treaty was made, our exclusive rights over these fisheries were suspended during its existence, for twelve years, and the Americans were permitted to go in and participate in the fisheries under that treaty while it lasted. But when that treaty expired, in 1886, England resumed the protection of the fisheries of Canada, and stated the existence of our claims as being revived, as they existed in 1854, and led Canada to believe that she would enforce the Treaty of 1818, as she had done up to the period of the Elgin Treaty, when our exclusive rights were suspended. In place, however, of defending the position of Canada, as she had done for the previous forty years, we found that she weakened, and a large amount of correspondence had to be carried on to stiffen the British Ministers, but while occasionally they would stiffen, they would weaken again. When the hon. the Minister of Finance taunted me with the fact that we had not carried out our first instructions as issued by myself as Minister, he knew the reason, and I am surprised he did not do me the justice of explaining that it was under instructions from the British Government that I had issued my orders to carry out the instructions of Sir Edward Cardwell, then Colonial Secretary. Under this pressure, we had to recall our first instructions and to limit the exclusion to bays six miles in width instead of ten miles. From that time, my efforts commenced; and let anyone refer to the volumes of sessional papers in the library and read over the efforts that were made during those seven years to protect the interests of Canada, and he will see, at all events, that the Government of that day did their duty by Canada, and insisted upon the British Government not abandoning our rights. I will not pass this stage without paying a tribute to the right hon. the leader of the Government—for whatever may have been my feelings about him of later years—in those days, at least, he stood out for the interests of the country that he governed; and in every instance, without one single deviation, he took my part in my efforts to bring the Colonial and Foreign Ministers of England, who were both weakening in the interests of Canada, to their senses, and we did bring them to their senses pretty well. What came next? In 1870, a crisis arose in relation to the fishery question. It was evident to every one in the Cabinet of Canada, and out of it, who understood the facts, that the British Government were weakening in sustaining our claims. First, in 1866, they asked us to allow the Americans to come in for one year; then they asked us to allow them to come in for another year; and then, in 1868, for another year; and in 1869, at last, a little rebellion of a mental character arose in the minds of some of us at least. It became my duty to deal with that question, and I did deal with it. But before discussing this point, I may ask the permission of this House to read in reply to the statement of the hon. gentleman my report, because his remarks imply nothing less than that I went back on my report and the position I assumed when I issued the orders and circulars to the marine police which I had organised. In that report, I will prove that the statement of the hon. gentleman that the British Government had stood by Canada was not correct.

Mr. MITCHELL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend has entirely misapprehended my whole argument, and my reference to himself. He has not only misapprehended my argument, but he has completely inverted the argument, and I will ask any gentleman who has looked at the verbatim report of my speech, if my argument is not this: that while Her Majesty's Government had technically always sustained the extreme headlands extension, and the exclusion of the American fishermen from our bays, they had refused to sustain my hon. friend in his efforts to shut the American fishermen out of bays that are not less than ten miles in width. My argument was the reverse of what my hon. friend says it was. I showed that he had made that effort. I read his instructions to the House in which he had upheld the ten-mile limit and gave his instructions to that effect to the cruisers, and I read Lord Granville's despatch not to carry out those instructions, but to limit the exclusion to the three-mile limit. I showed that my hon. friend had been obliged, under the pressure of Her Majesty's Government, who would not support the larger contention, to issue further instructions in accordance with the expressed request of Lord Durham.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will read exactly what the hon. gentleman did say:

"I will now, Sir, proceed to deal with the subject of the treaty itself, and I take up first the most important question, that of delimitation. I need not tell you that that is a question which for seventy years has been an open sore. It is a question, which from the day the Treaty of 1818 was signed down to the present hour, as my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) knows, has been a most fertile cause of discussion between the United States and Great Britain and Canada. The Americans have maintained from the very outset that what we termed our exclusive right to shut them out of all bays was not well founded in the treaty."

That is not correct,—

"They have maintained for seventy years that they had an indefeasible right under that treaty to approach within three miles of the shore of any bay or indentation. My hon. friend shakes his head; but I hold in my hand authorities, and I could give them to him by the score, in which they have again and again maintained that position, and demanded that right."

"Mr. MITCHELL. Did not Great Britain for forty years enforce her construction of that Treaty of 1818?"

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can only say that nobody knows better than my hon. friend that Great Britain induced him to recall his regulations and instructions."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

M. MITCHELL—

"After he had issued them, and restricted his jurisdiction to within three miles of the shore."

"Mr. MITCHELL. And why? Because Great Britain could control the Government of this country, and I had to do it; that is why."

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Never mind. My hon. friend's enquiry was as to the position of Great Britain, and I give it to him. Great Britain has always contended, and has rightly contended, for technical exclusion from any bay."

What I contend is that there was no technical exclusion for the first forty years, but there was an actual exclusion up to the year 1854 when the Elgin Treaty put our rights in suspense. That is what I contend, and what I will prove before I am through.

"And the Crown officers of England have sustained that contention. But my hon. friend knows that it is one thing to hold a technical construction, and it is another to undertake to enforce it."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend has interjected that word "technical" into this discussion. I have never found any such word in any of the correspondence or the despatches, which I have read and studied, and which I think I understand pretty well, during the seven years of my experience in that department, and for the previous forty years down to 1854.

"Mr. MITCHELL. Will the hon. gentleman let me put one question to him? He states that Great Britain has held a technical construction of the Treaty of 1818. I would say that Great Britain has effectually enforced her technical construction for forty years. And with reference to what the hon. gentleman says about exclusion from bays, the first decision was given in reference to the Bay of Fundy, where the headland on one side was American and the headland on the other was Canadian or Nova Scotian. That was the first give away of our treaty rights.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend then means that for the first forty years Great Britain held a particular view which she has abandoned for the last forty years."

The House will see how the hon. gentleman, with that astuteness which characterises all his debates in this House, and, for anything I know, in other places, twists my words and puts a construction on my utterances which they would not bear. I do not say that he does that deliberately, but it is the diplomatic construction which he has learned in the last few years; and I may say that I congratulate him on the improvement in his treatment of public men, on there being less of the heavy attack and more of the *suaviter in modo* than there was before he took his residence in London and associated with peeresses and lords and kings and princes.

"Mr. MITCHELL. I do not mean that."

You see he would try to get that forced upon me.

"I do not mean that. I will say what I mean if the hon. gentleman will let me. I say that for the first forty years Great Britain legitimately enforced that contention and the Americans recognised it."

And I will prove that too,—

"Under the decision in the case of the Bay of Fundy, one side of which was American and the other side Nova Scotian, it was held that that bay was not exclusively an English bay, and upon the decision in that case our rights were given away and suspended by England, and were not enforced as strictly as they had been before."

And he closed the discussion there, and I submitted.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend has just stopped exactly where he should begin. I said, referring to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that:

"From the time it was organised under his charge he showed the greatest possible determination to hold on to all that he had, and to get as much as he could in the interests of Canada."

Was that charging my hon. friend with surrendering anything? It was the very reverse.

"Now, I will draw the attention of my hon. friend and the House to the fact that, actuated by that motive, in 1870, he sent out the following instructions:

"In such capacity your jurisdiction must be strictly confined within the limit of three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors of Canada, with respect to any action you may take against American fishing vessels and the United States citizens engaged in fishing."

"Mr. MITCHELL. Under instructions from England."

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No. This is before the pressure, as the hon. gentleman will see, but he went on trying to get in the thin end of another wedge, and I commend his attempt. He said:

"Where any of the bays, creeks or harbors shall not exceed ten geographical miles in width, you will consider that the line of demarcation extends from headland to headland, either at the entrance of such bay, creek or harbor, or from and between given points on both sides thereof, at any place nearest the mouth, where the shores are less than ten miles apart; and may exclude foreign fishermen and fishing vessels therefrom, or seize, if found within three marine miles of the coast."

"Then he went on to give the jurisdiction and the action that should be taken under it; and the bays from which he instructed his officers to exclude American fishing vessels are those ten miles in width. What since? We have a despatch from Lord Granville to the Governor General:

"Her Majesty's Government hopes that the United States fishermen will not be for the present prevented from fishing except within three miles from land or in bays which are less than six miles broad at the mouth."

"That is the answer to the instructions. My hon. friend, I grant you, was under compulsion; he was, I grant you, under pressure from Her Majesty's Government; but that only makes the case stronger from my standpoint, and my standpoint is that in the position we occupy, dependent upon Her Majesty's Government"

So I very reluctantly interrupted him in order to show that, instead of attacking the hon. gentleman for not having

discharged his duty, I really commended him for attempting to carry out as far as he was able what we all thought were the rights of Canada, and I quoted the despatch of Lord Granville to show that it was under pressure from the Imperial Government that my hon. friend was not able to carry out his own views and wishes. I thought I ought to correct the erroneous impression which he had formed in regard to my remarks.

Mr. MITCHELL. And my hon. friend wound up that portion of his argument by saying that the terms we had obtained at Washington were better than those obtained before. Since there is a difference of opinion between my hon. friend and myself as to the attitude of the British Government on this matter, I will proceed, with the permission of the House, to prove it. I hold in my hand a State paper which has formed part of the records of this House. It was brought down three years ago in answer to a motion for all papers connected with the Washington Treaty, which had not been brought down under Mr. Blake's motion, and this is one of them. I may say that I prepared this paper with great care, and there is not a statement in it that is not true, and it is a record of the greatest humiliation that England could show in the treatment of her greatest colony. If the House will bear with me, I will read it, though it is rather long. It is dated, Department of Marine and Fisheries, 4th July, 1870. And I may say that, of all the British statesmen I have had to correspond with, I never found one of them so weak in the back as Lord Granville. I may also say that I dated that paper on the 4th July on purpose, for the signification of the date, so that they might understand it:

"The undersigned had referred to him for report, a despatch from Lord Granville to the Governor General, under date the 6th ultimo, having reference to the instructions given to British and Canadian vessels for the protection of the fisheries, and also to instructions from the Colonial Office of 30th April last, extending the privileges of American fishermen beyond what they previously enjoyed, permitting them to enter bays not less than six miles wide, and directing that no vessel should be seized unless actually taken within three miles of shore, or within a six-mile bay, as stated therein; appended to which is a memorandum from the Governor General, under date of 22nd June, informing the Council that it is indispensable that the instructions issued to Canadian cruisers should be brought into complete conformity with the latest instructions on the subject, issued by the Admiralty to Vice-Admiral Wellesley.

"The undersigned has the honor to report that the instructions to Canadian cruisers were amended on the 27th ultimo, as requested by Lord Granville.

"It would appear that Lord Granville contemplated by the despatch to convey—

"1st. That his telegram and despatch of the 30th April, were intended to modify the Colonial Office instructions of 12th April, 1866, while the council construed it as being required to be read in connection therewith, and they did not imagine that such an important concession of the rights of our fishermen, would have been made without consultation with, and the previous approval of the Canadian Government.

"2nd. That though the instructions from the Admiralty to the officers in command of ships of war employed in the protection of the fisheries, and from the Canadian Government to their officers similarly situated since April, 1866, which prohibited foreign fishermen from entering bays less than ten miles wide at the mouth, and which instructions suggested that the forfeiture of such vessels was, if possible, only to be enforced when fishing had taken place within three miles of shore; yet, notwithstanding the instructions, His Lordship now, for the first time, communicates to the Canadian Government the fact that it never was intended to be acted upon.

"3rd. That if any doubt existed about the meaning of the instructions, or the possible chances of a trespasser being taken by Her Majesty's cruisers, that doubt is now removed, inasmuch as his lordship intimates that it never was the intention of Her Majesty's Government that their vessels should seize a trespasser under any circumstances, and for fear of such a possibility his lordship now removes all chance of it by stating that 'the effect of my despatch, or rather of the letter of the Admiralty, which, it transmitted for the concurrence of your Government was, as regards Her Majesty's vessels, to make the direction of non-forfeiture so far absolute, as to require that no fishing vessel whatever should be seized, except within three miles, and for an offence committed within those limits. It was intended to imply, though it was not expressed, that as the only ultimate means of excluding Americans beyond these limits was not to be used, the exclusion itself was not to be enforced.

"The Canadian Government, by the approved report of the undersigned, of the 20th December last, was pledged to Her Majesty's Gov-

ernment to maintain an efficient marine police to enforce the law within the three-mile limit, in the belief that Her Majesty's Government would command respect to national rights outside thereof, and to which this Government conceived them to be pledged, as Dominion vessels, by the limitation of the exclusion of foreign vessels to bays from ten to six miles wide, are precluded from, in any case, seizing beyond three miles, and as British cruisers are now positively directed not to seize unless the offence is committed and the vessel actually seized within three miles of land, the reasonable presumption is that Her Majesty's cruisers are not intended to seize at all. As a matter of fact, they did not seize a single trespasser in the past four years. It will also appear, on reference to the reports of the commanders of Her Majesty's vessels on the station, that though they repeatedly boarded vessels within the three-mile limit, which vessels had no license, and were liable to seizure, there is no instance of a single seizure having been made."

There it is as clear as day that they are determined to abandon the whole thing but the three-mile limit, abandon the head line question, abandon our bays, abandon everything but the strip of three miles around the sinuosities of our coast.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL, You will not say "hear, hear" pretty soon.

"It would seem but reasonable, that if that policy as laid down, is to be maintained, and acted upon, that our fishermen who have had actual possession of the privileges referred to up to 1854, and who again by the lapse of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1866, were entitled to the same rights they enjoyed in 1854, should be maintained in their possession of all these privileges.

"7th. The despatch further remarks, that 'they (Her Majesty's Government) do not abandon the hope that the question of abstract right may yet be avoided by some arrangement between Canada and the United States, or that the limits may be definitely settled by arbitration or otherwise, and while any expectation of this kind exists, they desire to avoid all occasion of dispute, so far as this is possible consistently with the substantial protection of the Canadian fisheries.'

"In this paragraph there are two probabilities referred to :

"1st. The probability of an arrangement (trade arrangement, it is presumed) with the United States.

"2nd. The probability of the limits being fixed by arbitration, or otherwise.

"In reference to the first of these, it would have been much more satisfactory to the Government of Canada if the ground upon which Her Majesty's Government have founded the hope thus expressed, had been stated. Such hope entertained by Her Majesty's Ministers, has been held since 1855; it was believed in by Her Majesty's Government when Lord Clarendon wrote the despatch of 1866, which so ably indicated the position of British subjects in relation to these fisheries. Mr. Cardwell expressed a confident belief upon this subject when he induced Canada to adopt his licensing system, as a measure of expediency, for one year. His Grace of Buckingham and Chandos entertained the same hope; and now my Lord Granville, though five years have elapsed since notice of abolition, does not seem yet to have abandoned the hope that some arrangements may be secured.

"The Canadian Government regret that they cannot see either in the past or in the future, the same ground for believing that a satisfactory arrangement will be arrived at, nor, indeed, while the present fishery policy is maintained, any arrangement that Canada would be justified in accepting. On the contrary, it is believed that the chances of such a result are not so good as they seemed in 1866 and 1867; and that, so far from there being anything in the course taken by the United States to warrant the expectation of a fair trade policy being adopted by them, everything indicates the contrary result, and nothing tends more to encourage Americans in the course they have pursued than the spirit of concession towards them which has characterized the fishery policy of the last five years.

"In 1866 they, after a year's notice, voluntarily abandoned the Reciprocity Treaty, notwithstanding our efforts in the fall of 1865 to prevent that result."

"To do this, the undersigned would state our rights, as claimed by the Empire, and admitted by the United States in the Treaty of 1818, and also what were the rights of United States fishermen at the time the treaty was concluded.

"Article 1 of that treaty provided,—

"1st. Concurrent liberty of fishing within certain specified limits between the subjects of Her Majesty and those of the United States, subject to certain specified reservations

"2nd. The privilege to American subjects to land, dry and cure fish in certain districts, also subject to certain qualifications.

"3rd. Limits reserved exclusively to subjects of Her Majesty, and comprised within bounds of a marine league from the coasts, bays, harbors, and creeks—the line of exclusion and measurement on the three classes of indentations last above mentioned, being defined by straight lines drawn across from headland to headland.

"It may be stated, that upon the construction of Nos. 1. and 2, no serious differences of opinion exist.

"Regarding the interpretation of No. 3, the American Government advances peculiar claims,—the most important of which is the basis of

Mr. MITCHELL.

measurement on the mouths of bays, creeks and harbors. This line of demarcation between exclusive and common water, the United States contend—as in the tracing of the general coast line three marine miles from land—should at all bays continue to describe the outline of the shores of these indentations as if they were sinuosities of the coast.

"This is in brief the main point involved in the dispute known as 'The Fishery Question.'

"Other minor differences, more or less tributary to this, have entered into the discussion, but this substantially includes the only disputable ground of the controversy.

"The argument of Great Britain on this point is twofold:—

"1st. That the accepted definition of bays, harbors, and creeks is that established by international law throughout the civilized world, which distinctly adopts a headland line, irrespective of the configuration of any part of the coast, or the formation or extent of its indentations.

"2nd. That the territorial and maritime jurisdiction of all nations, and particularly of the United States, is so clearly laid down as not to admit of any exceptional application such as that claimed in connection with these fishing privileges in British America, in derogation of national rights.

"Moreover, Great Britain maintains that in the article of the Convention of 1818, Americans expressly relinquished the liberty before 'enjoyed' or 'claimed,' to pursue their calling anywhere else within British jurisdiction than in the limits described in the treaty. The text thereof being as follows:—

I need not read the text because you understand it,—

"The Americans have, up to 1854, persisted in arguing for an exceptional application of the law of nations, as regards bodies of water, such as the Bays of Fundy and Chaleurs, and other indentations along the sea-coast of the British North American colonies, in which United States fishermen were formerly wont to pursue and capture the fishes of the sea, or to which they still resort to take bait.

"Yet, while they desired exceptional construction of treaties, and were especially as applied to the Bays of Fundy and Chaleurs, their statesmen had to admit that the right of exclusion as claimed by us, existed. Secretary Webster, 6th July, 1852, writes thus:

"It would appear that by a strict and rigid construction of this article, fishing vessels of the United States are precluded from entering into the bays or harbors of the British provinces, except for the purposes of shelter, repairing damages, and obtaining wood and water. A bay, as is usually understood, is an arm or recess of the sea, entering from the ocean between capes and headlands, and the term is applied equally to large and small tracts of water thus situated; it is common to speak of Hudson Bay, or the Bay of Biscay, although they are very large tracts of water.

"The British authorities insist that England has a right to draw a line from headland to headland, and to capture all American fishermen who may follow their pursuits inside of that line."

And for forty years they did it, and captured lots of them.

"It was undoubtedly an oversight—"

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL :

"It was undoubtedly an oversight in the Convention of 1818 to make so large a concession to England, since the United States had usually considered that those vast inlets or recesses of the ocean ought to be open to American fishermen as freely as the sea itself, to within three marine miles of the shore."

"Again, Chancellor Kent, in his able commentaries, lays down as a rule that bays, such as Delaware Bay (resembling in its characteristics and extent the Bay of Chaleurs) is wholly within the 'territorial jurisdiction' of the United States, while the States of New Jersey and Delaware each exercise jurisdiction to its centre, and for three miles seaward, from Capes May and Henlopen. The same rule applies to Chesapeake Bay, and the State of Maryland exercises jurisdiction over that tract of water, which is more than double the extent of Bay des Chaleurs. The same rule is applied to Massachusetts Bay, with an entrance fifty miles wide between Cape Ann and Cape Cod; indeed, the principle is applied in the United States universally, and however much American statesmen may regret the application of the rule on the bays of this Dominion, they cannot deny its strict justice, nor their own renunciation of all claim to admission by the 1st article of the Treaty of 1818. Yet from that time up to 1854 the fishermen of the United States accepted the fact reluctantly, and frequently infringed within our limits when they thought they could do so with impunity; but the British Government enforced our treaty rights, including the headland claims, up to 1854, with the exception of the Bay of Fundy, in reference to which they made special exception of a temporary character in 1845."

On that I will just explain as I go along. Why was the Bay of Fundy temporarily excluded? Sir, history repeats itself. The men of that day, the men in charge of the fleet of the British Government, were charged to protect the fisheries. These were the men who enforced the treaty, the fishery rights; and these men seized the schooner *Washington* in the Bay of Fundy, but they were not

able to show, when the vessel was before the courts that she was within the points of land of the Bay of Fundy where it was British territory on both sides, as the Americans claimed that one of the points of land, which was outside of a line near Calais, was on the American territory and the other was on British territory, and upon that ground the vessel was discharged. Lord Aberdeen, then Colonial Minister, because that decision was made in a case which was not a parallel case to 99 out of every 100 cases that now occur, abandoned the whole Bay of Fundy to them, out of a desire to conciliate the Americans. Sir, there is a case of to-day. The *Adams* was seized upon a frivolous pretext, and she is now on trial before the courts; and though my hon. friend says that the delay is not entirely due to the Government, I venture to say that some of it is due to the Government. I am not in the secrets of the Government and do not know, but I know enough of American fishermen and vessel owners to know that they will not willingly allow one of their vessels to be tied up in the courts for a couple of years, without some good reason. The Bay of Fundy case was a weak case. It was a case that would not hold water, because one side of the bay was a British headland, and the other was American or alleged to be, and the courts held that it was not exclusively a British bay for that reason. But had the vessel been seized ten miles further or five miles further this decision about the Bay of Fundy would never have been had, and the probability is that this trouble about bays never would have reached the point it has reached. Lord Aberdeen abandoned the right of the colonies of the Maritime Provinces and gave up the question of the Bay of Fundy altogether, with the exception of the smaller inlets or bays leading into it. I will proceed:

"It may also be here stated that the Province of Nova Scotia supplemented the British squadron by several vessels during the years preceding 1845, and that during that time many seizures of American vessels were made at points ranging from near the shore to a distance of upwards of ten miles from land, on the ground that they were within headlands, many of which vessels were condemned and confiscated for such violation of our rights. In State documents, No. 22, published in the American Senate in 1862-63, I find the following fact reported by the United States Consul at Pictou, viz.:-

"The seizures in the course of the year were numerous. The *Java*, *Battile*, *Naughton*, *Charles*, *Eliza*, *Shelton*, *Hyder Ali*, *Independence*, *Hart*, *Ocean*, *Director*, *Atlas*, *Magnolia*, *Amazon*, and *Three Brothers* were among the number."

"The Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 gave to the Americans the use, under certain restrictions, of our bay and inshore fisheries, and for which we were supposed to have received compensation by certain trade arrangements. This treaty the United States Government put an end to of their own act, professing to believe that it was more to the advantage of the colonies than their own. Doubtless the treaty, during its continuance, was beneficial to both countries, but it was not in Nova Scotia considered that they had received the equivalent in trade for what they correctly designated as 'their priceless fisheries.' See Minute of Council of that Province, 10th April, 1884, as follows:—

"At the same time it is proper that the undersigned should take this opportunity to express the unusual sentiment pervading the Province, that, in the construction of that treaty, fair consideration was not given to the interests whose inexhaustible fisheries of priceless value were given away without the coasting trade, or the right to register colonial-built shipping, having been secured in return to those British American Provinces."

"The treaty terminated in March, 1866, after the year's notice for which it provided had been given by the United States Government. The then Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, with the approval of Her Majesty's Government, sent delegates to Washington, to endeavor, if possible, to secure the continuance of the treaty, or else to effect some other arrangement which would meet the approval of both countries. In this they were unsuccessful. The delegation held several conferences with the Committee of Ways and Means, and the record of their proceedings proves that, there was really no desire evinced to renew commercial intercourse with the Provinces on any basis at all resembling the principles of reciprocal free trade. The efforts of our delegates proved fruitless, and they returned about the middle of February, 1866. On the 24th of that month a Royal Proclamation was issued by the Governor General of Canada, notifying American fishermen and United States citizens of the termination, on the 17th day of the ensuing month, of the fishing privileges which they had enjoyed under the said treaty, and warning them of the legal penalties which they would incur by trespassing upon the inshore fisheries of British America belonging exclusively to Her Majesty's subjects. In the meantime, Her Majesty's Government, in despatches of the 2nd and

10th of March, 1866, urged upon these Provinces that it was desirable, from an Imperial point of view, to forbear from asserting the rights which accrued to them at its termination, and to avoid every possibility of difference between the British and American Governments, from any attempt to prevent encroachments by foreign fishermen. Her Majesty's Government felt disposed to allow the freedom of fishing that had prevailed since 1854 to continue for the season of 1866, on the distinct understanding that, unless some satisfactory arrangement between the two countries should be made in the course of the year, such privileges would cease, and all concessions made in the treaty just about to expire be liable to withdrawal. Mr. Secretary Cardwell, in a despatch bearing date the 17th of March, 1866, refers to the near probability of some concessions on the subject of the tariff being made through a Bill then under the consideration of Congress; the prospect of a satisfactory arrangement appearing to the Colonial Office an additional reason for deferring the matter to another season."

Just as to-day. They say we have concluded a treaty, but there are certain Bills in relation to commerce coming before Congress and you may hope to get what you desire.

"The colonial authorities, whilst assuring Her Majesty's Government of their earnest wish to abstain from any act which could possibly embarrass them, and although actuated by a sincere desire to deal with the actual situation in a spirit of conciliation and liberality towards their neighbors, irrespective of whatever inconveniences and injuries might attend deferment of the just and valued rights of colonial subjects, experienced much difficulty in accepting the conclusion to which their assent was invited. A Minute of Council was adopted by the Canadian Executive, on the 23rd of March, 1866, setting forth the grounds upon which they believed that the proposed policy could neither be carried out so as to avoid serious and lasting injury to the interests of the country, nor attain the purpose it was designed to effect. The intrinsic worth of the fisheries was pointed out, and also their value to the Confederation of the British North American Provinces, then in prospective, as a staple of extensive trade with foreign countries, a nursery for hardy seamen, and an inexhaustible resource for the industrial energies of our maritime population. The great and peculiar advantages which their exclusive working by British colonists would afford to the United Provinces was likewise dwelt upon.

"The memorandum in question proceeded to say that:—
"The Canadian Government receive this expression of the opinion of Her Majesty's Government with the utmost respect; but they doubt whether its adoption would not in the end produce most serious evils. They fear there is no reasonable hope of satisfactory commercial relations being restored with the United States within the year. They think the prospect of attaining this result in the future will be greatly diminished if the United States fishermen continue to exercise the rights given by the late treaty. The withdrawal of their privileges a year hence will create more irritation than than now, as having the character of retaliation. The step, if taken now, is plainly and publicly known to be the consequence of the act of the United States. They, and not Great Britain, have cancelled the agreement, and voluntarily surrendered the right of fishing. The course suggested would certainly be regarded by the American people as evidence of weakness on the part of Great Britain, and of an indisposition to maintain the rights of the Colonies; while it would disturb and alarm the Provinces. The determination to persist in encroachments, and in resistance to law, would be stronger by the impunity of the past year, and the danger of collision, when exclusion becomes necessary, would thus be much increased; while the value of the right of fishing, for the purpose of negotiation, would be diminished precisely in proportion to the low estimate which the Provinces would thus appear to have placed upon it.
"The committee would also respectfully submit to Her Majesty's Government that any apparent hesitation to assert an undoubted national right will certainly be misconstrued, and be made the ground for other and more serious exactions, till such a point is reached as neither country can recede from with honor."

That was a despatch worthy of the hon. gentleman of that day. I do not mean the Finance Minister, but the Premier; it did him honor and did him credit.

"Notwithstanding the strong opinions thus entertained, the Government of Canada reluctantly acquiescing in the suggestion of Her Majesty's Government, adopted the temporary expedient of issuing seasonal licenses to United States fishing vessels, at a nominal tonnage rate, so as formally to preserve the right of sovereignty without occasioning any dangerous complications, such as were apprehended by the Imperial authorities. Under this provisional system any vessel attempting to fish without licenses, and refusing to procure them from the cruising officers, were to be removed from the fishing grounds and punished by confiscation.

"The Executive Government of Nova Scotia gave to this expedient an unwilling assent. In a Minute of Council, dated the 9th of May, 1866, it was stated:—

"The Council, after the most serious deliberation, and with a view to meet the wishes both of the Imperial Government and the Government of Canada, are compelled to state that they are of the opinion that any concession at this moment of the admitted rights of British subjects to the exclusive use of the inshore fisheries of British North America would be most injurious and disastrous to the interests of British North America."

"The privilege of using these fishing grounds has been deliberately abandoned by the Government and Congress of the United States, and abundant notice was given to the people of that country by the official announcement made more than a year ago which abrogated the Reciprocity Treaty.

"If under these circumstances, when the United States are exhausted by a four years' war, and paralysed by an oppressive debt, any indecision is exhibited in the maintenance of these undoubted and admitted rights, and a temporising policy substituted, which will be certain to be misconstrued, the Council believe that the prospect of obtaining a fair Reciprocity Treaty will be diminished, that the most injurious results will follow, and that the difficulties to be encountered a year hence in dealing with the question will be vastly enhanced.

"At the same time the Council entirely concur in the view enunciated by the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies recommending that, while firmly maintaining the exclusive right to the fishing grounds, the Local Governments should exercise all possible forbearance in pressing their rights, and the utmost caution in selecting the cases for enforcing the extreme penalty of confiscation. In this spirit the legislation of this Province has already been modified so as to remove any reasonable cause of complaint on the part of the Government of the United States."

"This expression of the views of the Government of Nova Scotia is referred to by the Secretary of State for the Colonies in a despatch to Sir W. F. Williams, the Lieutenant Governor, under date the 26th of May, 1866, in the following terms: 'Her Majesty's Government trusts on further consideration, and when the Executive Council are informed that there are reasonable grounds for hoping that before next season permanent arrangements may be made with the Government of the United States, they will feel themselves at liberty to withdraw their objections to a temporary arrangement for the year which has received the cordial approval of Her Majesty's Government.'

"I must distinctly inform you that on a matter so intimately connected with the international relations of this country, Her Majesty's Government will not be disposed to yield their own opinion of what it is reasonable to insist on, nor to enforce the strict rights of Her Majesty's subjects beyond what appears to them to be required by the reason and justice of the case."

"A further Minute of Council was passed by the Nova Scotian Executive, on the 21st of June following, expressing entire concurrence in the views held by the Government of Canada, regarding the policy which they felt themselves constrained to adopt; and although adhering to the opinions already expressed, they recognised the necessity of accepting the suggestions of Her Majesty's Government, and accordingly withdrew all objections to the granting of licenses for that year."

"In New Brunswick the same feeling of reluctance to grant licenses existed, but that Province followed the example of Canada, and assented to the license system, entirely out of deference to the wishes of Her Majesty's Government. Her Majesty's Government believed then, as they even still express the hope, that some arrangement might be arrived at, whereby satisfactory treaty arrangements may be secured, and, notwithstanding that such a hope was at variance with the convictions of the Government of the other Provinces, they gave way to the wishes of Her Majesty's Government, on the understanding that the license system was to continue only for one year in order to give an opportunity to the American Government to renew negotiations."

There is the evidence by the records of the Council of the three Provinces where they expressly declared their determination to maintain their rights as they existed prior to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, and urging upon Her Majesty's Government to enforce Canadian rights and to protect and maintain them. We will see how it was done, though:

"This license system continued throughout the years 1866 and 1867 with very unsatisfactory results. It proved quite inefficient in respect of enforcing compliance with its chief conditions, and equally ineffective with regard to the influence it was presumed to exercise towards inducing the United States Government to assist in merging it in some general measure of a permanent and satisfactory nature. The principal causes of its inefficiency and failure may be found in the extreme anxiety to avoid enforcing it wherever there was the least probability of United States citizens not voluntarily complying with it, the annotated instructions to the naval officers in command of Her Majesty's ships issued by the Colonial Office under date of 12th April, 1867, being conceived in this spirit. And also to the fact that amendments to the system suggested by the various naval commanders and particularly by Admiral Sir James Hope, in a despatch to the Admiralty, dated the 3rd of August, 1866, such as were calculated to render it real and practically effective, were pronounced inexpedient by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty."

"In order to illustrate the complete defeat of the license system, it is sufficient to note the simple fact of Her Majesty's cruisers not having during these four seasons, detained a single American vessel, although it was notorious that great numbers of United States vessels were continually invading our limits, even after repeated warnings, a large proportion of which vessels when afterwards boarded were found to be still unprovided with licenses."

"American fishermen committed other infractions of the Treaty of 1818: such as frequenting our harbors to transfer cargoes and take supplies, creating riots and disturbances, and setting the law at defiance, as witness the scene at Paspebiac, in Bay des Chaleurs, in 1868, and

Mr. MITCHELL.

their refusal to pay harbor dues, at Magdalen Islands, during the present season, as reported by Commander Lavoie in May last."

My hon. friend the member for Gaspé will recollect the American fishermen landing and wrecking the place.

Mr. JONCAS. Yes, quite well.

Mr. MITCHELL:—

"In his annual report for the year 1869, Commander Lavoie also says:

"At Paspebiac there was a strong feeling against the crews of foreign schooners, who two or three times went ashore and committed all kinds of disorder; so much so that the inhabitants were obliged to put night watchmen to guard their property, and secure themselves against the outrageous conduct of these people."

"The effect of this system upon the American fishermen was practically a failure, as will be seen by the following statement, showing the number of licenses issued each year since 1866, and inclusive thereof:

In 1866 there were	354 licenses.
1867 "	281 "
1868 "	56 "
1869 "	25 "

"It will be perceived that in 1866, the first year of its adoption, the vigorous policy indicated in Lord Clarendon's despatch before referred to, and a lively recollection of the numerous seizures and confiscations made by Her Majesty's cruisers, and officers of the Nova Scotian Government prior to 1854, for violation of our fishery rights, induced a majority of the American fishermen who resorted to the gulf that season to take out licenses, notwithstanding that they required to have three warnings given them by Her Majesty's cruisers before seizure could be effected. The following year only about two-thirds of these took licenses, while in 1868, when it came to be understood that the effect of the instructions issued by Her Majesty's Government, requiring three warnings, was practically to nullify the whole system, the number taking licenses dropped, in 1868, to 56."

I may say here that one of the conditions of those protecting the fisheries at that time three warnings had to be given a vessel even when it was found she was acting illegally. This was one of the things enforced upon us, and against which we afterwards rebelled.

"In 1867 the Canadian Government acted, as it also did in 1868 and 1869—called attention to this defective system,—and Vice Admiral Mundy in his despatch of the 15th May, 1867, spoke of it thus:—

"Since the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1866, the system of warnings to trespassers has not realised the anticipations of the Government by which it was established in that year. Hence the desire of the present Dominion Executive to resort to the more stringent steps proposed in the minutes of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.' The Admiral then gives the probable number of American vessels on the fishing grounds that season as 700. In 1869 Her Majesty's Government consented to the instructions being amended so as only to require one warning, and notwithstanding that if seizures were to be made at all the danger was immeasurably increased to foreign fishermen—during that year only 25 took out licenses, or about one in 28 of the estimated number of vessels on our coasts. On the 26th August, 1869, Mr. Vernon Lushington called the attention of the Admiralty to the fact 'That the Admiral reports that an unusual number of fishing schooners belonging to the United States had arrived on the north shore of Prince Edward Island, but that only a few licenses had been demanded by the masters, who objected to pay the license duty of \$2 per ton and prefer to run the risk of being caught within the three-mile limits.' The impression prevailed amongst the Americans that Her Majesty's Government in their great desire to avoid anything of an irritating tendency in the then temper of the American people towards Britain, arising out of their Alabama and other war grievances, would not make any seizures, and as a matter of fact, notwithstanding repeated violations, no seizures were made. Under such circumstances the system of licenses could not prove other than a most lamentable failure—and there was really no 'substantial protection.'

"This sort of protection was of no avail as affecting the interest of colonial fishermen, but simply ensured Americans in the practical enjoyment of the same privileges which they had enjoyed under the Reciprocity Treaty, and it saved the United States Government from all trouble and expense of maintaining a naval force in the Gulf."

"It was moreover, a manifest departure from the very terms on which the system was so originated, namely: 'That any vessel attempting to fish without licenses, will either be required to procure the license from the cruising officer, or will be removed from the fishing grounds.' (Vide Minute of the Executive Council of Canada, dated 23rd March, 1866) It also relieved Americans of any pressure such as might influence their Government to desire a settlement of the disputes which prevailed up to 1854; and while it injured the business of Canadian fishermen by affording facilities to foreigners, such as, together with a prohibitory duty on British-caught fish, enabled them to compete with our fishermen on unequal conditions, it also nullified whatever inducements to enter into a new commercial treaty would otherwise be held forth, by reason of an indirect counter-tax on their fishing and maritime industry."

“ Another ill-effect attending this continued indulgence towards Americans is remarked upon by Vice Admiral Wellesley, in the following extract from a despatch to the Secretary of the Admiralty, dated 18th November, 1869:—

“ Very few colonial vessels are engaged in fishing, owing to the almost prohibitory Tariff imposed in the United States, on fish imported in colonial vessels, and the colonial fishermen therefore in considerable numbers man the American vessels.

“ The Government of Canada should view with very serious concern the baneful effect on our maritime population of such dependence on American employers. It creates sympathy with foreign sentiments and institutions, and affords opportunities for instilling into the minds of our people ideas and expectations altogether inimical to British connection. There is actually presented to them the example of subjects of a Republican power and citizens of a foreign state prosecuting their calling at the very doors and in the exclusive limits of British subjects in Canada, who are themselves shut out of the markets of that country by a prohibitive tariff, adopted in the interest of their own fishermen, whilst ours cannot even enjoy their own exclusive privileges. Can the immediate influence of these circumstances be otherwise than seductive of the loyal attachment and personal enterprise of our sea-board population? It also discourages the independent employment of Canadian fishing craft, and provincial fishermen. It tempt our fishermen to catch and sell their fish clandestinely to United States owners of fishing vessels, who can afterwards market them in the United States, free of duty, as American caught fish. This practice demoralises our population, and accustoms them to violation of our own laws. The residents are induced to connive at other infractions of our treaty rights. The temporary and local advantages which these practices afford are of small account compared with the general injury done to our people. They militate also against our prospects of establishing an extensive fish trade with foreign countries, and others of the British possessions, and thereby developing the shipping and fishing industries of the Dominion, and creating a self-reliant and skilful class of fishermen and sailors identified in property and affection with our national existence, and attached by past and present associations to Imperial interests.

“ A Committee of the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia, in a report submitted to that body during the spring of 1867, represented that ‘ the system of granting fishing licenses to American fishermen, adopted and practised during the last year by the Governments of this and the adjoining Provinces, is viewed with deep regret, as nothing could more injuriously affect the fishing interests of the Province; and they cannot in terms too emphatic express their disapproval of the injustice done to our industrious and enterprising fishermen, in allowing American fishermen, upon nearly equal terms, to fish in our waters, side by side with the former, while the American market is virtually closed by a high tariff to their products.’

“ The undersigned would now refer to a despatch of the Earl of Clarendon to Sir F. Bruce, the then British Minister at Washington, under date the 11th May, 1866, covering a proposition of Mr. Adams, American Minister at the Court of St. James, in which he proposes the appointment of a Joint Commission to settle the point in dispute, in regard to the fishery privileges which the undersigned hopes will not fail to be secured in any re-arrangement of the treaty. Such was the opinion of Nova Scotia, and it was largely shared in by the other Provinces of the Dominion. To the main points of such proposal Lord Clarendon cordially assented, but asked explanations as to the concluding clause, which read thus:—

“ Pending a definitive arrangement on the subject, the United States Government engages to give all proper orders to officers in its employment, and Her Britannic Majesty's Government engages to instruct the proper colonial or other British officers to abstain from hostile acts against British and United States fishermen respectively.’

“ His Lordship in dealing with this paragraph, remarked:

“ And Her Majesty's Government would hold themselves entitled to maintain, pending the determination of the questions to be discussed, the principles for which they have heretofore contended, and to enforce all regulations and assert all rights which, previously to the conclusion of the Reciprocity Treaty, the British Government asserted and enforced. Therefore, if the purport of the concluding paragraph of Mr. Adams' paper is meant by the United States to involve an objection on the part of Her Majesty's Government to continue to allow, during the sitting of the commission, fishermen of the United States to enjoy in British waters the privileges under the Reciprocity Treaty which the Government of the United States have now renounced for their citizens, you will frankly state to Mr. Seward that into such an engagement Her Majesty's Government cannot enter.”

There is straight talk, and I would call the attention of the hon Minister of Finance to it. That is the talk of Lord Clarendon, who was something like a man.

“ Her Majesty's Government are most desirous that the rights of the colonies should be so enforced as to give the least possible occasion for complaint or discussion. They have cordially approved and have recommended to the Governments of the other British Provinces a proposal made by the authorities of Canada, that American fishermen should for the present season enjoy, under special licenses, the benefits conferred by the Reciprocity Treaty, and they will be glad to learn that the Lower Provinces have adopted an arrangement intended to prevent the change of circumstances from operating suddenly to the injury of the fishing interests of citizens of the United States, but they cannot engage indefinitely to adhere to this system.’

“ From this it will be evident that Her Majesty's Government at that time clearly decided—

“ 1st. That American fishermen should have only those rights which they had enjoyed from 1818 down to 1854; and

“ 2nd. That they were resolved to enforce for British fishermen the full privileges they enjoyed during that period, and which were put in abeyance at that time by the operation of the Reciprocity Treaty; and

“ 3rd. That the license arrangement was adopted only as a temporary arrangement at the instance of Her Majesty's Government, and but for one year. If further evidence is necessary in reference to the latter conclusion, I would beg to refer to the despatches of the Right Hon. Edward Cardwell, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, under date the 12th April, 1866, addressed to the Lords of the Admiralty; also to the despatches of the same right honorable gentleman to Viscount Monck, then Governor General, under date of 21st April of same year, in which, referring to the Minute of the Canadian Council on the subject, he says:

“ I recognise in this Minute, with much pleasure, the moderation and forbearance shown by the Canadian Government.

“ The suggestion that American fishermen should be allowed to fish during the current year in all provincial waters, upon payment of a moderate license fee, meets with the full approval of Her Majesty's Government; and I should inform the Governors of the Lower Provinces that I trust they will readily concur in it. In anticipation of this result, Sir James Hope will be instructed to act upon it as soon as he shall have been informed that the arrangement is concluded.’

“ To this arrangement the Province of Nova Scotia dissented in an earnest Minute of Council, which exhibits wonderful forecast of what has since occurred, and the Canadian and New Brunswick Governments assented only out of deference to the expression of Her Majesty's Government that it was a temporary arrangement for one year, and adopted in the belief that before the year terminated, arrangements would be made with the United States; but by the despatch of 26th May, of same year, hereinbefore quoted, Mr. Cardwell informed the Lieutenant Governor of that Province that the policy as expressed by Her Majesty's Government must be carried out.

“ This brings the history of the matter down to 1866, when the Colonial Government adopted the policy of Her Majesty's Government as a temporary expedient for the then present year, and in the belief that there were reasonable grounds for the hope that they expressed of a permanent arrangement being arrived at with the United States.

“ The colonies believed—as they had a right to believe—that as the American Government had voluntarily terminated a treaty under which they received certain concessions,—each party should revert to the *status quo* anterior to the treaty,—and from the text of My Lord Clarendon's despatch of 11th May, 1866, before quoted, it is clearly implied that Her Britannic Majesty would continue to demand for the colonial subjects the same rights and privileges which they had enjoyed previous to 1854. But it appears from the letter of the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, of the 12th April, 1866, before quoted, that a policy of concession had even then commenced. It is therein stated, ‘ That Her Majesty's Government are clearly of opinion, by the Convention of 1818, the United States have renounced the right of fishing not only within three miles of colonial shores, but within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of any British bay or creek. But the question of what is a British bay or creek is one that has been the occasion of the difficulty in former times.’”

There was the first evidence of their weakening. From that time out we have nothing but a record of it constantly recurring.

“ It is, therefore, at the present, the wish of Her Majesty's Government neither to concede, nor for the present to enforce, any rights in this respect which are in their nature open to any serious question. Even before the conclusion of the Reciprocity Treaty Her Majesty's Government had consented to forego the exercise of its strict right to exclude American fishermen from the Bay of Fundy, and they are of opinion that, during the present season, that right should not be exercised in the case of the Bay of Fundy, and that American fishermen should not be interfered with, either by notice or otherwise, unless they are found within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of a bay or creek which is less than ten geographical miles in width, in conformity with the arrangement made with France in 1839.’

“ The Right Honorable Secretary further adds, that in case of seizure for infringement of the limits, if ‘ it should become necessary to proceed to forfeiture, cases should, if possible, be selected for that extreme step in which the offence of fishing has been committed within three miles of land. Her Majesty's Government do not claim that the prohibition to enter British bays should be generally insisted on, except where there is reason to apprehend some substantial invasion of British rights. And, in particular, they do not desire American vessels to be prevented from navigating the Gut of Canso (from which Her Majesty's Government are asked that they may be temporarily excluded), unless it shall appear that this permission is used to the injury of colonial fishermen or for other improper objects. I have it in command to make this communication to your Lordships, as conveying the decision of Her Majesty's Government on this subject.’

“ This despatch recedes from the rights claimed and exercised by British fishermen up to 1854, and from the position assumed by Lord Clarendon in his despatch to Mr. Bruce, in May, 1866, inasmuch as it—

“ First, places in abeyance the headland question; and,

“ Second, continues the exceptional permission granted in relation to the Bay of Fundy;

“ Third, it fixes the bays from which Americans shall be excluded as those under ten geographical miles in width;

"Fourth, it requires that repeated warnings be given (fixed at three);
 "Fifth, that when seizures or forfeitures are made there, 'it is desirable that they should be selected from vessels in which the offence was committed within three miles of land.'

"Sixth, that Her Majesty's Government do not desire that vessels should be prevented from navigating the Gut of Canso, except it shall appear to be to the injury of colonial fishermen, or for other improper objects."

Now, Sir, I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to this fact, and to ask him to correct his statement that the British Government has never enforced its complete rights since 1854. Sir, he knows well that during the twelve years of the Reciprocity Treaty their rights were in abeyance, to be resumed in every particular when that treaty expired. Lord Clarendon admitted that, and the British Government admitted it, but by their despatches they tried to induce us to tone down and modify our claims.

"I would observe that these six points of concession or suspension of our rights were settled by Her Majesty's Government by letter aforesaid of 12th April, 1866, after Canada had reluctantly adopted their suggestions in reference to the license system, as may be seen by Minute of Council of 23rd March, 1866, without any previous consultation or approval of such policy by Canada, and against the positive protest of Nova Scotia, as before stated. The Island of Prince Edward and the Province of New Brunswick also acted in harmony with their sister Provinces in the feeling of opposition to the policy proposed.

"Mr. Secretary Seward proposed, through Her Majesty's Ambassador at Washington, on the 4th of June of the same year, to negotiate upon the basis of a reduction of the customs duties on fish imports from the Provinces, in consideration of admitting American fishermen and fishing vessels to the free and unrestricted use of our waters. Such proposition was rejected by the Government of Canada (see Minute of Council, 18th June, 1866), and the Government of the United States were informed that no engagements could be entered into which could at all connect the admission of American fishermen and vessels to the desired privilege with a remission of duties proposed to be levied by the United States on Provincial-caught fish. The licensing was continued at the request of Her Majesty's Government, during the year 1867, with the reluctant assent of the Provinces, such assent having again been given plainly out of deference to the policy of the Empire, and in the belief expressed by the Government, that there was still a prospect of arrangements being arrived at in reference to a trade treaty with the United States. On the 1st of July and 3rd of September, 1867, His Grace the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, being then Colonial Secretary, addressed the Governor General of Canada, dealing with the question of a continuance of the policy of licensing and increase of the tonnage duty payable for such license; and, on the 21st of February, 1868, the then Governor General, by direction, submitted with these despatches a memorandum, containing four propositions as a possible means of dealing with the subject.

"1st. To maintain the small fee (of fifty cents per ton, merely as an assertion of title).

"2nd. To increase the fee to a sum representing the value of the liberty conceded.

"3rd. To absolutely prohibit fishing by United States fishermen in colonial waters.

"4th. To propose to the Government of the United States to admit their vessels and fishermen on condition of opening American markets to Canadian fishermen.

"While the policy of the Colonial Office favored the continuance of the license system at an increase of one dollar per ton, the Government, by Minute of Council, acting on the reports of the undersigned, respectively bearing date the 20th November, 1867, and 27th February, 1868, were clear and explicit in conveying their opinions that the first, second and fourth propositions should not be entertained, that the third was the course which should be adopted, and that by total exclusion the American fishermen could alone be made to realize the importance of the privileges which they were permitted to enjoy. It was also again clearly asserted in these papers that the consent of the colonies to the licensing arrangement of 1866 was obtained on the faith of its continuance only for one year, and in the belief that the faith of Her Majesty's Government was pledged to its abandonment, and that they would not ask its continuance if the Americans failed to enter into trade arrangements of a satisfactory character.

"In proof of this position, the undersigned may here quote a few extracts from the Minutes referred to in the Minute of 20th November 1867, where it is stated that—

"It was also remarked in this connection that the tonnage duty of 50 cents per ton then imposed was adopted for that year only, and must not, in any sense, be regarded as an equivalent for the advantages accorded."

"It was also distinctly understood, 'that unless some satisfactory arrangement between Great Britain and the United States, embracing the whole subject of reciprocal commercial relations, should be made during the course of the then current year, the special privileges thus allowed should be withdrawn, and in the same Minute the belief was expressed that it was upon the faith of that promise alone that Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island reluctantly gave their consent. It further states, in support of the same position, that—

"If there appeared at this juncture any near prospect of continued liberality and forbearance being exercised by the United States—if

Mr. MITCHELL.

there was evinced an active desire to re-establish a fair interchange of the staple productions of the two countries, the peculiarity of our situation might not press with so great urgency. But unless before the opening of another fishing season some more equitable and permanent arrangement be effected, the existing provisional system ought wholly to cease."

"In the Minute of 27th February, 1868, it was stated as an objection against continuing the license system, 'that besides its inadequacy it is liable to the grave objection mentioned by His Excellency of being likely to degenerate into a total relinquishment of the exclusive right of fishing. A continuation, even for another year, of this nominal license fee, which system, when established, was expressly limited to the first year, but has now extended over two years, ought, on no account whatever, to be proposed.'

"The Minute further goes on to state that whatever may at present be determined on 'by Her Majesty's Government, unless before the advent of another fishery season some satisfactory arrangement shall be effected, the existing and any other merely provisional system ought wholly to cease, and all concessive liberties of fishing be absolutely withheld.'

"This Minute in further stating the temporary character of the arrangement observes that,—

"Conscious of their rights, and equally anxious to obviate every possibility of estrangement between neighboring peoples, or of international difficulty between Great Britain and the United States, they would rather accept a further temporary arrangement for the current year, provided it shall be made contingent on contemporary enquiries by a mixed commission of the nature indicated in the Earl of Clarendon's despatch of 11th May, 1866'

"On several occasions during the year 1868, the subject was again brought under the notice of Her Majesty's Government, and by a Minute of Council of the 9th their attention was called to the fact that evils of a peculiar character were arising under the new system of licensing American fishermen, inasmuch as the Provinces finding that their interests were neglected, and foreigners permitted to enjoy their fisheries against their will, were in danger of becoming Americanised in their views,—in fact, the people of Prince Edward Island were, by permitting the Americans to ignore the enforcement of treaty obligations, bidding for the trade which our own fishermen should have enjoyed, but which Americans monopolised, and were thus injuring the neighboring Province of Nova Scotia, where the treaty was enforced. In the Dominion the natural rights of our people, so far as we had power, or would be permitted by Her Majesty's Government to enforce them, were enforced; and Americans, so far as related to the causes for which they had a right to enter our ports, were kept strictly to their treaty rights. Our Government precluded them from trading in our ports,—from transferring cargoes from the fishing vessels to the freight and passenger steamers of their country, which visited our ports for the purpose of receiving their cargoes,—while in the neighboring Island of Prince Edward they were permitted as much license and liberty as a British subject. They bought fish, salt and barrels, sold and trafficked in fishing outfits, landed and stored their fish, to be again re-shipped in the line of American steamers running from thence to Boston, and whose trade was built up by this illicit violation of treaty rights. Again, they purchased the fish of the island,—shipped them as American fish,—and thus got them into American markets free of duty, calling them American fish. The trade of the island was thus gradually becoming alienated, and the disregard of the authorities to the constant and continuous violations on the part of Americans of treaty stipulations, was doing much harm, as well to the trade of the adjoining Province of Nova Scotia, as in sapping the loyalty of the people of the island. So serious did this become, that it was made the subject of grave remonstrance on the part of Nova Scotians, and the Government of Canada despatched, as a Special Commissioner, the Honorable Stewart Campbell, M.P., to report thereon. His report fully maintained the facts as previously stated, and the subject being again brought under the notice of Council upon report of the undersigned, of 10th June, 1868, in which attention was called to the very unsatisfactory state of the fishery question, and suggesting that the attention of Her Majesty's Government be called thereto,—the Government availed itself of the presence in England of two of the leading members of the Cabinet, viz.:—Sir George E. Cartier, Baronet, and the Honorable Wm McDougall, C.B., and directed them 'to secure a personal conference with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, with a view to the timely adoption of some permanent and satisfactory policy.'

"The report referred to, after giving a brief resume of the fishery question,—the course pursued by the British authorities and that followed by the United States, remarked upon the belief that was entertained by Her Majesty's Government, that the Americans would shortly resume their trade relations which they, in 1866, so hastily abandoned, and upon the fallacy thereof, it again referred to the fact that the license system was limited to the then current year, and stated 'that during three successive seasons the same system has been continued,—that it was each year renewed with manifest reluctance, attended as it has been by considerable loss, and many inconveniences occasioning impatient acquiescence on the part of the Maritime Provinces.'

"The burdensome continuance of a system, originated as an amicable concession towards the neighboring States, does not seem to have met with the slightest appreciation. The sole practical effect of it has been to admit foreigners to a free use of our fisheries, whilst imposing on the Imperial and Provincial Governments the material expense of regulating such foreign participation in lucrative advantages, and incurring the cost of protecting British subjects in the concurrent use of privileges exclusively theirs by the laws and usages of civilized nations, and at the same time guarding their own fishing grounds against substantial injury

by American fishermen. Under all these circumstances, it is respectfully but earnestly submitted whether the system of licensing United States fishing vessels, avowedly a provisional one, and implying no principle, should now be absolutely discontinued, and that it shall in future give place to a definite policy of exclusion agreeable to colonial interests, and consistent with national dignity and right.

"The gentleman referred to brought the matter under the notice of the Secretary of State, but without resulting in any change of policy.

"The undersigned need not here especially deal with the despatch of Earl Granville of 21st June, 1869, as it is dealt with in the report to Council of 20th December of the same year, but would observe that, notwithstanding all the representations which the Government of Canada had made against licensing foreign fishermen, the system was still maintained, though at an increased rate, and he would especially recall attention to the report referred to, and also to that of the 15th of same month, on the subject of trade and fisheries, as bearing upon our relations with the United States. I may here state that some inducements were held out by the action of Congress leading to a belief that arrangements for trade might be secured, and a conference was held upon the subject by Mr. Fish on the part of the American Government and Sir John Rose on behalf of that of Canada, but with no practical effect; and though Mr. Rose was given to understand by the American Secretary of State that so soon as the opinions of certain leading statesmen could be obtained, he would invite the Government of Canada again to send delegates to meet him, no such invitation was sent; and notwithstanding the apparent change of sentiment indicated by the resolution of Congress alluded to, the President, in his annual address to Congress, on 4th December last, dispelled all hopes of such an arrangement, and the Government of Canada adopted the reports of the 15th and 20th of December, in which these remarks appear:—'But Her Majesty's Government cannot fail to be struck with the injustice to us, and the danger to the Empire which attend an indefinite and temporising policy; it is therefore respectfully recommended that, unless the course submitted in a former report of the 15th instant be pursued, the United States Government be at once urged to enter into a mixed commission, of the nature described in Earl Clarendon's despatch, of 11th May, 1866, founded on suggestions offered by Mr. Adams.' And that pending the recommendations of such joint commission, as may be adopted and confirmed by the respective Governments, an improved system of licensing American fishing vessels shall be enforced under regulations necessary to its effective operation, and limited positively to the ensuing year.

"In the event of the United States Government declining this proposal, the existing licenses which expire with the closing year should not be renewed, and a policy of entire exclusion from our fishing limits should be adopted and enforced."

"To this Minute no answer was received until the 5th May, 1870, when Mr. H. J. Holland for Earl Granville, under date 19th April last, sent a despatch to Sir John Young, of which the following is the text:—

"With reference to previous correspondence with respect to the protection of the Canadian fisheries, I have the honor to inform you that the Board of Admiralty have been requested to send to the Canadian waters a force sufficient to protect Canadian fishermen, and to maintain order."

"In the meantime, however, the Canadian Government had passed an Order in Council, under date 8th January last, to the following effect, viz.:—

"That the system of granting fishing licenses to foreign vessels under the Act 31 Vic., cap. 61, be discontinued, and that henceforth foreign fishermen be not permitted to fish in the waters of Canada.' They further provided that six vessels similar to *La Canadienne*, be employed for the protection of the fisheries, in addition to the two already engaged on that service; and they also recommend that Her Majesty's Government be requested to maintain on the fishing stations of Canada a sufficient naval force to prevent riotous conduct, and to protect the officers of the police in the discharge of their duty. In reference to the proposal of Lord Granville to support the local force, by the presence of only one vessel of war, the minute stated that it considered this measure of support would be inadequate, and hoped that Her Majesty's Government may be instructed to increase it.

"In dealing with the latter point, the undersigned, in his report of 20th December last, before referred to, remarked:—

"With further reference to the concluding portion of Earl Granville's despatch of 21st of June last, signifying the readiness of Her Majesty's Government to furnish for next year one vessel of war to assist in giving effect to regulations for protecting the fisheries, provided that the Canadian Government furnish at their own cost such other vessels as may be necessary, the undersigned would draw the attention of Council to the national character of this service as contra-distinguished from the municipal duty which it appears to be considered. It, in fact, involves important political considerations. The public right of fishing in the waters of British North America has been dealt with and disposed of in former times by Imperial authority, and has formed the subject of treaties or conventions with foreign powers. The differences which existed between the British and American Governments under the Treaty of 1878, arose from concessions of fishing privileges in colonial waters, made by the Imperial Government in favor of citizens of the United States; and the succeeding disputes which have arisen out of the Convention of 1818, resulted from the terms of an arrangement made entirely by the Imperial authorities. Those disputes were the same that would have been revived at the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty, had not a temporary postponement occurred through the licensing system. The Government of Canada did not desire to avoid their settlement. If, therefore, they are now to be still further postponed in deference to the views of Her Majesty's Government, the people of Canada may reason-

ably claim that Imperial connection with the great question in suspense shall be duly represented by Her Majesty's ships. The purely local or municipal duties of guarding the coast and inshore fisheries within the limits of our territorial jurisdiction, the Canadian authorities do not hesitate to assume, and will amply provide for; but in support of those national rights on which the whole question depends, it is respectfully submitted that a sufficient Imperial force should be maintained in colonial waters."

The particular despatch to which this refers is brought out here. The Canadian Government inform Her Majesty's Government that they are prepared to fit out a fleet to protect Canadian rights within three miles of the shore, and they ask Her Majesty's Government, instead of putting on one ship as they proposed, to protect the fisheries outside of the three-mile limit, to put on a sufficient number of ships, and they made this response:

"Hitherto the number of war vessels detached for this service has been, according to the testimony of the commanding officers, altogether too few; and should the inadequacy of the force be further reduced to the small measure of one ship, the moral and material effect would, it is feared, prove as injurious to our interests as it is possible to conceive. Were an increased number of cruisers to be employed, the undersigned is prepared to recommend that they be supplemented by a sufficient number of sailing vessels, armed and equipped by the Canadian Government as a marine police, to enforce our fishery laws and protect our inshore fisheries. These vessels would be similar in build to the foreign fishing vessels, and well manned. The schooner *La Canadienne*, now employed, is described by naval officers as very suitable to the duty, and has accomplished like duties for several years past in a most satisfactory manner. The others might be provided somewhat on that model. These auxiliary vessels could cruise close in shore, and accompany the fishing fleet, co-operating always with Her Majesty's ships, and furnished with licenses to be issued, if required, to foreign fishermen."

"In pursuance of the policy indicated in that report, the Canadian Government directed that the force employed for the protection of the fisheries and maintained by them, be supplemented by the addition of six vessels of the class of *La Canadienne*, a style of vessel which was considered suitable for that service, and such as was recommended by the officers in command of Her Majesty's cruisers, as most desirable, which was accordingly done, and the Canadian force was thus increased to one steamer and seven sailing vessels.

"The Canadian Government also submitted to Parliament a Bill in amendment of the Act 31 Vic., cap. 61, which was passed, intitled: 'An Act to amend the Act respecting Fishing by Foreign Vessels,' which abolished the necessity of giving any warnings to foreign fishermen before seizure if found within our limits.

"The Government of Canada also submitted special instructions to be given to the officers in command of these vessels, under date 14th April last, based upon those which had been previously approved by Her Majesty's Government in former years, varying only when the altered circumstances called for change. To a portion of these instructions, exception was taken by Mr. Thornton,—at the instance of Mr. Fish—the correspondence in reference to which will appear in the report to Council, by the undersigned, under date of the 28th April last, and the Minute of Council thereon.

"After the instructions before referred to were issued, the Governor General submitted to Council, on the 2nd of May last, a copy of a cable telegram which he received from Lord Granville, dated 30th April last, in the following words:—

"Take steps to secure that American fishing vessels are not seized even between headlands, except within three miles distance of the shore, and be asked that he might be furnished with an answer to be sent the Colonial Office, with a copy of the orders which had been given or which might be given to the commanders aforesaid. To this Council by Minute of the 3rd of May, replied as follows:—

And here is perhaps the explanation of why Mr. Mitchell had to alter his orders,—

"The Committee advise that Earl Granville be informed that steps have already been taken to provide against the seizure of American vessels under the circumstances above mentioned, and that the instructions to the officers in command of the vessels engaged in the protection of the fisheries (copies of which have been forwarded to the Colonial Secretary) contain special directions on the subject."

"In agreeing to the above report, Council naturally concluded that the telegram of the 30th April, had reference to, and was to be read in connection with, the instructions issued by Mr. Cardwell in April, 1866, and upon which the annual instructions of the Canadian Government were based for the past four years, and that if Her Majesty's Government had decided in any way to limit or abandon our rights to the fisheries of which we were in possession, that before doing so they would have consulted the Government of Canada upon the subject, or at least have explicitly informed them that they had so limited them, and in what particulars."

They actually reduced the limit from ten miles to six miles without consulting the Canadian Government, and that is the way in which Canada's interests were protected.

"The Government was, however, somewhat surprised to receive on the 25th of May last, a copy of a despatch from Lord Granville to Sir John Young, bearing date the 30th April last, informing the Governor General that his Lordship had transmitted to him a copy of a letter addressed to the Admiralty, respecting the instructions to be given to the officers of Her Majesty's ships employed in the protection of the Canadian fisheries, and stating 'that Her Majesty's Government do not doubt that your Ministers will agree with them as to the propriety of these instructions to the vessels employed by them.'

"The letter referred to is as follows:—

"DOWNING STREET,

"30th April, 1870.

"In Mr. Secretary Cardwell's letter to the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, of the 12th April, 1866, it was stated that American vessels should not be seized for violating the Canadian fishery law, 'except after wilful and persevering neglect of the warnings which they may have received; and in case it should become necessary to proceed to forfeiture, cases should, if possible, be selected for the extreme step in which the offence of fishing has been committed within three miles of land.'

"The Canadian Government has recently determined, with the concurrence of Her Majesty's Ministers, to increase the stringency of the existing practice by dispensing with the warnings hitherto given, and seizing at once any vessel detected in violating the law.

"In view of this change, and of the questions to which it may give rise, I am directed by Lord Granville to request that you will move their lordships to instruct the officers of Her Majesty's ships, employed in the protection of the fisheries, that they are not to seize any vessel unless it is evident, and can be clearly proved, that the offence of fishing has been committed, and the vessel itself is captured, within three miles of land."

"This despatch the Council read also in connection with the before-named letter of Mr. Cardwell of 1866, and did not conceive, although the language of it was scarcely consistent with the latter, that Her Majesty's Government meant to convey a limitation in connection with the bays upon our coast, inasmuch as the Canadian Government was not advised of any alteration in that particular; and in the report to Council upon it, the text of which I have thought it desirable to give at length, it will be perceived that Council did not construe it to mean a restriction of the geographical limits of our jurisdiction, but mainly objected to that portion of the despatch which directed 'that they are not to seize any vessel unless it is evident, and can be clearly proved, that the offence of fishing has been committed, and the vessel itself is captured within three miles of land.'

We protected our fishermen within our municipal jurisdiction of three miles, and what did the British fleet do? Did they protect them outside that limit? No. The instructions they had in regard to their action outside were a sham, and, if we could get to the bottom of those instructions, I believe it would be found that they were instructed not to seize any vessel at all. At least, that is what they did do.

"To the latter clause of this despatch, as to the place of capture, the Canadian Government had decided objection; it was a new feature in the instructions to Her Britannic Majesty's officers which had never before been given, was a further limitation of the means of preventing these encroachments, which it was the professed object of Her Majesty's cruisers to accomplish, and my Lord Granville was in error in assuming 'that the Government of Canada would agree with them as to the propriety of these instructions,' as will appear by the following report and the Minute of Council thereon.

"Having reference to a despatch of the 30th ultimo, from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, covering a communication of the same date from Sir Frederick Rogers to the Secretary of the Admiralty, directing attention to instructions given to officers of Her Majesty's ships employed in the protection of the fisheries of Canada, and desiring the Canadian Government to give corresponding directions to officers in command of the marine police vessels similarly engaged, the undersigned has the honor to submit that in certain respects, Lord Granville's wish has been already provided for in the special instructions adopted by the Governor General in Council on the 14th instant.

"The officers of Her Majesty's ships are, it is said, instructed 'not to seize any vessel unless it is evident, and can be clearly proved, that the offence of fishing has been committed and the vessel itself is captured within three miles of land.'

"Attention is respectfully requested to a division of the instructions issued by the Government of Canada, headed 'Action,' by which it will be seen that exercise of the lawful power of peremptory and absolute detention is not contemplated on the first occasion, unless there be a wilful and persistent violation of the law; but such preliminary forbearance could not possibly be extended to any subsequent act of trespass. Another division of these instructions, headed 'Directions,' provides with great care against the possibility of any offending vessel seized by the Canadian officers, except actually within three miles of land, and unless the commission of the offence can be clearly proved.

"It is, however, intimated under the same head that any offending vessel which may resist or avoid immediate seizure within three miles of land, remains liable to capture for the offence committed by Canadian officers in the waters of Canada and by Imperial cruisers wherever she may be afterwards found in British waters, and in consequence, the

Mr. MITCHELL.

Canadian officers are directed to communicate without delay the names of any vessels they shall have notified and accosted, or any which may escape or resist seizure; this proviso is consonant to the Acts relative to fishing by foreign vessels, as, besides the offence of being 'found fishing,' it is unlawful to 'have been fishing, &c.' (Vide 31 Vic., cap 61, sec. 1, and amending Act).

"The undersigned begs to express the hope that the instructions suggested in Lord Granville's despatch to the Admiralty may not be interpreted so as to affect such liability. It is also understood that the term 'offence of fishing has been committed,' occurring in the Admiralty instructions, to which the assent of the Canadian Government is invited, are to be construed conformably with the fishery laws, as, under these Statutes, 'preparing to fish,' inshore constitutes an offence.

"The undersigned would, therefore, respectfully observe that while recommending acquiescence in so much of his Lordship's suggestion as consists with these special instructions, it is advisable to guard against any further practical modification of the strict right of entire exclusion, and also of summary action, than what has been already provided for in the very considerate instructions issued by the Canadian Government.

"There should, as far as it is possible, be uniformity of procedure in these particulars between Her Majesty's ships and the subsidiary force employed by Canada.

"With reference, however, to that part of Lord Granville's suggestion affecting the order to capture any foreign vessel liable to seizure only when the ship is actually within three miles of the coast, the undersigned considers it open to serious objection.

"Both the Imperial and colonial statutes regulating fishing by foreign vessels, relate to jurisdiction in British waters. The system applied under them recognises certain conventional limits as the basis of actual exclusion. But it would seem to be inconsistent both with the provisions of these Acts, and the object of defence, to admit of offending vessels avoiding all penal consequences of their trespass by simply passing an imaginary line out of colonial bounds, and yet being still within British jurisdiction, after having violated the provincial laws, and infringed the treaty between Great Britain and the United States, and also the Imperial Act founded on the same. The peculiar facility with which foreign fishing vessels may cross and recross along this marine limit, renders it possible that under shelter of the exemption resulting from any instruction of the nature suggested, trespassers may present the anomaly of escaping from the marine police of Canada to the quasi-protection of Imperial authority. The existence of such a rule must really invite illegal encroachments on the part of foreigners; and the immediate effect would be to encourage intruders to quicken their efforts to avoid detention and evade seizure, knowing that the capture of their vessels is certain only when caught, as it were, in the very act of trespass. It will certainly weaken the moral influence of any demand made by the officers in command of these Canadian vessels, depending, as they are instructed to do, on the material aid of Her Majesty's ships in case of violence, they being themselves unauthorized to fire upon and disable any vessel either offering resistance or endeavoring to escape seizure."

"There is also to be considered the probable future reference to this exception in connection with any final settlement of the reserved question of headland lines. If, for instance, any foreign vessel having actually trespassed within three miles of the shore of the interior of the Bay des Chaleurs, and escaped from the municipal force of Canada, shall not be afterwards subject to seizure under British authority anywhere within the entrance to that bay, say inside of a line drawn across from Miscou to Point Maquereau (distant apart about 15 miles), and where, in all other matters of a civil or criminal nature, Canada exercises provincial jurisdiction, it may imply waiver of both Canadian and British control *quo ad* exclusive rights of fishing. The Government having deliberated on and determined to maintain this essential point by several Orders in Council adopted since 1864, it is inadvisable to sanction any such dubious proceeding as might be in future pressed into service to support American views.

"Occasion is taken again to refer to reports from this Department, dated 15th and 20th December last, in which this disputed part of the fishery question is referred to at length, and other previous reports enumerated; and the undersigned begs leave again to urge that Her Majesty's Government may be requested to bring it to a speedy settlement in the manner proposed by Lord Clarendon in 1866, on the suggestion of the American Minister at London.

"The undersigned would respectfully, but most earnestly, represent the tendency of any restriction of the kind proposed by Lord Granville on the support of Her Majesty's squadron, to mar the efficiency of this important service, and begs leave to recommend that Her Majesty's Government may be asked to instruct the commanding officer to receive and act upon whatever definite and reliable reports (with satisfactory particulars) of actual detection or escape, may be made by the officers in command of the Canadian Government vessels employed in protecting the inshore fisheries of Canada.

"The action of Council thereon will appear by the Minute of 2nd instant, in which, after reference to the despatch, the Minute goes on to state that 'they have also had before them the memorandum from the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to whom the above-mentioned despatch and enclosure were referred, and they respectfully report their concurrence therein, and advise that a copy thereof be transmitted by Your Excellency to Lord Granville as containing the views of the Canadian Government on the question referred to in the said despatch.'

"It will further be perceived, by reference to the Minute of Council of 8th inst., that immediately upon receipt of the instructions issued by Vice-Admiral Wellesey, under the directions of Her Majesty's Govern-

ment, a Minute of Council was passed in accordance therewith, and amongst other minor changes essential to secure uniformity, these words were added:—“It must be evident and susceptible of the clearest proof that the offence has been committed and the capture effected within the prohibited limits.”

“I need scarcely remind the Council of the great reluctance that they felt in thus narrowing our powers of protecting the interests of our fishermen, nor the feeling of doubt and distrust as to the real intentions of Her Majesty’s Government in relation to these fisheries which was forced upon them. It became evident that a personal remonstrance ought to be made by a member of the Canadian Government to the British Ministry. This course was shortly thereafter resolved upon, and the Honorable Alexander Campbell was despatched to London for the purpose of remonstrating with Her Majesty’s Government, and urging them to insist upon a reference of the matters in dispute on the part of the Americans to a Joint Commission, or failing that, at once to enforce and secure the exclusive use of all those privileges and limits which British subjects enjoyed from 1818 up to their suspension by the Reciprocity Treaty in 1854.

“Council had hoped that until the mission of Mr. Campbell should have enabled them to judge what they might expect as to the course Her Majesty’s Government might hereafter pursue, that at least they would not be called upon to make fresh changes, or submit to any further limitations of their rights, and were surprised at the receipt of a copy of a telegram of the 6th instant, forwarded to the Governor General in Council, from My Lord Granville to Sir John Young, in the following words:

“Her Majesty’s Government hopes that the United States fishermen will not be for the present prevented from fishing, except within three miles of land, or in bays which are less than six miles broad at the mouth.”

“The Government were again surprised to find that a new and further limitation of the rights of the British people was resolved upon by Her Majesty’s Government, inasmuch as in all former instructions, foreign fishermen were excluded from bays which were less than ten geographical miles wide, while the telegram referred to, limited the exclusion, for the first time, to ‘bays which were less than six miles wide at the mouth.’

“The question which naturally presented itself to the Canadian Ministry was, where is this to end? and to what extent are these concessions to be made? They felt it to be a duty they owed alike to Canada, for whose Government they were responsible, as to the whole British people, to remonstrate with Her Majesty’s Ministers before issuing the required instruction, and on the 9th instant they adopted a Minute of Council, concurring in the report of the undersigned of the 8th instant, and requesting that a copy thereof should be sent to Lord Granville for the information of Her Majesty’s Government.

“The report states that precautions have been already taken against seizure by Canadian officers of United States fishing vessels outside of three marine miles from land on the coasts of Canada, and further remarking upon the despatch, observes that:

“The termination of the Reciprocity Treaty by the United States, and the consequent cessation of the labors of the Joint Commission embracing disputed points in the controversy suspended thereby, had the legitimate effect of leaving the inshore fishery rights just as they stood in 1854. The main point formerly in dispute, involving the definition of bays, &c., has never since been conceded by the Imperial or Colonial authorities. It, on the contrary, has been steadily asserted in all subsequent correspondence and transactions. The letter of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 12th April, 1866, expressly reserves it and sets forth the opinion of Her Majesty’s Government as clear on this point. The Canadian Government was, however, desired to forego, for the present, the strict enforcement of British rights in this respect, and ‘during the (then) present season’ to accept a conventional arrangement affecting bays or creeks less than ten miles wide at their entrance.

“It was so accepted as part of the temporary system at that time proposed, but has shared with kindred provisions the disapproval repeated on various occasions by this Government during four years past. The policy adopted this year by Canada, and approved by Great Britain, would in its entirety supersede all provisional concessions heretofore subsisting. But, in deference to the obvious wishes of Her Majesty’s Government, this policy has been carried out in the spirit of Mr. Cardwell’s despatch of 12th April, 1866, and the same conventional limit of ten miles will be again for the present observed. The Government of Canada ought not, therefore, to be now desired to recognise any further and fresh limitation of our exclusive rights, however temporary and guarded it may be intended to be made.

“This disputed matter has now been pending for upwards of twenty-five years, during which period the American Government has had frequent opportunities and has been specially invited to join in an equitable adjustment of the same. The fault that it is still unsettled, and the source of difficulty attached to the United States Government alone. Great Britain and Canada are mere defendants, as in possession of a natural right existing in fact and in law.

“The Council is aware that, when the British Government in 1845 opened the Bay of Fundy to American fishermen, as an amicable relaxation of treaty rights, the act was officially regarded as ‘a practical abandonment’ by American authorities of the British construction of the Convention of 1818. It was immediately followed by a demand for general application to all indentments exceeding six miles in width. This extraordinary demand appears to have been for the moment acquiesced in by Lord Aberdeen, for peace sake, but was soon afterwards rejected by Lord Stanley, on the earnest remonstrances of the colonies. Another

concession in the same direction, as proposed by Lord Granville (identical in the words of that ineffectual and unjust claim), may be similarly construed to our detriment. Thus the whole policy of exclusion would be gradually subverted, and component parts of a question vital to the future welfare and interests of Canada, become practically abandoned piecemeal.

“The peculiar concession now suggested would, it is believed, tend to create new differences with the United States instead of promoting any final settlement of the existing controversy.

“Reference is particularly requested to reports of the 15th and 20th of December last, in which the whole matter in question is fully set forth. The conclusions arrived at were, that, as the American Government had voluntarily terminated the Treaty of 1854, and ever since failed to consider any propositions regarding an equivalent for the use of our inshore fisheries, notwithstanding an intermediate license system which continued to United States citizens the same fishing privileges they had enjoyed under the Reciprocity Treaty, on merely formal conditions, all such concessions should be absolutely withdrawn and our rights duly enforced as they existed and were upheld anterior to that reciprocal compact.

“The undersigned, therefore, respectfully submits that the terms of the policy already adopted, and now in actual course of being carried out, should be strictly adhered to.”

“The undersigned would further observe that this *resumé* of the fishery question need not be embarrassed with the correspondence on the points raised, through Mr. Thornton, by the American Secretary of State, Mr. Fish, in relation to the text of the instructions given to the fishery officers commanding the marine police vessels in connection with the Magdalen Islands, and Labrador, as it is not material to the main question, and has been already answered by reports and Minutes of Council, of the 31st ult., and the 8th, 14th and 27th instant, it is necessary now to make reference to the Bay of Fundy.

“Upon the concession made in relation to the correspondence it will be found that, after the right of Americans to fish in that bay was discussed at length, the following conclusions were arrived at by the then Foreign Minister, the Earl of Aberdeen, in his letter of the 10th May, 1845, in which, after reasoning upon the merits of the question, he states that:

“The undersigned will confine himself to stating that, after the most deliberate re-consideration of the subject, and with every desire to do full justice to the United States, and to view the claims put forward on behalf of United States citizens in the most favorable light, Her Majesty’s Government are, nevertheless, still constrained to deny the right of United States citizens, under the Treaty of 1818, to fish in that part of the Bay of Fundy, which, from its geographical position, may properly be considered as included within the British possessions.”

“Her Majesty’s Government must still maintain—and in this view they are fortified by high legal authority—that the Bay of Fundy is rightfully claimed by Great Britain as a bay within the Treaty of 1818; and they equally maintain the position which was laid down in the note of the undersigned, dated the 15th of April last, that with regard to the other bays on the British American coast, no United States fisherman has, under that convention, the right to fish within three miles of the entrance of such bays, as designated by a line drawn from headland to headland at that entrance.

“But while Her Majesty’s Government still feel themselves bound to maintain these positions as a matter of right, they are, nevertheless, not insensible to the advantages which would accrue to both countries from a relaxation of the exercise of that right—to the United States, as conferring a material benefit on their fishing trade; and to Great Britain and the United States conjointly and equally, by the removal of a fertile source of disagreement between them.

“Her Majesty’s Government are also anxious, at the same time that they uphold the just claims of the British Crown, to evince by every reasonable concession their desire to act liberally and amicably towards the United States.

“The undersigned has accordingly much pleasure in announcing to Mr. Everett, the determination to which Her Majesty’s Government have come, to relax in favor of the United States fishermen that right which Great Britain has hitherto exercised of excluding these fishermen from the British portion of the Bay of Fundy, and they are prepared to direct the colonial authorities to allow henceforward the United States fishermen to pursue their avocations in any part of the Bay of Fundy, provided they do not approach, except in the cases specified in the Treaty of 1818, within three miles of the entrance of any bay on the coast of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick.

“This concession made by Lord Aberdeen in the interest of peace and in the belief that it would have been reciprocated by the United States, and that his suggestion of their taking off the duties from British-caught fish going into the United States would have been acted upon, was not realised.

“An American writer in dealing with this subject (see page 424 of the United States Senate documents of years 1852-53) says:

"The opening of the Bay of Fundy considered in itself alone, though nominally confirming the interpretation of the treaty which the colonial authorities had set up, was, in fact, a practical abandonment of it, and we have the highest assurance that the British Government contemplated the further extension of the same policy by the adoption of a general regulation that American fishermen should be allowed freely to enter all bays of which the mouths were more than six miles wide."

"This communication was frustrated by the strong remonstrance of the Governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, fortified by an able and elaborate opinion of the then Attorney General, now the master of rolls of Nova Scotia, on the legal rights of colonists, in which, after indicating the legal rights of the latter, he says:

"The colonists cannot understand the principle upon which concession in any form should be granted to the American people in a case avowedly touching the highest ground of national policy, even, although concession did not involve consequences, as it unhappily does in the present case, both immediate and remote, most injurious to colonial interests."

"He further says: 'We believe the treaty does not exclude them, and we but ask a judicial enquiry and determination before these valuable privileges are relinquished: the highest law opinions in England have justified our belief. Her Majesty's Government, in theory, avows and maintains it.'

"The case was finally submitted to the British law officers of the Crown in a case put by the Legislature of Nova Scotia. The Advocate General and the Attorney General of England gave as their opinion 'That, by the terms of the convention, American citizens were excluded from any right of fishing within three miles from the coast of British America, and that the prescribed distance of three miles is to be measured from the headlands or extreme points of land next the sea, of the coast, or of the entrance of bays or indents of the coast, and, consequently, that no right exists on the part of American citizens to enter the bays of Nova Scotia, there to take fish, although the fishing, being within the bay, may be at a greater distance than three miles from the shore of the bay; as we are of the opinion that the term 'headland' is used in the treaty to express the part of the land we have before mentioned, including the interior of the bays and the indents of the coast.'

"The colonies sent a delegation and strong remonstrance to Her Majesty's Government, and on the 17th September, 1845, Lord Stanley thus wrote to the Governor of Nova Scotia respecting the policy of granting permission to the fishermen of the United States to fish in the bay of Chaleurs, and other large bays of a similar character on the coasts of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and apprehending, from your statements, that any such general concessions would be injurious to the interests of the British North American Province, 'We have abandoned the intention we had entertained on the subject, and shall adhere to the strict letter of the treaties which exist between Great Britain and the United States relative to the fisheries in North America, except in so far as they may relate to the Bay of Fundy, which has been thrown open to the North Americans under certain restrictions.'

"Mr. Webster, in notifying fishermen after the decision of Her Majesty's Government, and after dealing with this question and citing the above remarks, states: 'It is this construction of the intent and meaning of the Convention of 1818, for which the colonies have contended since 1841, and which they have desired should be enforced—this the English Government has now, it would appear, consented to do.'

"Yet, notwithstanding this amount of authority in support of the colonial claim, no sooner was the concession made as a matter of favor to the Americans to fish in the Bay of Fundy, than they claimed that the concession settled the question as a matter of right, and that in its operation it should be applicable to all bays, and the practical effect has been largely to encourage trespassers.

"It will be further seen, by reference to the despatch of Mr. Everett in reply to Lord Aberdeen's despatch of 10th March, 1845, as regards the concession in reference to the Bay of Fundy, that no sooner was that generous concession made, than a new and further one was demanded, viz.:—admission into the smaller bays of the coasts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, within the Bay of Fundy; this, of course, was not conceded by Her Majesty's Government.

"This further concession, which is now, by the despatch of the 6th inst., temporarily made, limits the exclusion from bays only of less than six miles wide, in place of, as formerly, from all bays less than ten miles wide—is the same concession which was on the eve of being agreed to by the then Earl of Aberdeen, and

Mr. MITCHELL.

which was arrested by the late lamented Earl of Derby, then Lord Stanley, on the strong remonstrances of the colonists, and will, it is to be feared, if not at once withdrawn, be viewed by foreigners, not as an act of grace nor a concession of a temporary character, but will, in future years as in the Bay of Fundy concession, be claimed, and its continuance, demanded as a matter of right—and, under any circumstance, inure to our disadvantage if the reference asked for is obtained.

"The undersigned would now call attention to the question of the navigation of the Gut of Canso in connection with the fishery question.

"The points which present themselves are:

"1st. What are the national rights in relation to the navigation and user thereof by foreigners, and have British subjects the exclusive right thereto?

"2nd. Have the Americans ever obtained any treaty rights from Great Britain to use it in common?

"3rd. What have been the restrictions against foreigners in its user, and what jurisdiction has Great Britain or the Province of Nova Scotia exercised over it?

"In order to a clear appreciation of the case, it may be stated that the Strait of Canso is a narrow strip of water or arm of the sea, connecting the Bay of Canso, which opens into Chedabucto Bay on the eastward, with St. George's Bay opening into the Straits of Northumberland in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, its dimensions are described by Admiral Bayfield, in the report of his survey of the coast, volume II, as follows:

"The length of the passage through the Gut from the lighthouse at the north entrance to the lighthouse on Eddy Point at the south entrance is 14½ miles, and its least breadth between Bolache Point and Cape Porcupine is 4½ cables' (or under half a mile).

"It is bounded on both sides by counties which now form part of the Province of Nova Scotia, and in no portion of its length between the points referred to, is the width up to two miles.

"Under such circumstances, it would seem that, beyond any doubt, international law would vest the absolute control and the exclusive uses of such gut, strait, or arm of the sea, within the exclusive territorial jurisdiction of the country which controls both shores.

"The maritime territory of every state extends to the ports, harbors, bays, mouths of rivers and adjacent parts of the sea enclosed by headlands, belonging to the same State. The general usage of nations superadds to this extent of territorial jurisdiction a distance of a marine league, or as far as a cannon shot will reach from the shore, along all the coasts of the state. Within these limits (i.e. the ports, harbors, bays, and mouths of rivers and adjacent parts of the sea enclosed by headlands, with three marine miles superadded) its rights of property and territorial jurisdiction are absolute, and exclude those of every other nation.'—Elements of International Law, p. 320. By Henry Wheaton, LL.D. Second annotated edition, by W. B. Lawrence, Boston, 1864.

"Navigable rivers, which flow through a territory, and the sea coast adjoining it, and the navigable waters included in bays, and between headlands and arms of the sea, belong to the sovereign of the adjoining territory, as being necessary to the safety of the nation, and to the undisturbed use of the neighboring shores.'—Kent's Commentaries, p. 25.

"The property and dominion of the sea might belong to him who is in possession of the lands on both sides, though it be open above as a gulf, or above and below as a strait, provided it be not so great a part of the sea, as when compared with the lands on both sides, it cannot be supposed to be a portion of them.'—Grotius de jure belli et pacis, L. 11.

"The exclusive right of dominion, and territorial jurisdiction of the British Crown, have immemorially extended to the bays or portions of the sea cut off by lines drawn from one promontory to another, along the coasts of the Island of Great Britain. They are commonly called the King's Chambers. A similar jurisdiction, or right of domain, is also asserted by the United States over the Delaware Bay and other bays and estuaries as forming portions of their territory. Other nations have claimed a right of territory over bays, gulfs, straits, mouths of rivers, and estuaries, which are enclosed by capes and headlands along their respective coasts, and the principle would seem to be pretty well established as a rule of international law.'—International Law by H. W. Halleck, A.M., San Francisco, 1861.

"Gulfs and channels or arms of the sea are, according to the regular course, supposed to belong to the people with whose lands they are encompassed.'—Puffendorf Law of Nature and of Nations, L. IV.

"All we have said of the parts of the sea near the coast, may be said more particularly, and with greater reason, of roads, bays, and straits, as still more capable of being possessed, and of greater importance to the safety of the country. But I speak of bays and straits of small extent, not of those great tracts of sea to which these names are sometimes given, as Hudson's Bay and the Straits of Magellan, over which the empire cannot extend, still less a right of property.'—The Law of Nations, by Mons. de Vattel, New Edition by Jos. Chitty, Esq., Annotated by C. D. Ingraham, Esq., Philadelphia, 1858."

"According to the current of modern authority, the general territorial jurisdiction extends into the sea as far as cannon shot will reach, and no further, and this is generally calculated to be a marine league.'—Kent's Commentaries, p. 29.

"Considering the great extent of the line of the American coasts, we have a right to claim, for fiscal and defensive regulations, a liberal extension of maritime jurisdiction; and it would not be unreasonable, as I apprehend, to assume, for domestic purposes, connected with our safety and welfare, the control of the waters on our coasts, though included within lines stretching from quite distant headlands, as, for instance, from Cape Ann to Cape Cod, and from Nantucket to Mauntauck Point, and from that point to the Capes of the Delaware, and from the south of Cape Florida to the Mississippi.'—Kent's Commentaries, pp. 29 and 30.

"It is difficult to draw any precise or determined conclusion, amidst the variety of opinions, as to the distance to which a state may lawfully extend its exclusive dominion over the sea adjoining its territories, and beyond those portions of the sea which are embraced by harbors, gulfs, bays, and estuaries, and over which its jurisdiction unquestionably extends. All that can be reasonably asserted is, that the dominion of the sovereign of the shore over the contiguous sea, extends as far as is requisite for his safety, and for some lawful end.'—Kent's Commentaries, p. 29.

"The preceding dicta should be borne in mind, with especial reference to the plea set up by American Ministers that the limit of maritime jurisdiction claimed by Chancellor Kent is with respect to 'belligerent purposes;' and that the principle of drawing lines from distant headlands does not sanction such a definition of marine bounds as affecting territorial jurisdiction and piscary. Is not fishery a 'lawful end,' and are not the fishing pursuits of citizens 'purposes connected with our safety and welfare'?"

"For purely belligerent purposes Great Britain takes sixteen miles of outside sea as the limit, and the United States take much more, both estimating the distance 'from a right line drawn from one headland to another.'—Chancellor Kent, p. 30.

"In Nova Scotia, from 1825 up to 1854, much excitement pre-

* "When the United States, by the Treaty of 1818, solemnly renounced forever the right to fish within three miles of the coasts, bays, creeks or harbors of certain portions of North America, the stipulation was neither extraordinary nor extravagant. It is matter of common history that sea-girt nations claim peculiar rights within a league of their shores; and equally plain that, according to the maxims of international law, this claim is defined by lines drawn not only between the formation of bays, but from the headlands of indentations of the coasts.' Memorial to Her Majesty, 2nd, Sept. 1852.

"It would appear that by a strict and rigid construction of this article, fishing vessels of the United States are precluded from entering into the bays or harbors of the British provinces, except for the purposes of shelter, repairing damages, and obtaining wood and water. A bay, as is usually understood, is an arm or recess of the sea entering from the ocean between capes or headlands; and the term is applied equally to small and large tracts of water thus situated. It is common to speak of Hudson's Bay, or the Bay of Biscay, although they are very large tracts of water."

"The British authorities insist that England has a right to draw a line from headland to headland, and to capture all American fishermen who may follow their pursuits inside of that line. It was undoubtedly an oversight in the Convention of 1818, to make so large a concession to England, since the United States had usually considered that those vast inlets or recesses of the ocean ought to be open to American fishermen, as freely as the sea itself, to within three marine miles of the shore.'—Mr. Secretary Webster, 6th July, 1852.

"No United States fisherman has under the Convention (1818), the right to fish within three miles of the entrance of such bays as are designated by a line drawn from headland to headland at their entrance.'—Lord Aberdeen's despatch to Mr. Everett, 10th March, 1845.

vailed in reference to this question of the fisheries, and with it the navigation of the Gut of Canso.

"In 1841 the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia proposed the following questions for the consideration of Her Majesty's legal advisers, dated 8th June, 1841:

"I. Whether the Treaty of 1783 was annulled by the war of 1812, and whether citizens of the United States possess any right of fishery in the waters of the lower Provinces other than ceded to them by the Convention of 1818; and if so, what right?"

"II. Have American citizens the right, under that Convention, to enter any of the bays of this Province to take fish, if, after they have so entered, they prosecute the fishery more than three marine miles from the shores of such bays; or should the prescribed distance of three marine miles be measured from the headlands, at the entrance of such bays, so as to exclude them?"

"III. Is the distance of three marine miles to be computed from the indents of the coast of British America, or from the extreme headlands, and what is to be considered a headland?"

"IV. Have American vessels, fitted out for a fishery, a right to pass through the Gut of Canso, which they cannot do without coming within the prescribed limits, or to anchor there, or to fish there; and is casting bait to lure fish in the track of the vessel fishing, within the meaning of the Convention?"

"V. Have American citizens a right to land on the Magdalen Islands, and conduct the fishery from the shores thereof, by using nets and seines; or what right of fishery do they possess on the shores of those islands, and what is meant by the term shore?"

"VI. Have American fishermen the right to enter the bays and harbors of this Province for the purpose of purchasing wood, or obtaining water, having provided neither of these articles at the commencement of their voyages, in their own country; or have they the right only of entering such bays and harbors in cases of distress, or to purchase wood and obtain water, after the usual stock of those articles for the voyage of such fishing craft has been exhausted or destroyed?"

"VII. Under existing treaties, what rights of fishery are ceded to the citizens of the United States of America, and what reserved for the exclusive enjoyment of British subjects?"

"1st Query.—In obedience to Your Lordship's commands, we have taken these papers into consideration, and have the honor to report, that we are of opinion that the Treaty of 1783 was annulled by the war of 1812; and we are also of opinion that the rights of fishery of the citizens of the United States must now be considered as defined and regulated by the Convention of 1818; and with respect to the general question 'if so, what right' we can only refer to the terms of the convention, as explained and elucidated by the observations which will occur in answering the other specific queries.

"2nd and 3rd Queries.—Except within certain defined limits, to which the query put to us does not apply, we are of opinion, that by the terms of the convention, American citizens are excluded from any right of fishing within three miles of the coast of British America, and that the prescribed distance of three miles is to be measured from the headlands, or extreme points of land next the sea, or the coast, or of the entrance of bays, or indents of the coast; and, consequently, that no right exists, on the part of American citizens, to enter the bays of Nova Scotia, there to take fish, although the fishing being within the bays, may be at a greater distance than three miles from the shore of the bay, as we are of opinion that the term 'headland' is used in the treaty to express the part of the land we have before mentioned, including the interiors of the bays, and the indents of the coast.

"4th Query.—By the Convention of 1818, it is agreed that American citizens should have the liberty of fishing in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and within certain defined limits, in common with British subjects; and such convention does not contain any words negating the right to navigate the Passage or Strait of Canso, and, therefore, it may be conceded that such right of navigation is not taken away by that convention; but we have now attentively considered the course of navigation to the Gulf by Cape Breton, and likewise the capacity and situation of the Passage of Canso, and of the British possessions on either side; and we are of opinion that, independently of treaty, no foreign country has the right to use or navigate the Passage of Canso; and, attending to the terms of the convention, relating to the liberty of fishing to be enjoyed by the American citizens, we are also of opinion, that that convention did not, either expressly or by necessary implication, concede any such right of using or navigating the passage in question. We are also of opinion that casting bait, to lure fish in the track of any American vessel navigating the passage, would constitute a fishing, within the negative terms of the convention.

"7th Query. The rights of fishing ceded to the citizens of the United States, and those reserved for the exclusive enjoyment of British subjects, depend altogether upon the Convention of 1818, the only existing treaty on this subject between the two countries, and the material points arising thereon have been specifically answered in our replies to the preceding queries."

"The Parliament of that Province took action upon the encroachments of the Americans, and an Address was forwarded to the British Government upon the subject of the Fisheries, as well as upon the navigation of the Gut, and the Attorney General of that Province was directed by Lord Falkland to prepare a report on the various questions referred to which he did under date 16th June, 1845. Again, on three separate occasions, prior to 1851, efforts were made to bring, under the notice of Her Majesty's Government, the desirability of exercising their right to close the Gut of Canso against foreigners. Again, in 1851, the same Parliament made a fourth report upon the subject of closing Canso, based upon the action of Mr. Stevenson, the United States Minister to England, in a letter addressed to Lord Palmerston, then Foreign Minister, in which he objects to the closing of the Strait of Canso against American fishermen upon the ground that, at the time of the Treaty of 1818, one side of it was divided by Cape Breton, and the other by Nova Scotia, and that the union of the two could not be held to vest the right in Nova Scotia. In reply to this assertion, Lord Falkland contended that Her Majesty's exclusive property and dominion in the Strait of Canso is maintainable upon the principles of international law already referred to, and which it is considered will equally apply whether the shore on either side forms part of the same Province or of different Provinces belonging to Her Majesty. The strait is very narrow, not exceeding one mile in width, and its navigation is not necessary for communication with the space beyond, which may be reached by going round the Island of Cape Breton."

"It will be seen by the authorities, hereinbefore quoted, that the opinion of Chancellor Kent, agreed with the opinion put forward by the British law officers of the Crown, and justified the conclusions at which they arrived, that 'no foreign power, independently of treaty, has any right to navigate the Passage of Canso.'

"Again, the Province of Nova Scotia, for upwards of forty years, has exercised a control over the Strait of Canso, and imposed a tonnage due upon all vessels navigating the same for the support of the lights upon her coasts, and enforced the payment of the same. Such exercise of authority has never been disputed, and Nova Scotia has by her enactments legislated both for the obstruction and the restrictions of the rights of foreigners in relation thereto. The object, on the part of the Americans, in inserting the article I of the treaty referred to, was to secure certain privileges in connection with the fisheries, to which they were not entitled by the law of nations. Those are enumerated—it covered certain rights of fishing under limitations—it gave the right to land, to dry and cure fish in certain uninhabited districts, and gave permission to enter bays, coasts, and harbors, for the purpose of shelter, and of repairing damages therein, of purchasing wood and obtaining water; but in no part of the treaty is there any reference to their right to navigate the Passage or Strait of Canso, and as they have no right by the law of nations, and obtained none by treaty, they are clearly proscribed from setting up such a claim."

"That portion of the Convention of 1818, which relates to the fishery question, is in the following words:—

"ART. I.—Whereas differences have arisen respecting the liberty claimed by the United States, for the inhabitants thereof to take, dry, and cure fish on certain coasts, bays, harbors, and creeks, of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America, it is agreed between the high contracting parties that the inhabitants of the said United States shall have, forever, in common with the subjects of His Britannic Majesty, the liberty to take fish of every kind on that part of the southern coast of Newfoundland which extends from Cape Ray to the Rameau Islands, on the western and northern coast of Newfoundland, from the said Cape Ray to the Quirpon Islands, on the shores of the Magdalen Islands, and also on the coasts, bays, harbors, and creeks, from Mount Joly, on the southern coast of Labrador, to and through the Straits of Belleisle, and thence northwardly indefinitely along the coast, without prejudice, however, to any of the exclusive rights of the Hudson's Bay Company; and that the American fishermen shall also have liberty, forever, to dry and cure fish in any of the unsettled bays, harbors, and creeks, of the southern part of the coast of Newfoundland, heretofore described, and of the coast of Labrador; but so soon as the same, or any portion thereof, shall be settled, it shall not be lawful for the said fishermen to dry or

Mr. MITCHELL.

cure fish at such portion so settled, without previous agreement for such purpose, with the inhabitants, proprietors, or possessors of the ground."

"And the United States hereby renounce, forever, any liberty heretofore enjoyed or claimed by the inhabitants thereof, to take, dry, or cure fish, on or within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbors of Her Britannic Majesty's dominions in America, not included within the above mentioned limits; provided, however, that the American fishermen shall be admitted to enter such bays or harbors, for the purpose of shelter and of repairing damages therein, of purchasing wood, and of obtaining water, and for no other purpose whatever. But they shall be under such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent their taking, drying, or curing fish therein, or in any other manner whatsoever abusing the privileges hereby reserved to them."

"It will thus be apparent that no such right was created by treaty, and, therefore, no such right exists."

"In April, 1841, Lord Falkland in dealing with this whole fishery question, stated that 'the greatest anxiety is felt by the inhabitants of this Province (Nova Scotia) that the Convention with the Americans, of 1818, should be strictly enforced,' and, while stating the efforts of that Province in fitting out armed vessels to protect her rights, suggested that additional vessels of the navy be sent to supplement their efforts; and between that time and November, 1842, two additional reports of the Committee of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, upon the same subject, were forwarded to Her Majesty's Government, when the late Earl of Derby (who was then Lord Stanley) informed the Nova Scotians, that, 'as regards the fisheries, the precautions taken by the Provincial Legislature appear adequate to the purpose, and that being practically acquiesced in by the Americans no further measures are required.'

"It would, therefore, appear that the active enforcement of the headland lines, and the exclusion from the Gut, was, in November, 1842, in the opinion of Lord Stanley, acquiesced in by the Americans, and was, as a matter of fact, actively enforced."

"The foregoing statement brings the history of this question down to the present time, and the undersigned will now resume the consideration of the despatch of my Lord Granville to Sir John Young, of the 6th instant before referred to, and the memorandum of His Excellency the Governor General of the 22nd instant thereupon."

"It has already been stated in compliance with the command of His Excellency, by the directions of Lord Granville, that the instructions to the above fishery officers should be altered, and a report embodying that policy has been submitted."

"It is, however, the duty of Council carefully to consider the despatch referred to, and as it is one of so much importance, the points in which involve such serious considerations on the part of Canada, it is given at length, It states:

"In your despatch of 4th May, you state that you have laid before your Ministers, my telegram of 30th April, the effect of which, as of a written despatch now in your possession, was to modify in one respect the Colonial Office instructions of 12th April, 1866."

"The instructions of 1866 were to the effect that the United States fishing vessels were to be excluded from bays less than 10 miles wide at the mouth, but that the forfeiture of such vessels was, if possible, only to be enforced when the fishing had taken place within three miles of shore."

"It further states: 'That the effect of my despatch, or rather of the letter to the Admiralty which is transmitted for the concurrence of your Government, was, as regarded Her Majesty's vessels, to make the direction of forfeiture so far absolute as to require that no fishing vessel whatever should be seized except within the three miles and for an offence committed within those limits.'

"It was intended to imply, though it was not expressed, that, as the only ultimate means of excluding Americans beyond these limits was not to be used, the exclusion itself was not to be enforced."

"You enclosed, in reply, a minute of your Ministers, stating that steps had been taken to prevent the seizure of American vessels beyond the three-mile limit, and you enclosed certain special instructions of 1st April, 1870, as affecting this object."

"But, in your telegram of 14th May, you inform me that those instructions conform, or are intended to conform, not to my instructions of 30th April, but to the Colonial Office paper of 12th April, 1866, which those instructions were intended to supersede."

"I am not quite sure whether you now perceive that the British and Canadian instructions are inconsistent with each other."

"The Canadian instructions are inconsistent with the spirit of which I conveyed to you, in that they still require Canadian fish-

ery officers to exclude American fishermen from bays more than ten miles in width, and you will see, on perusal, that under the head 'action,' they are inconsistent with the letter of the Admiralty instructions, by directing the fishery officers, after certain warnings, 'instantly to seize' any person fishing within 'prescribed limits,' which, read with the preceding paragraph, cannot but be taken to include bays.

"And under the head 'directions' it is implied that vessels are to be seized for coming into a Canadian bay (whether or not within three miles of shore), unless they are forced thither by violent winds or other unavoidable cause.

"These objections to the instructions as they stand are not removed by the limitation implied in the words (p. 4), 'or seize it if found within three marine miles of the coast.'

"I further observe that the decision of Her Majesty's Government not to exclude American fishermen, except within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of a bay or creek which is less than ten geographical miles in width, does not warrant their exclusion from that part of the Bay des Chaleurs which is not more than ten miles wide.

"Considering the importance of the subject, and that your attention appears to have been especially directed to the sentence respecting that part of the Bay of Chaleurs, I am somewhat surprised that these points should have escaped your notice.

"Her Majesty's Government are fully aware that no steps should be taken which should prejudice the question what are Canadian waters? or should admit the right of United States fishermen to fish within these waters, except within the limits prescribed by the Convention of 1818. But they do not abandon the hope that the question of abstract right may yet be avoided by some arrangement between Canada and the United States, or that the limits may be definitely settled by arbitration or otherwise, and while any expectation of this kind exists, they desire to avoid all occasion of dispute so far as this is possible consistently with the substantial protection of the Canadian fisheries. With these objects they think it advisable that United States fishermen should not be excluded from any waters except within three miles of shore, or in the unusual case of a bay which is less than six miles wide at its mouth, but spreads out to a greater width within.

"It will, of course, be understood and explained to the United States Government that this liberty is conceded temporarily, and without prejudice to the rights of Great Britain to fall back on her treaty rights, if the prospects of an arrangement lessens, or if the concession is found to interfere practically with the protection of the Canadian fisheries."

"It would appear that Lord Granville contemplated by the despatch to convey—

"1st. That his telegram and despatch of the 30th April, were intended to modify the Colonial Office instructions of 12th April, 1866.

"2nd. That though the instructions from the Admiralty to the officers in command of ships of war employed in the protection of the fisheries, and from the Canadian Government to their officers similarly situated, since April, 1866, were based upon Mr. Cardwell's letter of instructions of April, 1866, which prohibited foreign fishermen from entering bays less than ten miles wide at the mouth, and which instructions suggested that the forfeiture of such vessels was (if possible) only to be enforced when fishing had taken place within three miles of shore, yet notwithstanding the instructions, his Lordship now, for the first time, communicates to the Canadian Government the fact that it never was intended to be acted upon.

"That if any doubt existed about the meaning of the instructions or the possible chances of a trespasser being taken by Her Majesty's cruisers, that doubt is now removed, inasmuch as his Lordship states:—

"That it never was the intention of Her Majesty's Government that their vessels should seize a trespasser under any circumstances, and for fear of such a possibility his Lordship now removes all chance of it by stating that 'the effect of my despatch or rather of the letter of the Admiralty, which it transmitted for the concurrence of your Government was, as regards Her Majesty's vessels, to make the direction of non-forfeiture as far absolute as to require that no fishing vessel whatever should be seized, except within the three miles, and for an offence committed with those limits. It was intended to imply, though it was not expressed, that as the only ultimate means of excluding Americans beyond these limits was not to be used, the exclusion itself was not to be enforced.'

"It may be stated that as the Canadian Government, by the approved report of the undersigned, of the 20th December last,

stood pledged to Her Majesty's Government to maintain an efficient marine police to enforce the law within the three-mile limit, in the belief that Her Majesty's Government, having declined to do that which they designated as strictly a police duty—viz., to command respect to municipal law within the three mile limit—would command respect to national rights outside thereof, and to which they are, in the opinion of Council, pledged, and as Dominion vessels by the limitation of the exclusion of foreign vessels to bays from ten to six miles wide, are precluded from, in any case, seizing beyond three miles—and as British cruisers are now positively directed not to seize unless the offence is committed and the vessel actually seized within three miles of land—the reasonable presumption is that Her Majesty's cruisers are not intended to seize at all, under any circumstances; and if further proof were required than the text of the despatch referred to, the fact is easily verified on reference to the reports of the commander of Her Majesty's vessels on the station, who, though they repeatedly boarded vessels within the three-mile limit, and which had no license, there is no instance of a single seizure having been made.

"3rd. That Her Majesty's Government had narrowed the limit of exclusion from bays more than ten miles wide to bays under six miles in width, and had done this without the slightest reference to the Canadian Government, who are responsible to the people of the Dominion for the protection of their rights, and this fact was communicated to the American Secretary of State before Her Majesty's Government ascertained whether or not it was satisfactory to the Government of Canada.

"4th. That it does not appear from the said despatch that there was any special reason for deliberately limiting and restricting the rights of Her Britannic Majesty's subjects in British America, nor that the Government of Canada was consulted thereon, nor indeed does it seem to have ever been considered necessary in the changes that have been resolved upon during the current year.

"5th. 'That Her Majesty's Government states that they are fully aware that no steps should be taken which should prejudice the question 'which are Canadian waters?' or should admit the right of United States fishermen to fish within these waters, except within the limits prescribed by the Convention of 1818.' Her Majesty's Government have virtually done this act already, which they profess to disavow. In 1854 we were in active possession of the three miles limit—of the bays 10 miles wide—of the headland line of coast in which our rights were reinforced and practically recognised,—and it appears much like 'prejudging the question,' and to the disadvantage of British subjects too—for Her Majesty's Government, pending the settlement of those questions, to waive for the time all but the first of the positions, and so far as the acts of her own cruisers and their instructions to them are concerned, probably even that also. It is practically abandoning to United States fishermen privileges which they had not by the Treaty of 1818, when we allow them to fish in the Bay of Chaleurs, and on all of the best and most valuable fishing grounds which we possessed within headland lines. No such privilege was conceded to them by the Treaty of 1818, nor were they permitted to enjoy them up to 1854, yet our exclusive rights in them are for the present suspended; and in the despatch which thus deprives us of those rights, we are informed that Her Majesty's Government are aware 'that no step should be taken which should prejudice the question.'

"The undersigned would further observe that Mr. Boutwell, the Secretary of the Treasury Department at Washington, in his circular to the United States Customs Officers, dated 16th of May last, acting on the concession of the three mile limit so recently made, also prejudices the question, inasmuch as he says 'That the authorities of the Dominion of Canada have terminated the system of granting fishing licenses to foreign vessels, under which they have heretofore been permitted to fish within the maritime jurisdiction of the said Dominion—that is to say, within three marine miles of the shores thereof.'

"Here is a clear attempt at limitation of our treaty rights of 1818, 'by which Americans renounced the right to fish not only within three miles of the coasts, but of the bays, creeks, or harbors of His Britannic Majesty's Dominions in America,' while Mr. Boutwell's circular ignores that portion of the right which gives us jurisdiction over bays, creeks, or harbors and states our jurisdiction to be only three miles from the shore.

"6. 'The despatch further remarks, that they (Her Majesty's Government) do not abandon the hope that the question of abstract right may yet be avoided by some arrangement between Canada and the United States, or that the limits may be definitely settled by arbitration or otherwise, and while any expectation of

this kind exists, they desire to avoid all occasion of dispute, so far as this is possible consistently with the substantial protection of the Canadian fisheries.'

"In this paragraph there are two probabilities referred to—

"1st. The probability of an arrangement (trade arrangement it is presumed) with the United States;

"2nd. The probability of the limits being fixed by arbitration or otherwise.

"In reference to the first of these it would have been much more satisfactory to the Government of Canada if the ground upon which Her Majesty's Government have founded the hope thus expressed, had been stated. Such hope, entertained by Her Majesty's Ministers, has been held since 1865; it was entertained by Her Majesty's Government when Lord Clarendon wrote the despatch of 1866, which so ably indicated the position of British subjects in relation to these fisheries. Mr. Cardwell expressed a confident belief upon this subject when he induced Canada to adopt his licensing system as a measure of expediency for one year. His Grace of Buckingham and Chandos entertained the same hope, and now My Lord Granville, though five years have elapsed since notice of abolition, does not seem yet to have abandoned the 'hope that some arrangements may be secured.'

"The Canadian Government regret that they cannot see either in the past, or in the immediate future, the same ground for believing that a satisfactory arrangement will be arrived at. On the contrary, the chances of a satisfactory arrangement are not so good as they seemed in 1866 and 1867, and that, so far from there being anything in the course taken by the United States to warrant the expectation of a fair trade policy being adopted by them, everything indicates the contrary result, and nothing tends more to encourage them in such a course than the spirit of concession towards them, which has characterised the fishery policy of the last five years. In 1866 they, after a year's notice, voluntarily abandoned the Reciprocity Treaty, notwithstanding our efforts, in the fall of 1865, to prevent that result. The licensing arrangement pressed upon us in the interests of Her Majesty's Government, and because of their hope of a trade arrangement gave to foreigners the principal thing that they cared for, which we had to give. By the liberal policy of England, they had already practically the free admission to our coasting trade, as between Province and Province—the privilege of navigating our rivers and canals—the advantages of registry for their shipping in our ports—almost everything in fact—that we had to give, that they desired except the enjoyment of our valuable fisheries, and this the despatch of My Lord Granville has practically permitted them the use of. How have our advances been met by the Americans in the last few years? The advantages which, through the liberal policy of the Empire, they have enjoyed in Canada have been responded to by most prohibitory tariffs—their canals closed against us—their coasting trade confined to themselves, and their refusal to reciprocate the liberal policy of Britain in reference to the Registration of Shipping. 'Tis true that a resolution of Congress was passed in 1869 which induced many to believe that they had changed their policy, but this idea was much shaken after our experiences of that year. Canada soon discovered that the resolution referred to either meant nothing, or such terms as she could not accept. The utterances of Mr. Schenck, in referring to the resolution which induced the Government of Canada for a time to believe that a change of sentiment had been created in the public mind of the United States, are given in the *Congressional Globe* of the 3rd March, 1869.

"It states that Mr. Schenck was Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, a position analogous to that occupied by Mr. Morrill in the Conferences of 1866. In reply to a question put by Mr. Pike, when the resolution was reported to the House of Representatives, Mr. Schenck said: 'I do not believe we ought to enter into any relations of reciprocity with the British Provinces, either through negotiating with the Imperial Government of Great Britain or by direct treaty with the Provinces themselves, if that were possible. I believe the people of the British Provinces should be treated like all other foreigners, and made to pay the same duties on articles they export into our country that other foreigners are required to pay on similar articles.' He added: 'I am not authorised to speak for the rest of the members of the committee, but I am not aware of any difference of opinion between any of them and myself on that subject. But Mr. Schenck expressed himself in favor of commercial treaties 'in regard to the fisheries on the coasts of these Provinces, and in relation to the free navigation of the St. Lawrence River from its source to the sea.' In the course of this debate not a single member expressed himself in favor of reciprocity.

Mr. MITCHELL,

"Thus upon the *pro forma* submission of a resolution passed by Congress denying the right of the Executive Government of the United States to make treaties or conventions with foreign governments touching 'import duties,' the House assents to confining the scope of the resolution, although professing to renew negotiations regarding commercial intercourse,' to securing to Americans 'the rights claimed by them to the fisheries,' and 'in relation to the free navigation of St. Lawrence.' With a committee, through whose hands our proposition must be sifted, already committed to a circumscribed form of 'commercial intercourse' and avowedly hostile to any relations of reciprocity,—with a House of Representatives which (although supposed to contain some few members at least favorable to mutual trade relations somewhat less restrictive than they are) silently and safely 'recommends to the President' to negotiate for securing certain 'rights' claimed by the United States citizens,—and with an Executive which proclaims beforehand hostility to any reciprocal engagement,—what concessions can we hope to obtain as equivalents for the privileges we have to offer? Even these privileges of fishing and navigation which we might concede—in return for what?—must be first reduced, from an American point of view, to the extent of the 'rights' asserted in this resolution. With such enunciations before us, and the proceedings of the delegation at Washington, in 1866, still fresh in our memory, it is difficult to discover any ground for hoping that new trade arrangements can be secured on equitable terms, in pursuance of the resolution of Congress.'

"But this matter may, for the present, be looked upon as finally postponed, from the official announcement of the President of the United States in his last inaugural message in the following words:—

"The question of renewing a treaty for reciprocal trade between the United States and the British Provinces on this continent, has not been favorably considered by the administration. The advantage of such a treaty would be wholly in favor of the British producer, except possibly a few engaged in the trade between the two sections. No citizen of the United States would be benefited by the reciprocity. Our internal taxation would prove a protection to the British producer, almost equal to the protection which our manufacturers now receive from the tariff. Some arrangements, however, for the regulation of commercial intercourse between the United States and the Dominion of Canada may be desirable.'

"On the face of such authority to the contrary, and in the absence of the grounds on which My Lord Granville rests his hopes of an arrangement, the undersigned cannot participate in the belief that the United States are prepared to offer any terms that Canada will accept. It is true, that the United States intimated a desire to admit coal, salt, lumber, and fish free of duty, provided we would do the same, and give them, besides, the free use of our fisheries, our River St. Lawrence, and our canals, and also consent to deepen the latter. Canada feels no imperative necessity, as she certainly has no desire, to enter into any such one-sided arrangement. When we do make an arrangement it must be on equal and fair terms, or it will not be made at all, and must be such an one as obtains for our people the same rights and reciprocity in trade, registry of shipping, and coasting that the Americans now have from us, and in the meantime, until public opinion so changes in America, as to bring about these results, Canada can afford to wait.

"This Government, prior to the meeting of the last Parliament, ceased to entertain the hopes expressed by My Lord Granville, and felt it to be their duty to deal with the great resources of this country quite irrespective of what might or might not be hoped for from the United States. This was clearly indicated in a report of the undersigned of the 11th December last, approved by Council in dealing with a despatch of My Lord Granville, covering two memoranda from the Board of Trade upon the subject of the colonial coasting trade, in which, while regretting the necessity of declining to act upon the suggestions of Her Majesty's Government by throwing open our coasting trade to the United States as Great Britain had done, while they continued to close theirs against us, the subject was there entered into at length, and a policy outlined which has met with the approval of Parliament and the public sentiment of this country.

"The following is an extract from such report:

"The Board of Trade in their memorandum state that it is to be hoped that the Legislature and Governments of the colonies will be disposed to co-operate with Her Majesty's Government in their attempt to secure the benefits of free navigation and cheap freights for Her Majesty's subjects, throughout the British Empire, and to strengthen their hands in their efforts to obtain from

foreign countries for the shipping of the United Kingdom and of the British colonies a reciprocal liberality of treatment.

"The undersigned is of opinion, as twenty years have now elapsed since the British Government extended to the shipping of the United States, in common with the shipping of all other foreign countries, the privilege of participating in their carrying trade throughout the British dominions on equal terms with British ships (with the exception of the local coasting trade in each colony), and as the recent Act first herein quoted has shifted the responsibility of legislating upon or dealing with the question of colonial coasting trade from the Imperial to the Colonial authorities, and as the liberal treatment of American shipping by the British Government has produced no corresponding reciprocity of sentiment on this subject on the part of the United States Government, that the time has arrived when it becomes our duty to define a policy which should be pursued towards our neighbors from the standpoint of Canadian interests, and which should apply, not alone to the coasting trade, but to all matters affecting navigation and the trade generally.

"The experience of the twenty years has, in the opinion of the undersigned, proved to the people of Canada, that concessions in matters of trade, navigation, and shipping, voluntarily conceded by us, have not been reciprocated in by the Government of the United States, and indeed, have not always been appreciated, nor the value of them realised.

"The United States Government put an end in 1865, after an existence of eleven years, to the Reciprocity Treaty, which was of such great value as well to them as to the several British American Provinces—they refused to renew or reconstruct it, except on terms which were not to be defended in the interests of our trade; and though the undersigned, in common with a considerable portion of the public of Canada, was led to believe from the utterances of their press and commercial centres of trade for the last two years, as well as the expressed opinions of some of their leading public men, that public sentiment was changing in favor of 'new arrangements,' whereby trade relations would be again re-established on principles of reciprocal free trade;—these expectations have been dispelled, and the existence of such opinions to any great extent in the Cabinet of the United States have been negated by the Message of the President, in which he distinctly states, 'that the renewal of the treaty with us has not been favorably considered by the Administration;' while he expresses a belief 'that the advantages of such a treaty are wholly in favor of the British Provinces, except possibly, a few engaged in the trade between the two sections,' he distinctly states that 'no citizen of the United States would be benefited by reciprocity,' and yet gives expression to the opinion that some arrangements for the regulation of commercial intercourse may be desirable, and the recent action of Congress would tend to confirm the belief that no reciprocal arrangement of a satisfactory character can now be obtained.

"The undersigned would observe that there are numerous arguments which can be adduced from an American point of view in favor of the position assumed by their chief magistrate against the renewal of the treaty, and that while England has pursued a most liberal course towards foreign nations in relation to trade and navigation, and has offered the fullest opportunities for foreign competition, the argument which has done much to remove objections to such a policy in Canada, has been the belief, repeatedly expressed by English statesmen, that those foreign countries which enjoyed the benefits of that liberal policy, and that free trade would in time reciprocate; and such expectations have not been without their results in Europe. In America, however, no such results have followed the liberality of England, although a generation of our people have nearly passed away; and indeed national events have tended to make the adoption of such a policy on the part of the United States much more difficult, and while we go on making concessions, permitting them to have privileges, and giving them facilities which they decline to reciprocate, while in fact they possess the right of registry for their ships in our ports, and have practically enjoyed our coasting trade, and at the same time refused us similar privileges—while they have had the benefit of our canals and rivers, without corresponding concessions on their part—they have compelled our ships to pay a war tax of thirty cents gold per ton and other customs fees, without any such corresponding charges in our ports upon their ships (notwithstanding the 173rd section of the Imperial Act, 16 and 17 Victoria, cap. 107, to which I have referred in the Minute of Council annexed—we have not retaliated). Our fisheries, too, they have had opened to them on the most liberal terms, while British-caught fish is met with a duty which has closed their country as a market for our fishermen, and indeed they have

made their tariff in general almost prohibitory, and while their legislation tends towards exclusion, the construction they put upon their tariff laws, and their execution of them, bear most heavily upon our people. Under these circumstances, the undersigned regrets that he should, in viewing the past, arrive at conclusions different from those which seem to be entertained by the board of trade, viz., that a continuance of the policy of concession would, with that foreign nation in whose trade we are chiefly interested, lead to the result hoped for, and secure a 'reciprocal liberality of treatment'; and he thinks it would be unwise to force it on them unasked at the present time. He is of opinion that the true policy of the Canadian Government at present should be to retain all the privileges which it now possesses, until fresh negotiations take place for new trade relations between Canada and the United States, when the opening of the whole coasting trade of the Dominion to United States shipping can be included in any arrangements which may be made, if the Canadian Government should then be of opinion that it would be advisable and in the interests of Canada to do so.

"A copy of the report to Council made by the undersigned on the 2nd April, 1860, hereinbefore referred to, on the subject of tonnage duties and custom house fees, and other restrictions imposed on British vessels entering the ports of the United States, as compared with the charges and restrictions imposed on American vessels entering Canadian ports, and as to the advantages which American vessels have in the United States as compared with British vessels, is herewith attached, to which the undersigned begs to draw attention.'

"The active protection of our fisheries was the first step in our National Policy—"

Will the hon. gentleman observe that I initiated the National Policy, and I am sorry it has come to be a protective policy,—

"—as viewed from a colonial standpoint—and has since been followed up by legislation which has imposed certain charges upon shipping and imposts upon articles of trade. It should, however, be clearly understood that these restrictions and charges we are prepared to remove whenever the United States are disposed to give us reciprocal treatment. Till then, the public sentiment of the country calls for vigorous action at the hands of the Canadian Government, and demands that this, the greatest and largest question of them all, and one which our neighbors most appreciate, shall be dealt with with spirit and vigor, and form part of an important National Policy—Council should, therefore, ask of Her Majesty's Government that which we feel confident the Empire will not refuse us, viz.: 'That our rights in the fisheries may be maintained and enforced as they were prior to 1854.'

"The second probability which I noticed, as referred to in the despatch of Lord Granville, viz., 'His hope that the limits may be definitely settled by arbitration or otherwise,' it would be pleasing to see realised in a satisfactory manner. If, however, this is to be attained, it will not be by pursuing the policy which has characterised the treatment of the fishery question on the part of Her Majesty's Government.

"In 1866, Canada reluctantly consented to the licensing policy for one year;—Nova Scotia was forced into it against her will, on the faith of what cannot be viewed otherwise than a condition or a pledge that it was only for one year; New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island assented for the same reasons as Canada, and because she led the way in this policy.

"In 1867, the Council of Canada protested against its continuance, as it also did in 1868-69, when it further asked that the proposition so favorably entertained by Lord Clarendon, for a Joint Commission to settle the disputed points be again urged upon the consideration of the United States Government. To these propositions the Council have, as yet, received no reply, nor are they aware whether the proposals for a Joint Conference, have ever been communicated to the American Government, or, if so, with what result?

"The undersigned cannot but feel that this treatment of an important and vital question is not such as Canada had a right to expect, nor will its people be satisfied with such a result.

"As part of the Empire, Canada is entitled to demand that her rights should be preserved intact, and at least it cannot be considered that Council will have performed its duties if we silently permit ourselves to be divested of them by piecemeal, as is the case with our fishery interest; and the people consider that their valuable fisheries are a trust incident to Canada, and involve interests which Her Majesty holds for the benefit of her

loyal subjects, and which should not be abandoned nor their protection neglected.

The Government of Canada, therefore, now ask of Her Majesty's Ministers that they at once require of the United States the appointment of a Joint Commission, to settle the matters in dispute, and, in the meantime, that they should be requested to give such instructions to Her Britannic Majesty's officers on the North American stations as will secure:

"1st.—The exclusion of all foreigners from fishing within our bays, from which they are excluded by the Treaty of 1818, as interpreted by Her Majesty's Government.

"2nd.—The exclusion of all foreigners from fishing within the limits of three miles from headland to headland, according to the British interpretation of said treaty.

"3rd.—The exclusion of all foreign vessels from the use of the Gut of Canso.

"It is further advised that Her Majesty's Government be requested to make no concessions nor terms limiting the privileges to which we are entitled as British American subjects of Her Majesty, and more especially those which were secured to us by the Treaty of 1818, without first submitting them for the consideration of, and obtaining the approval of the Government of Canada thereto.

"The people of Canada have ever been loyal and true in their maintenance of the interests of the Empire, and feel deeply anything that would impair its material interests or create dissatisfaction amongst its population; and the undersigned cannot but express his convictions that the policy recently pursued in reference to the fishery question is not such as to meet the approbation of the people of Canada, and he would earnestly recommend that a strong remonstrance be submitted to Her Majesty's Government upon the subject.

"Respectfully submitted.

"P. MITCHELL,

"Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

"DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES,
"OTTAWA, 4th July, 1870."

Now, Sir, in the record which I have read of concessions yielded year after year by Her Majesty's Government, I think my hon. friend will fail to perceive that any strong ground has been taken or any material support given, in the interest of Canada, such as he spoke of in his introductory remarks on Tuesday last. Sir, I think it is a record which is a discredit to Great Britain—to have the interests of a great colony, the greatest in the Empire, and one she is proud of, frittered away by piecemeal, as I have said. It is a record of concessions which have been made step by step without even consulting the people who are interested in them. I think the record of the last thirty years, at least the last twenty years, is a disgrace to the British Empire and the British Government. In saying what I do, I do not intend to cast any reflections on the action of my hon. friend and his colleagues at Washington. He has very patriotically and very magnanimously taken the blame for the shortcomings in this treaty on himself. It is natural for him to do that in such cases; but I know him too well, I know the facts too well, and I have had too much experience in dealing with the fisheries, not to know that what he did there he did under pressure. Although he spoke of the largest power in the world being behind him, as a matter of fact that power was not there. It was there in name, but not in power; and if there has been an act since the formation of this Dominion which has tended to loosen the bonds between Canada and the Empire, if there has been an act which will tend to produce dissatisfaction and to promote distrust in the British Empire with reference to the affairs of Canada, it is this last act of hers in abandoning us and taking away our fisheries, in the face of the fact, as I have shown from the despatches I have read, that she stood pledged to maintain the interests of Canada as they stood when they were suspended in 1854. When the treaty lapsed by the act of the United States, where was the British Government? Read Sir Edward Cardwell's, Lord Kimberley's and the Earl of Aberdeen's despatches.

Mr. MITCHELL.

The only man among the whole of them who has fairly stood by us was the Earl of Clarendon. Yet everyone of them, one after another, assured us that England intended to stand by us in maintaining the exclusive rights which the British Government claimed and enforced up to 1854; and, Sir, everyone of them save Lord Clarendon went back on his record, and left us to see our rights taken away from us by piecemeal and under false pretences. That is the position of the British Government towards Canada for the last twenty years—and I speak of it with regret, for I have ever been as loyal a subject as any that stands in the Dominion of Canada. I have been loyal, in fact I have been more, I have been also loyal in sentiment, but the sentiment is knocked out of me, and I fear that a great many others feel as I do; and when we see the interests of Canada frittered away as they have been in this case, I fear that any desire to create a more permanent loyalty will ooze out of us, and we will become a dissatisfied people. They talk about the federation of the Empire—the veriest rot that ever was spoken. What interest have we in common with the other side of the Atlantic? We owe to England our existence as a semi-nation, it is true; we owe to her our language and our laws, and we are proud of both; but while England has been one of the greatest colonising nations of the world, there is no nation has worse administered her colonies. Take the case of Cape Colony, a record of years of mismanagement, misrule and misgovernment. Look at her treatment of us in regard to the boundary of Maine, as well as the Oregon boundary, in each of which cases an immense tract of territory was abandoned, either by ignorance or imbecility, to the United States; and again look at the St. Juan affair, they are all, as our Behrings Sea interests will I fear be, a complete give away, as our fishery rights, in my opinion, have been. In future we will have to look to ourselves to protect our interests, and want no more diplomatic interference by such men as Chamberlain and Sir Sackville West. Indeed what would Canada have been in the past without the administrative powers of the Canadians themselves?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Without the rebellion?

Mr. MITCHELL. Look at the record in this case. I, who was intimately connected with the whole affair and felt deeply the necessity of standing up for our rights; I, who spent day after day, and week after week, pressing these claims on the British Government and keeping them up to the mark, found them always receding at the first opportunity—and now everything is gone. My hon. friend speaks of the advantages this treaty has given us; he speaks of the limit of space which is described by the points of the treaty; he speaks about the delimitations which are named in the treaty. Sir, let any man take up a map—and I regret that my hon. friend should have made the excuse he did about not producing a map—for it was his duty to produce one. His excuse is, that there is a provision made for the appointment of a commission for the delimitation on the treaty. True, there is; that is the official delimitation. But it was the duty of the Cabinet to have prepared a map and to have it submitted to Parliament, so that we could appreciate and understand these advantages my hon. friend has so eloquently described, but which I cannot see. I may tell my hon. friend that, looking to the contentions of Canada and England, as propounded in 1818, and maintained up to 1854, when they were suspended for twelve years under the treaty of Lord Elgin, after which they were urged to be enforced again and recognised by the British Government from that time out, until they were again suspended in 1871 by a new treaty. I say if a map based on those contentions, was taken from headland to headland, and those exclusive rights of the bays delineated upon it, this House would see what the difference is between the delimitation in that map

and the concessions given up to the Americans. If I can understand the meaning of the statements in the great mass of despatches which I have had to wade through, in order to define how we have endeavored to maintain the interests of Canada, I should say that the men who wrote them were bound in honor to have stood by Canada and enforced those rights. If they had done so, we would have stood to-day with our headland system maintained and our rights to bays recognised—because all that was wanted was a little firmness some twenty years ago—and we would not be in the position of having to beg for reciprocity. About the inshore fisheries, it was never disputed that we had an absolute right to them, and yet my hon. friend comes here with his eloquent tongue and persuades us—he knows he can do anything in this country, for he can do what none of us can do, he can control the First Minister, as he saved him in the contest of a year ago—he comes with his eloquent tongue and persuades us that in this delimitation, which the treaty provides for, we have obtained a great concession. Sir, we have abandoned everything, and while we have done that, my hon. friend has forgotten one thing. Did he know there were two ends to the shores of America on the Atlantic? Where is the provision in the treaty to give the Canadians the same rights in the Delaware and Chesapeake, in Boston Bay, and Narraganset, and Albermarle, and from the Cape of Florida past the mouth of the Mississippi, that they have captured from us? Do we find that the interpretation which they set upon their shores, bays, and coasts is the same as they ask us to set upon ours? Have they not rights which they claim from headland to headland, and which are enforced even among themselves, and from which we are excluded? Where is our right to enter their bays? It is true it is the separate states own them there, but that does not alter the law or right on the question. Where has my hon. friend provided in the treaty that we should have the use of those bays to the south of where our boundary terminates? Why have we not secured the same privileges in the American bays, straits, and headlands, that they demand in ours. There is no such provision in the treaty. Let a Canadian fisherman go down to Delaware and Boston, or the Sound, or go down amongst their oyster bays and attempt to fish, and he will soon find himself in prison. Where is the withdrawal of the outrageous American pretension in reference to Behrings Sea, and why was the settlement of that outrageous claim omitted from the treaty? Did my hon. friend forget all about these important questions? I am sure not. But my hon. friend found himself in Washington with instructions in Mr. Chamberlain's hands to make a treaty, and as to what that treaty should be neither Chamberlain nor the British Government nor Sir Lionel Sackville West cared, and the only man who did care was my hon. friend Sir Charles Tupper, and he had to obey his instructions as a servant of the British Government and representing their interests. He was handicapped, weighted down and overborne by the influence of that greatest Empire of the world, of whose power boasted. I feel I have taken up too much of the time of the House to-night, but I felt it to be my duty, even at the risk of wearying the House, to place upon record the history of this fishery question, not for the purpose of *éclat* to myself, but as a duty I owe the country, that we may be able to trace in some available way the history of the iniquitous manner in which the British Government has treated this colony of ours. I am as loyal a subject as any man, and I hope to remain so, but I will remind the House that the time is fast coming when, if the British Government continues to allow our interests to be frittered away in this way, she will find the colony itself frittered away before long. It is as well some plain speaking should be heard. I do not wish to be understood to express the opinion that

I desire it. I should regret it notwithstanding this treatment, and while I have heretofore felt proud of belonging to a colony of England, Canada cannot and will not always remain a colony, and I should not be surprised to find that this treaty will promote such change. Children do not always remain in their father's house, and we are gradually growing into the position when the interests of Canada demand we should branch out for ourselves. I do not desire to see this for some time to come, but a few more cases like this and I would not give much for the power of England in this colony of Canada. There are a great many points I wanted to talk upon, but I have taken up so much time in submitting the proof of these matters in order to sustain my contention, that I think it would be trespassing too much on the time of Parliament for me to continue. I will, therefore, not take up the time of the House any longer in discussing this painful matter. I felt I had a duty to perform, and I only regret that I have performed it so inefficiently. Of course this treaty will pass; there is no doubt about that, but I disapprove of it entirely, as I think the Americans have got everything and we have got nothing. I speak with knowledge of the subject when I say that we have got nothing. The delimitations that are spoken of are simply allowing us to retain an infinitesimal part of what Britain has over and over again declared we had an absolute right to, and has for nearly forty years enforced before the treaty put them in obedience. Our rights revived when that treaty ceased, and what did we find? We found that taken from us by the Commission which sat under the authority of the British Crown. I regret very much that England should have so much humiliated herself before her children here, and it is a humiliation, and I regret that it should be done by a nation which professes to have kept faith, especially with her colonies. I regret that I have to speak as I am now speaking of England, but I say this as a duty to my country, Canada, as a duty to myself, and as a duty to this House.

Mr. FOSTER. After the long discussion which we have had on this subject and the exhaustive and able speeches which have been made on this side of the House by the mover of the Bill and the Minister of Justice and other gentlemen who have spoken, I should not have considered it necessary to have said one word on this question had it not been that for two years past I have been charged, in my position as Minister of the Department of Marine, with the duty of carrying on the protective service and looking after the rights of Canada as far as her fisheries are concerned. Occupying that position, I feel that, before the debate closes, I will have to ask the indulgence of the House for a brief time while I make a few remarks. Certainly this debate has not lacked in variety. We have had all phases of opinion expressed by the hon. gentlemen on the other side. I think an attentive observer of this debate must have been struck with three things in this particular. First, the large amount of effort which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have directed to make a case against the Government; second, the small amount of effort which has been directed towards the discussion of the treaty itself, which is at the present time before the House, and as to whether or not it would be better in the interests of Canada and in the interests of the Empire, that the treaty should be now adopted; and, in the third place, the, I must say, disingenuous arguments and assertions which have been made with a view to discredit the Government and to discredit the treaty. We have had every phase of assertion and of argument, and all varieties of opinion. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island said we would occupy a proud and happy position if we had given up our position and had made these concessions two years ago. My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones), declares in

equally strong terms, that the Minister of Finance, who sat as commissioner at Washington, should have held on to all these matters and would have got further concessions if not now, at some future time. Some other hon. gentlemen have taken the Government to task because bait has been allowed to United States fishermen under this treaty. Other hon. gentlemen have taken the opposite side in regard to that matter. So we have had almost as great a variety of opinions as there have been persons who have spoken, or have made their opinions known, outside or inside of this House. Without criticising the individual opinions of hon. members, if the House will kindly bear with me, I will state the positions which have been taken in the main against the Government. The first was that the Government wasted a valuable opportunity in delaying to take advantage of what they said was a favorable condition of public sentiment in the United States, to make arrangements for the continuation of the treaty some two or three years before it was denounced. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island was especially strong in his indictment of the Government on that question. In view of the facts of the case, I believe I can challenge the sentiment of the House and the country for the negative of that position. From 1878, when the Halifax Award was made public, until the time of the Fisheries Treaty, I contend that no body of public opinion in the United States, either congressional, executive, or general, warranted the assumption that a proposition made to the United States Government for a continuation of the Washington Treaty would have met with a fair reception. Where did my hon. friend find that favorable sentiment in the opinion of that country during the period from 1877 to 1885? Where can he find any resolution of Congress or any utterances of their public men, or any action of the Senate or of the House of Representatives in that direction? He cannot put his finger upon one prominent expression of opinion in the public press, or amongst the public men, or in the Congress or from the Executive of the United States, which favors the idea that there was a favorable opportunity for the continuation of the Washington Treaty, and the very first moment it was possible to give notice to terminate the Treaty of Washington, that very moment it was done by Congress, and on the 3rd March, 1883, that resolution passed unanimously. It had previously been brought before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and had passed unanimously. It had passed the Senate. It went to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the House of Representatives, and this is what was stated by Chairman W. Rice, as instructed by the committee, and who gave these reasons:

"So that the matter stands by itself, or else we enter upon another term, for which England may demand ample payment from the United States, according to the enormous and unjust award of the Halifax commission for privileges which nobody in the United States, who has investigated the subject, considers worth keeping. The Senate's Committee on Foreign Affairs unanimously reported this resolution. It was adopted by the Senate without an objection; and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House, having fully examined the matter, unanimously instructed me to move the adoption of the resolution by the House, which I now do under that instruction. With this explanation, I trust that no objection will be made to the consideration of the resolution, which, I am very sure, I can satisfy everybody ought to be adopted to avoid liability to further payment of an extortionate sum to Great Britain for that which is not considered worth anything to us, by parties who are interested in the matter, and who have examined into it."

Well, Sir, the President's message came shortly after that, on the 4th December, 1883, that great message that my friend has characterized as being the outstretched hand, the message in which the President suggested that a commission should be appointed. What kind of a commission was that? It was not a mixed commission, it was not a joint commission; the President did not so propose. He says:

"That Congress create a commission to consider the general question of our rights in the fisheries, and the means of opening to our citizens,
Mr. FOSTER.

on just and enduring conditions, the richly stocked fishing waters and sealing grounds of British North America."

That was not a joint commission to which members were to be invited from the British Government, or from Canada as being represented upon it. It was simply a suggestion of the President that a commission of their own country, to enquire into their own rights, should be granted. That message was sent to Congress, and Congress did not even notice the suggestion in the message. So far from there being a favorable opinion toward the continuation of that treaty, when it was brought to their attention by their executive head, Congress did not even give it the courtesy of a consideration. So, Sir, at the very earliest possible moment, the treaty was denounced, and denounced in the way I have stated. Where does my hon. friend find a favorable sentiment, with the Executive opposed to it, with the House of Representatives and Senate opposed to the continuation of the treaty, with no public sentiment in the country, so far as expression went, in its favor, and with the fishery interest strongly against it. My hon. friend would have had this Government, in the face of all that opposition, make a proposition for the continuation of a treaty which the whole people, through their Congress and their representatives, had denounced, and declared that the privileges contained in it were not worth having, and they did not want them. So, I think, my friend's proposition, that the Government was guilty of delay, and lost the favorable opportunity for having arrangements made for the continuance of that treaty before it was denounced, falls to the ground, and I think this case in that respect is not proven. The next proposition that was taken by my hon. friend is this: That the policy of the Government was fickle and contradictory. He says, that at one period there was the giving away of the fisheries to the United States for six months; the next, there was a strong and almost tyrannical enforcement of protection in the jurisdiction of Canadian waters; then, again, there was a year of less strong enforcement, and afterwards the concession and giving away; and he tried to draw an inference from that, and asserted that the policy of the Government was a fickle and inconstant policy, and that it had no consistency in it. What is the test by which we are to judge of the policy of a Government, the policy of a party? It is two-fold. It is by the motive which underlies it, in the first place; and it is, secondly, by the methods by which that underlying principle is carried out. What was the policy of the Government with reference to the fisheries? Sir, the policy of the Government was to maintain the fisheries of Canada for the advantage of the people of Canada, by what was preferable, a mutual and amicable arrangement made between the two parties; or, failing in that, by a strict and prudent recognition of, and enforcement of, the rights of Canada in the premises. That, I think, may be stated as the policy of the Government, as the motive which underlay the policy of the Government; and if that be taken as true, I hold that the policy of the Government was thoroughly consistent on that point. How were these fisheries to be maintained for the country? They were to be maintained, first, if possible, by having an amicable, mutual arrangement between the two countries interested, by which Canada's fisheries could inure to her own advantage and to the enjoyment of her own people. In order to obtain that, the Government of the country, at the first favorable opportunity, when there was a change of Administration, when the Administration that succeeded the Republican Administration showed that it was more favorable, to open negotiations; and so the proposition was made and acceded to, that a period of six months should be given United States fishermen for the enjoyment of our fisheries, and that in return a commission should be recommended by the President to Congress. Was it not worth that trial? Was not the prospect of a commission, and the settlement of this question by a commission, in an

amicable way, worth the while of holding out the olive branch, worth the while of holding out a friendly suggestion, that, instead of interrupting the operations of the fishermen in the middle of the season, thereby causing certain irritation, and perhaps putting off what was wished for by the whole country, a commission representing both countries should sit down together and come to a mutually amicable arrangement which should be for the advantage of both countries? I say it was worth the while to give that advantage, to make that proposition, for the sake of the prospective gain. Well, Sir, they enjoyed half a season's fishing, and the President, true to his promise, the Executive, true to their undertaking, sent down to Congress the suggestion for a commission, and the Congress went against that. The proposition was not acceded to; by a vote of 30 to 15 in the Senate, the proposition was negatived, and the Senate gave its voice that no commission should be appointed to settle this question. Now, then, my hon. friend says that the policy of this Government was fickle, because the Government changed from the action which they had taken in allowing free fishing in our waters for half a season, in order to gain thereby a commission to settle the question, because they changed that, and introduced a policy of a prudent but strict enforcement of the rights of Canada. What else could be done, consistent with the underlying principle of Canada's policy, when the means at first adopted in order to bring about an amicable arrangement, had failed, and Congress and the Senate had stated that they were against a commission, that there was no prospect of its appointment at that time? Sir, it then became a duty to carry out the policy of the Government, to protect the fisheries of Canada, and to protect the rights of Canadians, so far as their territorial waters were concerned; and that course was adopted. In the years 1886 and 1887, it was carried out, consistently carried out, and my hon. friend is quite wrong in stating that the policy was carried out differently in 1886 and 1887. The very same instructions that were sent out in 1886 were continued in 1887; the very same policy of protection, and the very same form of protection was carried out in all its important features. And it is not true to say that there was any important material change in carrying out the protective service with respect to the fisheries in 1886-87. Well, Sir, that had its effect. I believe that both the holding out of the offer of a proposition respecting the fisheries in 1885, and the prudent, strict enforcement of the rights of Canada in 1886 and 1887, both had their operation and their effect and both contributed towards the proposition for the commission which was ultimately obtained, and the settlement which has resulted therefrom. I believe that both of those lines contribute to the success which has ultimately accrued. So much then for the fickleness and inconsistency of the policy. My hon. friend and others on that side of the House with him have said: Well, yes, your construction and interpretation of that treaty was all right; we agree with it. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) said: I have read over the Minutes of Council, based upon the reports of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the Minister of Justice, and I agree with everything that is contended for in those reports. He will correct me if I have misstated his position. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) took occasion in this House, not many days ago, to declare that he agreed with every word, with every contention embodied in those Minutes in Council. He will correct me if I have misstated his position.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is correct so far as the law is concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. That is so far as the interpretation and construction put upon the law and put upon what grows out of that, so far as the laws were concerned in those Mi-

minutes of Council, based on reports made by myself and the Minister of Justice, the hon. gentlemen as co-leaders of their party and as strong men in their party say that they agree with every word, with every construction, with every position taken.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. FOSTER. They agree with the construction. What was the construction? The construction was, in the first place, that the Treaty of 1818 was mutually binding. They agreed with that construction. In the second place, the contention was that we had a right to pass our own laws and to carry out the decisions of our own tribunals with respect to the fisheries. They agreed with that. Again, the contention was made that we had a right to refuse commercial privileges to the United States fishing vessels. They agreed with that. Again the contention was that we had a right to refuse the purchase of bait by American fishing vessels. They agreed with that. Again our contention was that we had a right to construe and carry out our own customs laws with respect to foreign fishing vessels, United States or others. Those were the constructions, those were the contentions, and those hon. gentlemen say they agree with those contentions to the letter. Then why do they find fault with the Government? Is the hon. gentleman in this position: that he ardently professes a creed but that he stolidly refuses to practice it, that he is most enthusiastically in favor of a law, but is most stubbornly and absolutely against the enforcement of that law? If those contentions were correct, and if this Government carried out those contentions strictly, why do they find fault with the Government so far as that was concerned? They must admit so far as their agreement with all those contentions is concerned that the Government must have strictly carried out those contentions, if they were sincere in their belief of those constructions and in those interpretations. Ah, yes, says my hon. friend, we would not object to your strictly carrying out those contentions, but we do object to the manner in which you did carry them out. That is the position which the hon. gentlemen opposite have taken. That is, to use their own language, the manner in which those constructions and interpretations were carried out was tyrannous, harsh and cruel, and I do not know how many other adjectives the hon. gentleman used, but almost all that could be gathered from the dictionary. That is the objection, if there can be any objection, of my hon. friend. He stated that the manner in which they had been carried out was harsh, irritating, persecuting, that they showed the jingo spirit that they arose—he did not quite fully express it but he expressed it sufficiently to carry his meaning—that they arose from an idea that the Government were going to show the United States people what they could do, that they were going to use force upon them and that they were glad to have an opportunity of using force upon them. Now my hon. friend must be honest in his reasoning, and he must show where he finds any proof of that desire. Does he find it in the spirit of the Government as shown in its action before the protective service was put on? Why, the Government had the right to have undertaken this system of restriction and protection on 1st July, 1885, in the very midst of the fishing season if they had chosen to do it, and if they had been filled with that spirit of jingoism that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), spoke of they would have jumped into the fray at once on 1st July, put on the protective force and come down into the ranks of the fishing vessels which were all about our coast. Instead of evincing such a spirit they made the proposition of which I have spoken, that they would not pursue this irritating course, but for that season they would allow them to fish on our coasts and would try meanwhile to come to a mutual arrangement with respect to the fisheries. Is it shown in the instruc-

tions which were issued to the officers of our protecting cruisers? No. If you will look at those instructions you will find they have been framed in a spirit the very reverse of that. First, with regard to the Magdalen Islands, it is stated in those instructions that:

"Although the liberty to land, to dry and cure fish there is not expressly given by the terms of the convention to United States fishermen, it is not at present intended to exclude them from those islands."

With respect to operations upon coasts that are unsettled or partially settled it is stated:

"It is not desired that you should put a narrow construction on the term 'unsettled.' The general conciliatory spirit in which it is desirable that you should carry out these instructions, and the wish of Her Majesty's Government that the rights of exclusion should not be strained, must influence you in making as fair and liberal an application of the term as shall be consistent with the just claims of all parties."

Then further there is a direct caution given to them not to exceed the limit of their power and not to go too far even in taking a technical advantage of United States vessels which may have got within the three-mile limit from unavoidable circumstances, such as storms or accidents. And the instructions close with these words:

"It cannot be too strongly urged upon you nor can you too earnestly impress upon the officers and crew under your command that the service in which you and they are engaged should be performed with forbearance and discrimination. The Government relies on your prudence, discretion and firmness in the performance of the special duties entrusted to you."

There is no jingo spirit, no undue irritating spirit, shown in those instructions. If my hon. friend will take up the instructions which are issued in the second year he will find that they are still further broadened and made more liberal, and beside liberal provisions having been made for the reporting of vessels to the captains of those cruisers who are on the grounds in their ports, there were direct and positive instructions issued that in all cases they were to extend all possible courtesies with reference to United States fishermen. The second instruction ends with the words:

"The Government rely upon your judgment actuated with a spirit of forbearance to undertake the delicate and important duties with which you are entrusted."

Now, Sir, there is nothing of jingoism shown in the instructions which were issued, neither, Sir, was there anything of that kind shown in the way in which our cruisers and their captains acted under the instructions that the Government gave them with reference to United States fishing vessels. It has been stated by men in this Parliament; it has been stated by the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite; it has been thrown broadcast through the United States press that no courtesy and no leniency was shown to United States fishermen, but that every pretext was taken advantage of in order to harass and provoke them. I hold in my hand a list, and not by any means a complete list, of the courtesies that were shown and of the mild and generous treatment which was accorded to United States fishing vessels for all infractions of the rules which were not considered to be important infractions. The *Joseph Storey*, a vessel that was detained in the very first of the protection service, had bought supplies and did not report to the customs. When the report was made to the Minister of Marine, it being her first offence, she was ordered to be at once released, with a warning. The Government had just the same right to hold that vessel, under the customs laws, as they had to take any other vessel that violated those laws. But it pursued a different course in reference thereto. The schooner *Hereward* was detained for shipping a man, and was released immediately with a warning. The *Boynton* was allowed to land an injured man from her vessel for medical attention. The *Fanny Spurling* was allowed to purchase provisions for

Mr. FOSTER.

her homeward voyage. The *French* was allowed to ship a crew to take the vessel home when she had discharged her own crew, and was thereafter long detained for repairs. The *French* and *Argonaut* had their boats seized within the three-mile limit, and their crews were allowed to be shipped home in United States fishing vessels. Technically we could have insisted that they should not have this privilege, but we gave the privilege and gave it heartily. The schooner *Perkins* had shipped a man illegally and was detained, but she was released after discharging the man. The schooner *Gracey* was allowed to ship men to take the vessel home. The schooner *Perkins* was extended the same courtesy. The schooner *Pendragon* whose crew had sickness on board, was, under medical advice, allowed to purchase fresh provisions and meats of all kinds just as long as the doctor gave a certificate that it was necessary for the health of the crew. The schooner *J. W. Day* was allowed to ship men to replace those who were taken ill. The schooners *Mary Steele* and *John S. Quinn* were allowed to buy provisions for the homeward voyage. The schooner *Oscar Hatton* was allowed to take a new set of sails, as her own through disaster had become useless, and the vessel, in consequence, had been rendered partly unmanageable. The *N. H. Fry*, the *Senator Fry*, the *Rice*, and other vessels were allowed to purchase provisions to take them on their homeward voyage, their own provisions having been casually exhausted. The collector at North Sydney gives a list of a large number of vessels to whom he allowed such courtesies, and besides that, vessels which met with disaster at sea and had been driven in by heavy storms and which were obliged to be put on the slip for repairs, were allowed to sell the fresh fish which they had on board, which would otherwise have spoiled and put the parties concerned to loss and inconvenience. These, Sir, are a few of the courtesies among the many that, in 1886 and 1887, were freely given to United States fishermen, and given with the best of spirit. This, I think, is enough, strong enough, and ample enough to disprove the assertion that there was a spirit of malice and a desire to irritate and provoke which actuated the carrying out of this service. Let me go one step further. I can give an answer, and I think a sufficient reason, to the charge that in 1886 and 1887 the protection service was carried out in a spirit of undue interference with the rights and privileges of United States fishermen. We must recollect that that service was new in 1886, and that new men undertook it. Of all that had been connected with our previous protection service, only Captain Scott was concerned in the protection service of 1886 and 1887. The captains of our vessels were new men, the service was new and we must recollect as well that in that first year, 1886, United States fishermen came down upon our coasts in very different spirit to what they came in 1887. They came not knowing exactly what treatment they were to receive, or what rights they were to have or what privileges they were to claim in our waters. They came down from Gloucester and other fishing towns where there was an idea that they would not be treated in the same strict way that they had in 1870 and 1871. Their own papers had favored the idea that commercial privileges would now be granted and that "touch and trade" permits would carry them into all the ports of Canada and bring them safely home. So with all those things was it to be wondered at that collisions had taken place? Was it to be wondered at that interference, lawful and proper interference, had to be taken with reference to those vessels? The wonder is, and the only wonder, that under such circumstances the protection service could have been carried on for those two years without more causes having occurred of interference or undue interference than did actually occur. The captains of the fishery protection vessels boarded in 1886 780 vessels and in 1887 1,362 vessels.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend says "hear, hear"; let me draw his attention—

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Let me ask the hon. gentleman whether they were boarded in the harbors or outside?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend a year ago, I think, tried to make a strong point in this House because our fishery protection vessels did not overhaul and board them outside of the three-mile limit, where they had no right to overhaul them. We are under no right to overhaul them or board them there.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will bear with me, I am sure. I did not intend to make a point that they did not board them outside the three-mile limit, but that they confined their boarding to the vessels while they were lying at anchor, and did not attempt to board them while they were within the three-mile limit but outside of the harbor.

Mr. FOSTER. There again my hon. friend is wrong. The fishery protection vessels board the vessels inside the three-mile limit wherever they think it necessary to do it, and they board them outside the harbor as well as inside the harbor; but my hon. friend knows well enough that in port, for instance, in the port of Souris, a fishing fleet of sometimes 200 vessels will lie at anchor at night, and the cruiser is there with them, and goes out with them in the morning to cruise about them during the day and to watch that foreign vessels do not come within the three-mile limit. If they do, the cruiser has a right to overhaul and seize them. The boarding takes place wherever it is necessary, and the captain of the cruiser is the judge as to where it is necessary. Well, Sir, as I was stating, 1,362 vessels were boarded in 1887, and 700 in 1886; and of all the vessels that were boarded in those two years only 30 cases have been brought to the attention of this Government by the Executive of the United States, and it is certain that everyone who had a fairly grounded complaint made that complaint to the Secretary of State for the United States and that the complaint was investigated and forwarded to the Canadian Government through the British Government. But thirty-two cases in all of United States vessels were dealt with by the Dominion of Canada in those two years. Now, Sir, will you listen to me for a moment, while I detail the circumstances of these thirty-two cases, to see whether or not the statement is borne out that undue interference, arbitrary, harsh, unwarranted interference, has taken place with respect to those vessels? The complaint with reference to five of them was that they were refused commercial privileges. Will my hon. friend say that that was harsh treatment, to refuse a United States vessel commercial privileges in our ports? That is the contention to which he gave his adhesion; and the carrying out of that contention is no grievance to a United States vessel, and no evidence of harsh treatment on the part of this Government. As to four of those vessels, the complaint was that they were warned off a head line. When the complaint was investigated the collector of Customs charged with having given the warning denied that he had given any other warning to vessels than to hand them the printed warning issued from the Department. With reference to three of them, he said they had not been in the port, as was alleged in the grievance. There was no hardship. One was refused the purchase of bait or to ship men. That was no grievance; it was within our right.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that because it is within his right to refuse to let a vessel ship men, therefore it ought not to be allowed to ship men? Is that his contention?

Mr. FOSTER. It is my hon. friend's contention, if consistent.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No.

Mr. FOSTER. Did he not give his adhesion to this contention, that we had a right to refuse the purchase of provisions, the shipment of men and the purchase of bait?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I beg to say that I have not spoken on this question, and I have never pretended to give my adhesion to anything. I have neither spoken for nor against the policy of the Government. I have spoke of the legal contention, nothing else.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the hon. gentleman approve of the legal contention made by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, that Canada under the Treaty of 1818 had a right to refuse commercial privileges to United States vessels?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Had the power to exclude—certainly I said so. How far should we act on the right or the power is a different question, and that question I propose to discuss when the hon. gentleman gets through.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, then, is exactly in the position of a gentleman who is in favor of the law, but against its enforcement.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not at all. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he has undertaken to defend the Government by saying that they did protect their rights in four cases. Now, he mentions a case of one sort, and he says the Government acted properly because they did not allow those parties to ship men. Surely the hon. gentleman must see how he is himself arguing on both sides of the policy, although he is on one side of the law.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is quite wrong. He has probably misunderstood me. I mentioned the cases of four vessels with reference to which the complaint had been made that they had been warned off a head line which extended from point to point some forty or fifty miles, and I simply stated that the collector denied that he had warned them off from that extended head line, or had given any warning to them except simply, as his duty was, to give them the printed warning sent him by the department. I did not argue on both sides as to that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but that is not the case to which I referred. I referred to the case of the shipment of men, obtaining supplies and making repairs.

Mr. FOSTER. I have stated the facts with reference to both of those cases. In the case of one vessel, the grievance was that she was warned off from fishing in the Bay of Chaleurs. In the case of another, the *Marion Grimes*, the complaint was with regard to interference with her flag, and the fishery correspondence will show that the regrets of the Government were immediately sent—not that there was a technical wrong, but it was thought that such action on the part of the captains of the cruisers should not be countenanced. One vessel had some trouble about the salvage of a seine that gave rise to a complaint and a very strong remonstrance from the Secretary of State; but after having received the answer of the Canadian Government, the Secretary of State wrote to the gentleman who made the complaint, to say that from the evidence which was given, it was clear that his case was not one relating to the fisheries or international rights, but that it was simply a case of salvage, and he could get his seine by complying with the laws of Canada with reference thereto. Another case was on alleged refusal to grant the sale of provisions for the homeward voyage. When this came to be investigated, it was found that the statement was untrue. One was for illegal fishing,

and the vessel was forfeited. Two cases were for buying bait, violating the customs and the terms of the treaty. Six were for minor violations of customs regulations where no penalty was imposed and the vessels were discharged with a warning. Nine cases were for violations of customs laws and for smuggling and the like, in which penalties were imposed, and a part of the penalties were afterwards remitted. That makes up the whole list, and after careful investigation of these cases, I think they fairly disprove the assertion that there has been unnecessary harshness, undue influence, or any desire to stretch the authority of the Government with the view of irritating the United States fishermen or people. I wish to call the attention of the House to two facts. One is that the Government of Great Britain, which has been described to-night as sensitive on that question, has reviewed all the correspondence and reports with reference to these cases, and in no single instance has the Government of Great Britain found fault with the action of the Dominion Government. Further, and this is also important, these grievances were forwarded by the Secretary of State for the United States to the Dominion Government, and the report as to the facts after investigation was sent back, and in only one instance was there an attempt made to refute the facts. In only one instance was there any further correspondence had as to the facts of a case reported upon to the United States by the Dominion Government. It cannot be said that in the course of the two years during which this protection service has been in operation, any man was deprived of his liberty or that any strong or undue interference took place with reference to the subjects of the United States. Taking the whole history, as given in the fishery reports which are before Parliament, and in this additional information which I have been glad to give to-night, I think it is fairly well shown that there was no desire shown by the Government to unduly interfere with American fishermen in any spirit of retaliation, but that, on the contrary, in the carrying out of the protection service for the two years, a wise, prudent and generous policy on the part of this Government was pursued. I wish briefly to deal with the oft-repeated assertion that this treaty is a complete surrender. Nearly every hon. gentleman, who has spoken on the opposite side, has said that the United States have obtained everything they asked for, and that the concessions have been entirely on our side. The record, I maintain, entirely disproves that assertion. What were the contentions of the United States? First, with reference to the headland limit, the American contention from the earliest date of this controversy down to the present time, notwithstanding the sole exception of Mr. Webster as Secretary of State, which was a qualified exception, I maintain has been always for a restricted interpretation of the headland question. They have almost uniformly contended that their vessels should approach to within three miles of the shores, and as to the bays their limit was not more than six miles wide. The proposition, one of the very latest propositions made by the Secretary of State for the United States in 1887, was that the extreme limit should be three miles from the shore and ten miles as regards bays. That is the contention of the United States, as laid down in the fishery correspondence, and embodied in the proposal for a commission to settle this question, which was made by Mr. Secretary Bayard. The contention of Canada was, in its broader terms, that the line should be drawn from headland to headland, and that it should be three miles from the shore in other respects. Well, a commission was held to settle the difficulty. It has been stated that the Government opposed very strongly a settlement on the ten mile bay limit when it was proposed to them. They did oppose it, because, as they stated, if that were carried out, it would take out of the jurisdiction of Canada, bays such as the Bay of Chaleurs,

Mr. FOSTER.

which are peculiarly Canadian bays, and which ought not to be opened to the United States fishermen. Neither side has had its extreme contention, so far as the headlands line is concerned, agreed to. Both have made concessions, but notwithstanding the strong remarks made by my hon. friend who spoke last (Mr. Mitchell), I hold that you may take the map of Canada, you may take your compasses and you may begin at the extreme western point of the Bay of Fundy and go around the whole coast until you pass the coast of Labrador, and you will find that Canada's construction has not been so very far departed from. You will find, notwithstanding the statements that have been made, that Canada's concessions have not, in any very important and essential particular, taken away from her the fishery privileges and the rights she practically enjoyed during the series of years that have passed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Nine-tenths of the water area for which she contended has been given up, and nineteen-twentieths on the coast of Newfoundland.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a point on which my hon. friend and myself cannot agree.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am perfectly willing to accept the measure of any competent surveyor who will undertake to compare the two lines.

Mr. FOSTER. And we will abide by that measurement, if you get a competent man to make it. With reference to the bait question, the statement is that Canada has given up everything to the United States. You will find throughout the whole correspondence, the contention was made by the Americans that their fishing vessels should have the right to buy bait, and that they also claimed the right of transshipment, and backed that claim up by their very strongest arguments. On the other hand, the Canadian contention was that, under the Treaty of 1818, the purchase of bait by United States fishing vessels and transshipment could not be allowed. Let my hon. friend read the treaty, and he will find whose contention has been in the main carried out. In reference to our laws, it was the declared contention in the United States that the penalties were excessive. These have been moderated to a certain extent, and that is a concession to the United States, so far as that goes. On the other hand, the penalties that have been retained are sufficient for the purpose. With reference to the customs laws, the Americans claimed that when their vessels entered our ports for any of the four purposes mentioned, they should not, no matter how long they staid, be subject to our customs laws. Canada contended that they should, and in that respect there has been a concession on both sides. But the large concession has not been on the part of Canada. Commercial privileges were claimed by the United States in their papers and despatches, and their arguments all went to show that they had the right now, under the changed order of things brought about by widened commercial relations, to commercial privileges in our ports for their fishing vessels with "touch and trade" permits. That is a contention which was directly adverse to the Canadian contention. Will my hon. friend find out which contention has been given up in respect of that? With reference to the harbor dues and other dues, the United States contention was that their vessels should not pay them. It was the contention of Canada that she had a perfect right to demand payment, and payment has been made. These dues have been given up. That is a concession by Canada, but the harbor regulations have been kept, and that is a concession to the principle that those laws hold good. So, if you take these different controverted points and look at the contentions of Canada and the contentions of the United States, and read the treaty fairly and candidly, you will find that the treaty itself is a record of mutual conces-

sions and that it is far away from the truth to say that the United States have had all their demands granted and that the concessions have been altogether on the part of the Dominion of Canada. At this late stage of the debate, I do not intend to take up the time of the House much longer. I was anxious to make this simple statement with reference to the carrying out of the protective service, and there were one or two points in reference to the treaty in regard to which I thought some misapprehensions should be corrected. I do not think it is worth while to seriously attempt to controvert the positions taken by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) with reference to the interpretations of articles 10 and 11 of the treaty as it stands. The wording is plain. It does not seem that a fair and candid reading of it can lead to any other conclusion than what is stated by the words themselves is what is meant and what will be carried out if the treaty comes into force. In the first place, the validity of the harbor regulations is affirmed. United States vessels, putting in for shelter or repairs, are not required to report if they remain only twenty-four hours, provided they do not communicate with the shore, but, if they remain more than twenty-four hours, or if they communicate with the shore, they are to report to the customs, and at any rate they are under customs supervision. That is far wide from the statement of the hon. gentleman that the customs laws are given away entirely, and that we have no customs supervision over United States vessels. My hon. friend tried to make a strong point in regard to these vessels being allowed to come in for supplies, and he said that would practically open the three-mile limit inshore to these vessels, and would practically give them the fishing inshore. I noticed that that statement was applauded by many hon. gentlemen on the other side, but would that be a whit worse than the condition of affairs at present? My hon. friend said that, if a cruiser overhauled a vessel, she would say she was going in for supplies, and under that excuse the three miles would be in reality opened up to the unrestricted use of United States vessels. Why, to-day United States vessels have a perfect right to go into our ports for wood, water, shelter or repairs; and what is there to prevent a United States fishing vessel making the same excuse? If a cruiser overhauls her, she may say: I am going in for wood or for water or for repairs. The same excuse exists to-day as would exist under this treaty, and, if it is possible now to protect the inshore waters, it will be equally possible to protect them under this treaty. Another hon. gentleman was exercised because, under this treaty, the price of bait would be raised to the deep sea fishermen, and yet he stated directly afterwards that what was especially needed was a free market for our productions in the United States. Well, for free fish in the United States markets, as it was under the Treaty of Washington, it is plain that we must give as a compensation the right to buy bait. The hon. gentleman finds fault with this because it gives the right to buy bait by giving a fee and so enhances the price of bait to the deep-sea fishermen, and yet he is in favor of a treaty which would open the markets to these fishermen in the United States, when the same effect would be found, to make bait dearer in the same way. The *modus vivendi* would go out of force the moment the privilege of free fish is given, and it is the same in regard to the price of bait. Some hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side have made a great deal of the inconsistencies of the Government in the diplomatic positions which have been taken. I think it comes with a rather poor grace from gentlemen on the opposite side to speak of inconsistencies with reference to this fishery question. When in 1871, the Washington Treaty was brought about and was later before this House for ratification, gentlemen on the other side opposed that treaty by might and main. They were especially

opposed to that treaty because it proposed for a money consideration, to give the use of our fisheries to the Americans. They said it was selling our birthright for a mess of pottage. Yet, in 1877, when the arbitration was held at Halifax, they plumed themselves, when the award was made, on having gained that award themselves, and from that time to this they have not ceased to make out of it something that they should gain credit for. They have attacked the Government for taking the first opportunity which was given them to secure a possible commission. They have then attacked the Government equally for enforcing the laws, when they failed to get the commission which was at first proposed. Sometimes it seems to me a wonder, in view of all the statements that we have heard from the other side, that we should have been able to get a commission at all; and it is still more a wonder that the commission should have been able to obtain the treaty which it framed. The conditions which were created, so far as the Opposition were concerned, were not favorable conditions in the United States towards the consummation of a treaty. For some years back the Opposition have been sedulously creating the feeling that harshness has been used by us in the treatment of their vessels, and a great deal of the feeling in the United States of unnecessary harshness on the part of Canada has taken its rise from utterances which have been made in Canada itself, in the newspapers of Canada, which have gone to the United States, and which have been accepted as authoritative statements as to the position of Canada in this regard. They have sedulously created the opinion in the United States that Great Britain would not back up the contentions of Canada, and so have striven to weaken us in what should be, and is really, the strongest point in Canada's claim for getting a fisheries treaty with the United States. They have given currency to the idea that Canada is falling to pieces, that she is disintegrating, that the different parts are separating from each other, and that in time it will fall to pieces, and then it will become gradually a part of the United States. The idea that there was no future for Canada in herself, but that annexation or absorption by the United States was her ultimate destiny—that sentiment has been created and has been spread in the United States, from the utterances of men in the Opposition, and papers in the Opposition, and that has been a very great difficulty in the way of the proper sentiment, on the other side, for granting us the advantages of a treaty. It has been stated here to-night that Canada has been deserted by the British Government, that Great Britain is but a name behind her; and my hon. friend, in solemn tones and sad, gave voice to his opinion that Canada need no longer look to Great Britain for support and for aid with reference to this great question, but that Great Britain had so acted in this matter as to put the finishing blow to his loyalty to the mother country, and that in the future, he would owe little of that spirit to the mother country. Sir, the only sentiment which was strongly applauded in the speech of the hon. gentleman, was that sentiment he uttered with reference to Great Britain, and with reference to the oozing out of his loyalty to Great Britain. I do not wish to stand here, as a Canadian citizen, as well as one who knows something of Great Britain's course with reference to this fishery matter during the two years that have passed—I do not wish to stand here and let that assertion pass without giving it, so far as I am concerned, my denial. I say that Great Britain has stood well by us in these two years that have just passed; I say that every contention that has been put forth has been backed by the Government of Great Britain, and that in all respects she has fairly, and consistently, and continuously given force to our contentions, and has stood firmly by Canada in this matter. Sir, an attempt was made to make it appear that Mr. Chamberlain was not the proper person

to be entrusted with the commission, and his commission had not been made public a day before influential journals in this country and influential men in this country, set themselves to work to undermine his influence with the people of the United States, and to raise prejudices there against him. That did not look very much like aiding towards the settlement of this question. The attempt to arouse prejudice against Mr. Chamberlain, to arouse race prejudice against him in the United States, in order that his mission might be defeated, was an attempt which will not bear scrutiny, and which will not gain the approval of fair and candid men in this country, or in any other country. Sir, I do not think so of the people of the United States, I do not think so of the Irish people, either, who are a generous people, whose impulses are generous. Whatever love they may have for their own island, whatever desire they may have to see her gain privileges and advantages that they think she has not now, I do not think that Irishmen are made of that kind of material that they would try to break down the influence of Mr. Chamberlain, or to oppose the settlement of a question with which he was entrusted, simply because they and he did not agree as to Irish matters, and the policy that should be pursued by Great Britain with reference thereto. I believe, Sir, and I take pleasure in stating here what my hon. friend has so well said with much greater authority, that Mr. Chamberlain did his duty nobly and well, so far as Canada was concerned in this matter, that he stood by her contentions, that he loyally supported them, and that though he started out for the purpose of getting a treaty—and he would not have started except for that purpose—he started, I believe, with the firm purpose of getting such a treaty as would be honorable to both countries, and as would be fair to the rights of Canada as the party greatly interested in the settlement of the question. Now, what will hon. gentlemen opposite do with reference to this treaty? All through the country their papers have denounced this treaty in the strongest terms. Sir, the head lines that have been printed with reference to this treaty ought to be preserved. "Canada lies a-bleeding," says the *Mail*.

Mr. MITCHELL. And truly, too.

Mr. FOSTER. "A complete surrender," says the *Globe*; "Secretary Bayard's victory," says the *Mail*; "A complete give away," says the *Halifax Chronicle*; "Canada betrayed," says the *Ottawa Free Press*; "So far as the United States are concerned, they have got everything they ever contended for," the Hon. Peter Mitchell; "The great Tupperian surrender," *Halifax Recorder*; "A base, beggarly blundering surrender," Attorney General Longley. These are some of the statements made by the party opposite outside.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to use my name in connection with this?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. What did Peter Mitchell say?

Mr. FOSTER. "So far as the United States are concerned, they have got everything they ever contended for."

Mr. MITCHELL. So I say now.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I did not misrepresent the hon. gentleman. This is what they have said outside, and we who have listened to those speeches inside, have heard every hon. gentleman who has spoken in opposition intimate, if they did not use the very words, that it was a "base and beggarly surrender," that it was a "complete give away," that it would be completely injurious to the fisheries interests of this country; and yet, with all these strong assertions outside, and with all these strong assertions inside, to back him up, my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), after framing this indictment, and declaring that

Mr. FOSTER.

the treaty was disgraceful to Canada and injurious to her interest, declared in the same breath that he did not intend to oppose the treaty. What will hon. gentlemen do? Are they honest in what they are saying? Were these head lines candid? Are they carrying out the real feelings of their hearts, or is it simply a something that they are putting before the people for party purposes which they do not sufficiently believe in to back up by their votes in the House? Now, Sir, in closing, I have just this to say in reference to the treaty. Everyone knows the length of time that this controversy has existed; everybody who has read the history of this question knows the difficulty which has surrounded it, the irritation which it has provoked. Sir, I believe that the Dominion of Canada, in its large and broad heart, from end to end, will be in favor of this treaty, not because it holds every contention that Canada has made, not because it carries out everything that Canada could wish had been carried out, but because it is, as stated by the President and Secretary of the United States, a fair and honorable arrangement on both sides, in which neither country gets the full of its contention, but in which neither country suffers great injury by the concessions that have been made. Taking into account the future of Canada, her future interests as well as her present interests, taking into account the fact that we are to live beside one great and powerful neighbor, that we form part of another great and powerful Empire, that we have conserved our interests to a very large degree, and that there is a prospect for the future of a permanent settlement of this question, I believe that the great heart of Canada, notwithstanding the head lines and the strong assertions, will beat with this one sentiment, that after all this long controversy of year upon year, it is a happy, a fair, a good settlement, one that has been made in the interests of peace and in the interests of the two great countries which ought to live beside each other in amity and good feeling. Sir, the executives of the four countries of Newfoundland, Canada, Great Britain and the United States have lifted this question from its troubled condition, have taken it out of the arena where it has been discussed as an irritating question for seventy years, and they have come to a final and permanent solution, so far as they are concerned. They say that this arrangement is fair to all parties concerned, and they relegate it now to the Parliaments and Congresses of the great nations. Notwithstanding all that may be said for party purposes and all that may be argued from interested motives, I believe that if the voice of the country could penetrate to the halls of all those Parliaments and Congresses and have its way, it would result in an approbation of this treaty and of this instrument as a conclusion, final, honorable and on the whole advantageous to all parties concerned. It is in that view that I support the treaty, and it is with those feelings that I hope the treaty will be finally ratified by all the powers concerned and will put an end to a vexed and troublesome question in what I consider a truly honorable and happy way.

Mr. KIRK. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. On this motion I desire to offer a few observations in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. I certainly did not expect from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) the remarks which he has made about myself. He has chosen to drag my name into this debate in a way which I think is quite unwarranted. I think the course I adopted in this debate was one of forbearance, and I refrained from speaking of the hon. gentleman's conduct, not referring to it throughout my speech except in one instance in regard to the *Adams*. I have said that history repeated itself, that the taking up of a weak case, the case of the schooner *Washington* seized in the Bay of Fundy, when it was doubtful whether she was in British

territory or not, led to the loss of the Bay of Fundy and the opening up to the Americans of that bay and the subsequent claim on their part of right of access to all other bays. History indeed repeats itself. I have forbore to speak as plainly as I could have spoken, and I have not touched upon some points I might have dwelt on in regard to the hon. gentleman's administration of the department; although I have expressed myself frankly it has not been in hostility to the administration of the day, nor do I desire to defeat their effort to get this treaty carried elsewhere. I have foreborne; but I tell the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that through his misconduct and his want of efficiency in raising, on frivolous points, the question of our rights under the treaty, and the rights of Canadian fisheries in such a case as the *Adams*, boarding or arresting a vessel when there was a doubt about our right to, releasing her and subsequently seizing her on customs grounds, these acts show that the case of Canada has been placed in a similar position to what it was when the case of the Bay of Fundy was raised on the seizure of the *Washington*. This whole question has arisen on account of the misconduct, mismanagement and maladministration of the department over which the hon. gentleman presides. If bad feeling has arisen, as he has described, with the United States, when did it arise? Did it exist before 1885? No. No such feeling existed in the United States at that time. That ill-feeling has existed since is true. Does the hon. gentleman want the proof? Let him take up—I did not think he would be so discreet to bring it up at this time of the evening—Mr. P. Phelps's despatch to the British Minister, and he will find that was the cause of the ill-feeling in the United States. It was due to the senseless seizures for petty offences. Mr. Phelps in addressing Lord Roseberry says:

"It would be at most, under the circumstances, only an accidental and purely technical breach of a custom house regulations, by which no harm was intended, and from which no harm came, and would, in ordinary cases, be easily condoned by an apology, and perhaps the payment of costs."

He further says:

"Can it be reasonably insisted under these circumstances that by the sudden adoption, without notice, of a new rule, a vessel of a friendly nation should be seized and forfeited for doing what all similar vessels had for so long a period been allowed to do without question?"

"It is sufficiently evident that the claim of a violation of the Customs Act was an after-thought brought forward to give whatever added strength it might to the principal claim on which the seizure had been made."

Again:

"I submit to your Lordship that a construction so harsh, so unfriendly, so unnecessary, and so irritating as that set up by the Canadian authorities is not such as Her Majesty's Government has been accustomed either to accord or to submit to. It would find no precedent in the history of British diplomacy, and no provocation in any action or assertion of the Government of the United States."

Again:

"Of the obvious conclusion the Canadian authorities seem to be quite aware. I am informed that since the seizures they have pressed, or are pressing, through the Canadian Parliament in much haste, an Act which is designed, for the first time in the history of the legislation under this treaty, to make the facts upon which the American vessels have been seized illegal, and to authorize proceedings against them therefor."

Still again:

"The practical construction given to the treaty down to the present time has been in entire accord with the conclusions thus deduced from the Act of Parliament. The British Government has repeatedly refused to allow interference with American fishing vessels, unless for illegal fishing, and has given explicit orders to the contrary."

In the face of that this vessel was seized. Two visitations were held. She was allowed to go, and while she drifted on the bar in Digby harbor she was seized and held. After she was boarded for preparing to fish and was released, she was also seized under customs regulations, and the First Minister knows that it was upon that he contended for the conviction of that vessel. Yet his Minister of Fisheries dares to attack me because I have expressed my opinion. Both

of them know they seized that vessel illegally, and on that illegal seizure, the first of a number of illegal seizures for trifles, this great question of the fisheries has come up, and our case has been given away at Washington.

Mr. THOMPSON. I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not. I think I know as much about it as you do.

Mr. THOMPSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not wish to know, but the *Adams* when she was seized was never released and continues unreleased up to this moment.

Mr. MITCHELL. The *Adams*, after she was boarded, was released, and when she was sailing out of the harbor and grounded on a bar she was seized—

Mr. THOMPSON. No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think I am right.

Mr. THOMPSON. The *Adams*, when she was seized, was never allowed to go. She was visited by one of the officers of the *Lansdowne*, and the statement made by the captain justified the captain of the *Lansdowne* not seizing her. It was ascertained before she got very far that that statement was entirely untrue, and she was then seized for the first time, and has been seized ever since.

Mr. MITCHELL. Say what you like, she was visited by the officers for a breach of the convention of 1818, and was subsequently seized for a breach of the customs regulations, while stranded on a bar and could not get out. Those are the kind of acts that brought about the concessions in the treaty.

Mr. THOMPSON. She was never seized until she was seized on the first occasion, and has never been released since. It was not because she stranded on the bar, but she was seized for two offences—buying bait and evading custom dues.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman has the faculty of making words suit himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to explain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to an explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will have order. I rise to an explanation. I am not going to be misrepresented, even by the Minister of Justice. What I have said is this: I said the vessel, after having been twice visited—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am in order, and you had better keep quiet, and you will get away quicker. I say that vessel was twice visited by those officers and they did not seize her, and it was after they had failed to be able to find any act for which to seize her that the vessel was going out of the harbor when she accidentally grounded and she was then seized. I say that this is true.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is an entire mistake. If the hon. gentleman reads the book he has under his hand he will see he is wrong from beginning to end.

Mr. MITCHELL. I know what I am talking about.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope the motion for adjournment was made to allow the hon. gentleman to make the statement he has made. I hope there is no object in pressing it.

Mr. MITCHELL. No; that was my object. Motion to adjourn withdrawn.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). When the hon. gentleman rose, I did rise to move the adjournment of the debate. It is now one o'clock in the morning, and I wish to address the House upon this subject. There are several gentlemen here who also wish to address the House, and I am quite sure that on a matter of this importance the Government, anxious as they are to carry the Bill confirming the treaty, will not insist upon the second reading of the Bill to-night.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to say to the hon. gentleman that there was a distinct understanding with the other side that this discussion should close to-night.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would correct the hon. gentleman. He will remember that it was an informal conversation and not an official understanding.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Quite so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I told him that we were quite willing, if we could, to close the thing to-night, but he will recollect that I told him I could only speak for the gentlemen around me, and I expressly excepted the hon. the leader of the third party. There is no doubt whatever but that that hon. gentleman had a perfect right to speak when he pleased. Had the Minister of Marine replied to my friend from Halifax, and had the debate been confined within the limits of the Ministers and the parties who are more especially conversant with the matter, like my hon. friend the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) the debate might easily have closed. Certainly the hon. gentleman will not pretend to say that I entered into anything like a formal agreement with him to close the debate to-night.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I certainly understood that the hon. gentleman was quite prepared to have the discussion close to night. It is quite true that he intimated that he and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had some remarks to make, but that they would not be very lengthy, and he did not know what time would be occupied by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). As the hon. gentleman is aware, there has been very little speaking on this side, and the greater portion of the time has been occupied by the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell).

Mr. MITCHELL. And the Finance Minister, too.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am speaking of the discussion to-day. The hon. member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), who represents a fishing county, made a few brief remarks, and the speeches generally were brief. It could hardly be expected that the debate should close without the Minister of Marine making some reference to his administration which was referred to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With the pressure of public business, and with the questions which I have myself to bring before the House, which will require a great deal of attention, I must ask the hon. gentleman to allow the second reading to take place to-night. There will be no difficulty at a further stage of the debate, for if hon. gentlemen wish to deal with any particular subject they will have abundant opportunity.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman cannot attach importance to the second reading to-night.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I attach the greatest importance to the second reading or I would not press it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can understand that the third reading would be a matter of importance.

Mr. MITCHELL,

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is the second reading of the Bill to which I attach importance.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) wishes to speak.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We shall be happy to hear him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I also have some remarks to make on this matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We will listen to both with great patience.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is perfectly unreasonable and unfair. We are quite willing to expedite public business, but at the same time when you have a great question like this—a question of first-rate importance—undoubtedly members should have an opportunity of speaking on it, and undoubtedly they should have an opportunity of speaking at a reasonable time in the morning. Now, the House is quite exhausted listening attentively to this discussion since three o'clock this afternoon. I was about to make a suggestion to the hon. gentleman which I thought would facilitate the business and that was that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) should move the adjournment on the understanding that the second and third reading might be taken on Tuesday, which would give the hon. gentleman all the expedition he could possibly obtain. The debate, if it were forced must go on the third reading, which would lead to a greater delay.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am extremely anxious not to defer the second reading of this Bill until Tuesday. I think I may say further that my hon. friend knows the anxiety I have to get the second reading of this Bill. I attach the greatest possible importance to have the second reading of this Bill take place now, and at the same time I am extremely anxious to avoid anything that would cause undue personal inconvenience. If the hon. gentleman will consent to make it the first order of the day on Monday, I will consent to the adjournment, otherwise I must ask them to allow the second reading to take place to-night. I think I am as unable as any other gentleman in this House to remain here for any longer period.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We want to meet the hon. gentleman's views also, and suppose we do this: We can get through the unopposed notices of motion in an hour or two on Monday, and let us resume this debate on Monday evening at 8 o'clock.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. With the distinct understanding that we take the second reading at that sitting.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to state definitely when he expects to make his Budget statement?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I hope to be able to make it this day week. I shall make a great effort to reach it by that time.

THE BOUNDARIES OF ONTARIO.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to ask the hon. First Minister again whether he will be prepared to propose an address to confirm the award of the Judicial Committee

of the Privy Council and the arbitrators with regard to the boundaries of Ontario. I make the enquiry, because, if it is not the hon. gentleman's intention, I desire to bring a motion on the subject before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say to the hon. gentleman that communications have been had with the Government of Ontario, and draft Bills have been interchanged. We proposed a draft Bill. An Order in Council has been passed, and will be sent by the first mail tomorrow to the Government of Ontario.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Can the hon. gentleman say whether he proposes in that draft Bill to deal with the boundaries as fixed by the arbitrators in 1878?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, the draft Bill is to confirm that portion of the answer of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council which refers to the boundaries between Ontario and Manitoba.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That, of course, will embrace the boundary of Manitoba as contended for by Manitoba and the counsel for the Dominion, that is, to a line drawn due north from the junction of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, which leaves a part of the Province of Manitoba north of the Albany River. The hon. gentleman will remember that the award of the Judicial Committee fixes the boundary on the west and the north. He proposes just to follow the award of the committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, that portion of the answer which settles the western boundary of Ontario, which is the boundary between Manitoba and Ontario.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Then I think I must go on with my motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, go on.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 1.15 a.m. (Saturday).

R

I N D E X .

SECOND SESSION, SIXTH PARLIAMENT, 1888.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1^o, 2^o, 3^o, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adj., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur. Con- curred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; Hae., House; Hse. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; Ms., Motions; m., moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Prop., Proposed; Q., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref. Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Repts., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y. N., Yeas and Nays; Names in *italic* and parentheses are those of the movers.

Amyot, Mr. G., Bellechasse.

Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1534 (ii).
C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*)
on M. for Com. on Res., 1347 (ii).
Cartridges, Rep. of Commission on Manufacture (Ques.)
1232 (ii).
Cavalry and Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1220 (ii).
Controverted Elections Act Amt. (B. 2, 1^o) 18; Order
for 2^o read, 73 (i).
—— (Ques.) 752 (i).
Cornmeal, Flour, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to remove
Duties, 1560 (ii).
Debater, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com. (Translators) on M.
to conc., 1501 (ii).
Dorchester Election, Issue of Speaker's Warrant
(Ques.) 27, 59 (i).
Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in
Com., 1146 (ii).
Drill Shed at Quebec, Water Supply (Ques.) 85 (i).
—— (M. for Cor.) 654 (i).
Field Exercises (Military) Translation (Ques.) 85 (i)
—— for Cor.) 655 (i).
Fishery Protection, appointment of Magistrates (Ques.)
826 (ii).
"Horse-Breeding in Canada," Translation of Pamphlet
(Ques.) 85 (i).
International Regulations *re* Trading and other Vessels
(Ques.) 826 (ii).

Amyot, Mr. G.—Continued.

Military School, St. Johns (Q.) services of Chaplain
(M. for Ret.) 654 (i).
Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir
Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1288 (ii).
Morin, Dr. J. A., claim for services (M. for copy) 655 (i)
Neely, Private T., provision for Widow, &c., on M. for
Ret., 651 (i).
Ottawa River, Improvements for Timber, &c. (M. for
Stmt. of cost) 827 (ii).
Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks)
1598 (ii).
Personal explanation, *re* charge of disloyalty, 598 (i).
Quebec Drill Shed, Water Supply (M. for Cor.) 654 (i).
—— (Ques.) 85 (i).
—— Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B.
135 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1296 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1422 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*)
and Amts., 532-539 (i).
St. Lawrence River Navigation, Montreal and Quebec
(M. for Ret.) 71 (i).
Salmon Rivers (Hudson's Bay) Lease (Ques.) 826 (ii).
Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1641 (ii).
Strange, Gen., Rep. submitted to Militia Dept. *re*
Rebellion (Ques.) 98 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. (Money) B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*)
in Com., 1593 (ii).

Amyot, Mr. G.—Continued.

SUPPLY :

Civil Government (Sec. of State) 1641 (ii).
Militia (Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1220 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 1534 (ii)

Trades Unions, List (M. for Ret.*) 50 (i).

— Regulations *re* Registry (M. for copies*) 50 (i).

— Rules (M. for Ret.) 46 (i).

Whale Fishery in Hudson's Bay (Ques.) 826 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J., South Middlesex.

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1256 (ii).

C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com on Res., 1366 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1191 (ii).

Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2°, 769 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Government (High Commissioner's contingencies) 106 (i).
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1163 (ii).

Bain, Mr. T., Wentworth.

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) on M. for 2°, 995 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 1635 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: (Kingston Graving Dock) 1671. *Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1539. Roads and Bridges, 1676 (ii).

Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) for Sel. Com. 35 (i).

Bain, Mr. J. W., Soulanges.

St. John and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Co.'s B. 7 (Mr. *Vanasse*) 2° m., 530 (i).

Baird, Mr. G. F., Queen's, N. B.

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 315-351 (i).

Baker, Mr. E. C., Victoria, B. C.

Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 973 (ii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt., (B. 56, 1°) 309 (i).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co's. (B. 35, 1°*) 124 (i).

Representation Act Amt. (B. 55, 1°) 309 (i).

South-Western Ry. Co's incorp. B. 54 (Mr. *Hall*) on M. for 3° (Ques. of Order) 954 (ii)

SUPPLY :

Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 132 (i).
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1160 (ii).

Public Works—Capital (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1653 (ii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. (B. 57, 1°) 309 (i).

Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 759 (i).

Barron, Mr. J. A., North Victoria, O.

Bexley Postmaster, appointment (Ques.) 58 (i).

Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1539 (ii).

Barron, Mr. J. A.—Continued.

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 944, 1138; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1403; neg. (Y. 59; N. 83) 1404 (ii).

Fenelon River Navigation (Ques.) 97 (i).

Gowanlock, Mrs., pension (Ques.) 58 (i).

— compensation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1016 (ii).

Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1010.

Ingoldsby Station Post Office (M. for Ret.) 1243 (ii).

Muskoka and Parry Sound Judicial District (Ques.) 1232 (ii).

Peace and Athabasca Rivers, Treaty with Indians (Ques.) 825 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1175 (ii).

Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2°, 768 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 303-309 (i).

Snetsinger, Mr., employment and dismissal by Govt. (Ques.) 825 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Collection of Revenues: Canals (Repairs, &c.) 1624 (ii).

Canals—Capital (Sault St. Marie) 1442; (Welland) 1453; (Trent River Nav.) 1454, 1460 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1539, 1541. Roads and Bridges, 1677 (ii).

Trent Valley Canal Commission (M. for Ret.) 71 (i).

Victoria County (Ont.) Postal Service (Ques.) 825 (ii).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., Berthier.

Criminal Laws, distribution to Justices of the Peace (Ques.) 59 (i).

Ice-breakers in county of Berthier (Ques.) 45 (i).

Judges of Provincial Court Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1691 (ii).

Labor Commission, certified copies of Depositions (Ques.) 171 (i).

— complaints against Chairman (Ques.) 171 (i).

— Instructions issued (M. for copies*) 672 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 392-396 (i).

St. Lawrence River Floods, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 60 (i).

SUPPLY :

Collection of Revenues (Culling, contingencies) 1667 (ii).

Public Works: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1563 (ii).

Béchar, Mr. F., Iberville.

St. John and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Co.'s B. 7 (Mr. *Vanasse*) on M. for 2°, 530 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 463-467 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Beauharnois.

St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 66, 1°*) 380 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Government (Sec. of State) 1641 (ii).

Bergin, Mr. D., Cornwall and Stormont.

Printing Com. (M. to conc. in Reprs.) 454 (i).
 South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. Hall) on
 M. for 3^o (Amt.) 6 m. h., 912; neg. (Y. 57; N. 86)
 953 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 1634 (ii).

Bernier, Mr. M. E., St. Hyacinthe.

Criminal Laws, distribution to Justices of the Peace
 (Ques.) 59 (i).

Ice-breakers in county of Berthier (Ques.) 45 (i).
 St. Lawrence River Floods (Ques.) 899 (ii).

Borden, Mr. F. W., King's N.S.

Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cart-
 wright) and Amts., 358-362 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1133 (ii).

Bourassa, Mr. F., St Johns, Q.

Isle aux Noix Wharf (Ques.) 955 (i).

Bowell, Hon. M., North Hastings.

Behring's Sea, Clearances to Vessels (Ans) 44 (i).

Bridges (Ottawa) &c., in Com. of Sup., 1573 (ii).

Buildings in Com. of Sup., 1535 (ii).

Can. Gazette, in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com.,
 1256 (ii).

Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr.
Sproule) 1241 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com.,
 1169 (ii).

— Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 129 (i).

Customs Act Amt. (prop. Res.) 499; (B. 92, 1^o*) 598
 (i); 2^o m., 897; in Com., 898, 946, 1001; M. to conc.
 in Sen. Amts., 1472 (ii).

— Seizures at Quebec, on M. for Cor., 1068 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 1666 (ii).

Debates, Official, distribution to Press (remarks) 752 (i).

Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 in Com., 868 (ii).

Hawke, J. T., impugning Judge's decision, on Ques. of
 Priv. (Mr. Davies) 1301 (ii).

Labor Commission, certified copies of Depositions
 (Ans.) 171 (i).

— Composition and Amounts paid (Ans.) 1468 (ii).

— Cost (Ans.) 494 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).

Logs, Shingle-bolts, &c., Duties collected (Ans.) 86 (i).

N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald)
 in Com., 1481 (ii).

Printing, Paper, &c, in Com. of Sup., 1031, 1611 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1431 (ii).

Ry. Commission, distribution of Evidence (Ans.)
 867 (ii).

Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.

Reciprocity with U. S., entry of certain articles free of
 Duty, 521 (i).

— on personal explanation (Mr. Davies) 239 (i).

— Rep. of Minister of Customs (Ans.) 647 (i).

Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir Charles Tupper)
 in Com. on Res, 891 (ii).

Rimouski Customs Collector (Ans.) 1067 (ii).

Statistical Diagrams, in Com. of Sup., 1164 (ii).

SUPPLY: (prop. Res. for Com.) 17 (i):

Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners, salaries) 129 (i).

Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1666 (ii).

Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1172 (ii).

Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing, Paper, &c) 1031 (ii)

Miscellaneous (*Can. Gazette*) 1611; (Labor Commission) 1658;
 (Printing) 1611; (Statistical Diagrams) 1164 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Que.) 1535. Roads and
 Bridges (Ottawa) 1573 (ii).

Trade and Navigation Tables (presented) 18 (i).

Ways and Means—(prop. Res. for Com.) 17 (i).

— The Tariff, in Com., 1129 (ii).

Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M.
 for 2^o, 918 (ii).

Wrecking in American Waters, on M. for papers, &c.,
 665 (i).

Bowman, Mr. I. E., North Waterloo.

Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cart-
 wright) and Amts., 543-547 (i).

Fire Insurance Risks under Dom. License (M. for
 Ret.*) 866 (ii).

Militia Clothing, Tenders and Contracts (M. for Ret.*)
 866 (ii).

Boyle, Mr. A., Monck.

Fraud, Prevention of, by Tree Peddlers, &c. (B. 105,
 1^o*) 899 (ii).

St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. (B 137) M. to
 suspend Rule 61 and 1^o*, 1522 (ii)

Trade Combinations, extension of powers of Sel. Com.
 (prop. M.) 103 (i).

Brien, Mr. J., South Essex.

Life-boat Service, in Com. of Sup., 1578 (ii).

Pelee Island and Mainland Cable, on M. for Com. of
 Sup. (remarks) 1011 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1187 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cart-
 wright) and Amts., 508-511 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia (Military Properties) 1221 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Rewards for Saving Life, &c.) 1578 (ii).

Brown, Mr. A., Hamilton.

Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr.
Sproule) 1240 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com.,
 1438 (ii).

Cruelty to Animals further provision (B. 29, 1^o) 97 (i).

Brown, Mr. A.—Continued.

Fraudulent Practices on Farmers (prop. Res. for Sp. Com.) 1244 (ii).

— examination of Witnesses on Oath (M.) 1382 (ii)

Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1408 (ii).

Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 904 (ii).

Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 288-294 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Capital Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 1462 (ii)

Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1666 (ii).

Tobique Valley Ry. Res (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1626 (ii).

White, Hon. Thos., decease of (remarks) 963 (ii).

Bryson, Mr. John, Pontiac.

La Banque Nationale Capital Stock reduction (B. 23, 1°*) 73 (i).

Pontiac and Renfrew Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 42, 1°*) 206 (i).

Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 496 (i); on M for Com., 1148 (ii).

Burdett, Mr. S. B., East Hastings.

Culbertson, Archibald, dismissal (M. for Cor.) 977 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners, salaries) 135 (i).

Burns, Mr. K. F., Gloucester.

Tobique, Gypsum and Colonisation Ry. Co.'s (B. 79, 1°*) 489 (i).

Cameron, Mr. H., Inverness.

Cape Breton Ry. Contractors' Sureties (Ques.) 1067 (ii).

Inverness and Richmond Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 1232 (ii).

Isbester & Reid, Messrs., completion of Contract (Ques.) 1067 (ii).

Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 610-611 (i).

SUPPLY:

Quarantins (Medical Inspection) 1197 (ii).

Campbell, Mr. A., Kent, O.

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Out.) 1667, 1674 (ii).

Railways—Capital (I.C.R.) 1652 (ii).

Carling, Hon. J., London.

Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).

— depl. Rep. (Ans.) 26 (presented) 455 (i).

Archives, in Com. of Sup., 1149 (ii).

Buttermaking, Translation of Pamphlet (Ans.) 98 (i).

Cattle Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).

Census, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1155 (ii).

Carling, Hon. J.—Continued.

Cincinnati Centennial Exhibition, Canadian representation (Ans.) 1136 (ii).

Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).

Concurrence, salaries, 1686 (ii).

Contingencies, Deptl., in Com. of Sup., 104 (i).

Criminal and Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1151 (ii).

Emigration from Dakota to Man. (Ans.) 495 (i).

Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1554 (ii).

— in Man. (Ans.) 495 (i).

Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).

"Horse Breeding in Can." Translation of Pamphlet (Ans.) 85 (i).

Lynch's Pamphlet on Dairy Practice, German Translation (Ans.) 496 (i).

Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).

Merrick, Richard, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 647 (i).

Monek, Richard, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 712 (i).

Patents of Invention (B. 38, 1°) 124; Deputy Commissioner (prop. Res.) 125 (i); 2° m. and in Com., 1511; 3° m., 1547 (ii).

Pauper Immigration (Ans.) 964; on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1595 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 1156 (ii).

Regina, accommodation for Immigrants (Ans.) 712 (i).

Royal Military College, conc., 1687 (ii).

Smyth, Henry, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 495, 647 (i).

Statistics, Criminal, Rep. (presented) 1551 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives) 1149; (Census, &c.) 1155; (Colonial and Indian Exhibition) 1638; (Criminal and Health Statistics) 1151; (Experimental Farms) 1154 (ii).

Civil Government (Agriculture) 95; (contingencies) 104 (i).

Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1160; conc., 1886; (Gratuities) 1638; (Pauper) 1156; (Pamphlets) 1160 (ii).

Militia (Royal Military College) conc. 1687 (ii).

Quarantine (Cattle, Que.) 1200; (Medical Inspection) 1195 (ii).

Wateret, P., employment as Immigration Agent (Ans.) 966 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P., K.C.M.G., Quebec County.

Ammunition, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1211 (ii).

Brigade Majors, in Com of Sup., 1209 (ii).

Cartridges, Rep. of Commission on Manufacture (Ans.) 1232 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1436 (ii).

Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1212 (ii).

Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 1217 (ii).

Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1213 (ii).

Drill Shed at Quebec, Water Supply (Ans.) 85 (i).

Fenian Raid (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).

Military Branch and District Staff, in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).

Militia and Defence, deptl., Rep. (presented) 18 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).

Caron, Hon. Sir A. P.—Continued.

- Militia, Books relating to Force, French Edition (Ans.) 85 (i).
- Properties, in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
- School, St. Johns (Q.) services of Chaplain, on M. for Ret., 654 (i).
- Neely, Private T., provision for Widow, &c., on M. for Ret., 650 (i).
- Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1600 (ii).
- Permanent Forces, in Com. of Sup., 1219 (ii).
- Properties, in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
- Rebellion of 1885 (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1202, 1205 (ii).
- Strange, Gen., compensation for loss of Pension (Ans.) 140 (i).
- Rep. submitted to Militia Dept. (Ans.) 98 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Civil Government* (Militia and Defence) 92 (i).
- Militia* (Ammunition, &c) 1211; (Brigade Majors) 1209; (Olothing, &c.) 1212; (contingencies) 1217; (Drill Pay, &c.) 1213; (Military Branch and District Staff) 1209; (Military Properties) 1221; (Permanent Forces) 1219 (ii).
- Pensions* (Fenian Raid) 1201; (Rebellion of 1885) 1202, 1205; (Vets. of 1812) 1201 (ii).
- Veterans of 1837, Pensions (Ans.) 85 (i).
- Veterans of 1866-70, Medals (Ans.) 965 (ii).
- York-Simcoe Battalion, Kit Allowance, on M. for Ret., 68 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J., K.C.M.G., South Oxford.

- Adams, David J.*, in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).
- Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 1619 (ii).
- Adjournment for Easter (Ques.) 344 (i).
- Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 96 (i).
- deptl. Rep. (Ques.) 26 (i).
- Alberta District, N. W. T., Leaseholders (M. for Ret.*) 498 (i).
- Banks and Banking, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 415 (i).
- Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 970 (ii).
- Bridges (Ottawa) in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).
- B. C. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1024 (ii).
- BUDGET, The (Ques.) 97, 822 (i); (reply) 1049 (Amt.) (1061) neg. (Y. 66; N. 117) 1120 (ii).
- Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1466, 1535, 1655 (ii).
- Business of the House (remarks) 125, 416, 457 (i).
- on M. to change hour of meeting, 1500 (ii).
- on M. to meet at 10 a.m., 1625 (ii).
- Can. Gazette*, in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).
- Can. Temp. Act, in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).
- on prop. Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 81 (i).
- C. P. R., B.C. Sections (Ques.) 86 (i).
- (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles Tupper) on prop. Res., 1001; in Com., 1377, 1388 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 1223 (ii).
- Lands, Stmt. of Sales (Ques.) 496 (i).
- Mortgage, enquiry for papers, 1586 (ii).
- Mortgage for Guaranteed Bonds (Ques.) 1506 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).
- Cattle Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
- Cayuga, Indian Lands near, appointment of Commissioners (Ques.) 27 (i).
- P. O., purchase of site (Ques.) 28 (i).
- Chambly Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 940 (ii).
- Civil Service Act Amt B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1435, 1469 (ii).
- Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 113, 129 (i).
- Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
- Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1616 (ii).
- Concurrence, 1685 (ii).
- Consolidated Fund, Receipts and Expenditure (M. for Ret.*) 38 (i).
- Consolidation of the Statutes, in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).
- Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 104 (i) 1218, (ii).
- County Judges (Ont.) salaries increase (Ques.) 899 (ii).
- Criminal Procedure Act Amt B. 123 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1513 (ii).
- Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1619, 1634 (ii).
- Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Bowell) in Com., 947, 1400 (ii).
- Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1629, 1666 (ii).
- Débats du Conseil Legislatif, in Com. of Sup., 1662 (ii).
- Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on reading Papers (remarks) 41 (i).
- on Ques. of Order, 721 (i).
- on prop. Res. (Mr. Laurier) 743 (i).
- distribution to Press (remarks) 750 (i).
- Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. to conc. in Res., 1383; in Com. on B., 1388 (ii).
- Delaney, Mrs. (pension) in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Thompson) on M. for 1°, 515 (i); on M. for 2° (Ques.) 942; in Com., 1144 (ii).
- Lands Act Amt B. 131 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 1514; on M. for 3°, 1549 (ii).
- Agents for Man. and N. W. T., Instructions, on M. for Ret., 37 (i).
- Man and N. W. T., Receipts from Sales (Ques.) 44 (i).
- Mines in Com. of Sup., 1635 (ii).
- Dom. Notes, Printing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 90 (i).
- Dorchester Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1021 (ii).
- Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1569 (ii).
- ESTIMATES, The, on presentation, (remarks) 50 (i).
- Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1653 (ii).
- Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
- Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1618, 1667 (ii).
- Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1575 (ii).
- Exports and Imports (M. for Ret.) 28 (i).
- Extra Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1615, 1637 (ii).
- Fabre, Mr. (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1614 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Fisheries Treaty, papers respecting (remarks) 20, 62, 99 (i)
 ——— Ratification B. 65 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 844–849; in Com., 873 (ii).
 ——— Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1662 (ii).
 ——— Reports, *re* superannuation of Valiquette (remarks) 1507 (ii).
 Franchise Electoral Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. Chapleau) on M. for 2°, 1550 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1641 (ii).
 Fraudulent Trade Marks on Merchandise Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 943, 1004 (ii).
 Free List, O. C. respecting (remarks) 648 (i).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1405 (ii).
 German Emperor's Death, Official Information (Ques.) 110 (i).
 ——— (late Crown Prince) rumored death (Ques.) 206 (i).
 Govt. Business (remarks) 416, 457 (i).
 Govt. in N. W. T. (expenses) in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).
 Grazing Leases in the N. W. T. (Ques.) 495 (i).
 Gratuities to Canal Employés, in Com. of Sup., 1646 (ii).
 Grenville Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
 Haldimand, Dep. Returning Officer (Ques.) 648 (i).
 ——— (M. to adjn. House) 922, 930 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1462, 1562, 1656, 1674 (ii).
 High Commissioner's contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 105, 109 (i).
 ——— Office, application of Civil Service Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1502, 1506; on M. for 3°, 1547 (ii).
 Hot Springs (roads, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1617 (ii).
 Indemnity, Members, in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
 Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1010 (ii).
 Indian Affairs, in Com. of Sup., 1627 (ii).
 Imperial Federation, on Res. (remarks) 1091 (ii).
 Indians, in Com. of Sup., 1606, 1682 (ii).
 Immigrants, Pauper (Ques.) 934 (ii).
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1595 (ii).
 Inland Revenue Dept., in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
 Insurance Act Amt. B. 126 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 1400 (ii).
 I. C. R., Receipts and Expenditure (Ques.) 65, 112 (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1224, 1620, 1651 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 912 (ii).
 Jones, Walter, and Haldimand Election (prop. Res.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1524; neg. (Y. 58; N. 98) 1533 (ii).
 Justice Dept., in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).
 Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1672 (ii).
 ——— Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 162 (i).
 ——— Post Office *re* Defalcations, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1012 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Labor Commission, Evidence before (Ques.) 98 (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, dismissal of Laborers (remarks) 1649.
 Life-boat Service, in Com. of Sup., 1578 (ii).
 Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1021 (ii).
 Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1197 (ii).
 Military Branch and District Staff, in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1391 (ii).
 Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 93 (i), 1610, 1683 (ii).
 Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1646 (ii).
 Newfoundland and Confederation, on M. for Cor., 664.
 N.W.T. Representation B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 1475; in Com., 1480 (ii).
 Obstructions, &c., in Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1531 (ii).
 O. C.'s collecting, in Com. of Sup., 1618 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. Ives) personal allusions, 524, 555 (i).
 Ottawa, additional Building, in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1231 (ii).
 Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Carling) in Com., 1512 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup. 1595 (ii).
 ——— (Ques.) 964 (ii).
 Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1639, 1671 (ii).
 Printing Bureau, in Com. of Sup., 92 (i), 1616 (ii).
 Printing, in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Davin) 1093 (ii).
 ——— (Mr. Mitchell) Reciprocity deb., 345 (i).
 ——— (Mr. Mitchell) despatches *re* admission of Newfoundland into Confederation, 111 (i).
 Post Office and Finance Depts., computing Interest, in Com. of Sup., 112 (i).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1634, 1684 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1185, 1418, 1492 (ii).
 Railways and Canals, Cost (Ques.) 141, 170 (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1637 (ii).
 ——— Dept., in Com. of Sup., 97 (i).
 Real Property in Ter. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1412 (ii).
 Rebellion (1885) Claims of Scouts, &c., on Res. (Mr. Davin) to reconsid., 1243 (ii).
 ——— Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1202, 1205 (ii)
 Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) on fixing day for deb., 26 (i).
 ——— Res. First Order of the Day (Ms.) 43, 86 (i).
 ——— attention of Govt. called to Retaliatory Bill 516 (i).
 ——— on M. to adjn. deb. (remarks) 822 (i).
 ——— Protocols (remarks) 74 (i).
 Regina Jail, in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).
 Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. to conc. in Res. and in Com. on B., 931 (ii).
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1646, 1671 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—Continued.

Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1675 (ii).
 Ste. Anne's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
 St. Ours Locks, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 136 (i).
 Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1624 (ii).
 Schools, Indian (Man.) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (ii).
 Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 92 (i), 1640, 1668 (ii).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1025, 1668 (ii).
 Sinking Fund, in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).
 Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1620, 1684 (ii).
 Statistical Diagrams, in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).
 Strange, Gen., compensation for loss of Pension (Ques.) 140 (i).
 Subsidies to Provinces, in Com. of Sup., 1604 (ii).
 ——— (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1587 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U.S. (prop. Res.) 144-161; neg 646 (i)

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 114, 117; (Exchequer Court) 119 (i); conc., 1635 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives, payment to O. C. Chipman) 1149; (Colonial and Indian Exhibition) 1638; (Experimental Farms) 1575; (Health Statistics) 1152 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Cornwall) conc, 1637; (Gratuities) 1646; (Grenville) 1459; (Murray) 1646; (Ste. Anne's) 1459; (Tay) 1460; (Welland) conc., 1-88. *Income* (Chambly) 1460; (Miscellaneous) 1646; (Rideau) 1646, 1671; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1624; (St. Ours Locks) 1460; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 1460; (Welland) 1460 (ii).
Charges of Management (Auditor and Asst. Rec. Gen., Winnipeg) 88; (Printing Dom. Notes) 90; (Sinking Fund) 89 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 96; (Auditor General's Office) 95; (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 113, 129; (contingencies) 104; (Fisheries) 96; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 85; (High Commissioner's contingencies) 105, 109 (i); (Indian Affairs) 1627 (ii); (Inland Revenue) 95; (Justice) 91; (Mounted Police) 93; (Post Office and Finance, computing Interest) 112 (i); (Post Office) 1638 (ii); (Printing and Stationery) 92; (Rys. and Canals) 97 (i), 1637 (ii); (Sec. of State) 92 (i), 1640, 1668 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Culling Timber) 1619, 1619, 1684; (Out-toms) 1629, 1666; (Excise) 1618, 1667; (I. C. R., Repairs, &c.) 1620; (Post Office) 1634, 1684; (Public Works) conc., 1688; (Slides and Booms, salaries, &c.) 1620, 1684 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Income (Mines) 1635 (ii).
Fisheries (David J. Adams) 1656 (ii).
Immigration (Pauper) 1155; (Pamphlets) 1160; (salaries, &c.) conc., 1686 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 1682; (Man. schools) 1681; (Ont. and Que.) 1606 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Indemnities) 1670; (salaries, &c.) 1025; (Sessional Clerks) 1025, 1668. *Miscellaneous* (Franchise Act) 1641; (Library, purchase of books, &c.) 1030 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses, &c.) 1681 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Antwerp and Canada) conc., 1689; (U. S. and Victoria, B.C.) 1680 (ii).
Militia (contingencies) 1217, 1644; (Military Branch and District Staff) 1209 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Can. Gazette) 1611; (Commercial Agencies) 1616; (Consolidation of Statutes) 1663; (Debats du Conseil Legislatif) 1662; (Extra Clerks) 1615, 1637; conc., 1688; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1614; (Fishery Commission) 1662; (Govt. in N.W.T.) 1611; (Govt. Printing Bureau, Plant, &c.) 1616; conc., 1689; (Hot Springs, Banff) 1617; (Labor Com-

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R. J.—Continued.

mission) 1658; (O.C.'s, collecting) 1618; (Printing) 1611; (Preparing Returns) conc., 1688; (Royal Military College) conc., 1687; (Statistical Diagrams) 1663 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1610, 1683 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Obstructions in Rivers) 1581; (Rewards for saving Life, &c.) 1578 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B.C.) 1024; (Dorchester) 1021 (ii); (Kingston) 122 (i); (Man.) conc., 1686 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 136 (i).
Pensions, 1639; (Mrs. Delaney) 1201; (P.E.I.) 1671; (Rebellion of 1885) 1202, 1642; (Vets. of 1812) 1201 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Esquimaux Graving Dock) 1653; (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1463; (Harbors and Rivers) 1462; (Kingston Graving Dock) 1672. *Buildings* (Ottawa, additional) 1461. *Income*: Buildings (Man.) 1542; (N.S.) 1466; (N.W.T.) 1672; (Ont.) 1537, 1541; (Que.) 1535 (ii); (Repairs, &c.) 655 (i). *Dredging*, 1569. *Harbors and Rivers*, 1642, 1562, 1686, 1674. *Roads and Bridges*, 1675. *Telegraph Lines*, 1677 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle, Que.) 1200; (Medical Inspection) 1197 (ii).
Railways—Capital (C.P.R.) 1223; (I.C.R.) 1224, 1661; (Oxford and New Glasgow Ry.) 1231. *Income* (Surveys, &c.) 1460 (ii).
Subsidies to Provinces, 1604 (ii).
 Tariff Changes (remarks) 24 (i).
 Tay Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
 Telegraph Lines, in Com. of Sup., 1574, 1677 (ii).
 Thorold Canal, Water Power (Ques.) 647 (i).
 Trade Combinations, on prop. M. to extend powers of Sel Com., 163 (i).
 ——— B. 138 (Mr. Wallace) on M. to introd., 1545 (ii).
 Travis, ex-Judge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
 Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
 U. S. and Victoria, B. C., Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1680 (ii).
 Ventilation of House of Commons (remarks) 171 (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1200, (ii).
 Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup. 1201 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Budget, 1049; (Amt.) 1061; neg. (Y. 66; N. 117) 1120 (ii).
 ——— The Tariff, in Com., 1121 (ii).
 Weights and Measures, in Com. of Sup., 1619 (ii).
 Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
 ——— River, Bridge at Chippawa Village (Ques.) 65 (i).
 Windsor Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1623 (ii).
 Wrecking Vessels in American Waters, on M. for papers, &c., 667 (i).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 754 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E., West Elgin.
 Banks, Supervision by Govt., on Res. (Mr. Casgrain) 672 (i).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) on M. for 2^o, 999 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chappleau) in Com., 1438 (ii).
 ——— Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 130 (i).
 Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 1218 (ii).
 Culbute Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Ques. of Order, 720 (i).
 ——— on Res. (Mr. Laurier) 732 (i).
 ——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 823 (ii).
 Debt., Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1280 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.

- Fabre, Mr. H (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).
 Fisheries Treaty, bringing down papers (remarks) 63 (i).
 ——— omission of papers (remarks) 142 (i).
 ——— Ratification B. 65 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 872 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Davies) 1329 (ii).
 Imperial Federation, on Res. (Mr. Marshall) 1078 (ii).
 Labor Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1292 (ii).
 Permanent Forces, in Com. of Sup., 1219 (ii).
 Post Office and Finance Depts., computing Interest, in Com. of Sup., 112 (i).
 Ry. Commission, dstbtn. of Papers (remarks) 867 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., new-paper Cor. re entry of certain articles free of Duty, 493 (i).
 ——— Proposals of Plenipotentiaries, presented (remarks) 88 (i).
 Revenue and Audit Act B. 87 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 891; in Com. on Res., 892 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Canals—Capital* (Culbute) 1460; (Tay) 1460; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 1459 (ii).
Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 130; (Post Office and Finance, computing Interest) 112 (i).
Militia (contingencies) 1218; (Permanent Forces) 1219 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Labor Commission) 1658 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1658 (ii).
 Tay Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
 Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
 Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for 2°, 777 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. P. B., L'Islet.

- Banks, Supervision by Govt. (Ques.) 18 (i).
 ——— (prop. Res.) 668 (i).
 Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. (Ques.) 73, 516 (i).
 Fisheries Treaty, on non-production of papers (M. to adjn. Hse.) 143 (i).
 Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 120 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Quarantine* (Medical Inspection) 1200 (ii).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. Thompson) on M. for 1°, 961 (ii).

Chairman, The (Mr. C. C. Colby) Stanstead.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 1246 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 1254 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1440 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, dismissal of Laborers (Ques. of Order) in Com. of Sup., 1648 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 1485 (ii).
 Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. 33 (Mr. Carling) in Com., 1512 (ii).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A., Terrebonne.

- Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 13, 1°) 62 (i).
 ——— Act Amt. (B. 117, 1°) 1063; 2° m. and in Com., 1433 (ii).
 ——— Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 113, 128 (i).
 ——— List, Canada (presented) 172 (i).
 Concurrence, 1689 (ii).
 Criminal Laws, distribution to Justices of the Peace (Ans.) 59 (i).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on presentation of papers, 39 (i).
 ——— on Ques. of Order, 719, 746 (i).
 ——— on Res. (Mr. Laurier) 716 (i).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 138 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1270 (ii).
 Dorchester Election, date of Issue of Speaker's Warrant (Ans.) 27 (i).
 ——— delay in issuing Warrant (Ans.) 59 (i).
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1654 (ii).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. (B. 117, 1°) 1063; 2° m., 1549; (B. 5) 3° m., 1536 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1641, 1668 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Davies) 1302 (ii).
 L'Assomption Election, Issue of Writ (Ans.) 110 (i).
 Printing and Stationery, Public, Act Amt. (B. 60, 1°*) 341 (i); 2° m. and in Com., 1005 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 92 (i); conc. 1689 (ii).
 ——— depl. Rep. (presented) 138 (i).
 Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1640 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 565-571 (i).
 Sec. of State's Rep. (presented) 20 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1590 (ii).
- SUPPLY :**
- Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 113; (Printing and Stationery) 92 (i); (Secretary of State) 1640, 1668 (ii).
Legislation (Franchise Act) 1641, 1668 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Printing Bureau, Plant, &c.) conc., 1689 (ii).
Pensions, 1640 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1654 (ii).
 Returns, on enquiry for (remarks) 1136 (ii).
 Voters' Lists under Franchise Act, Amount paid (Ans.) 27 (i).
 ——— Revision, Suspension (Ans.) 965 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. J., North Norfolk.

- Boundary between Alaska and Canada (Ques.) 171 (i).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1672 (ii).
 Business of the House, on M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) to take in Wednesdays, 1061 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 823, 1298 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1263 (ii).
 Dom. Lands Agents in Man. and N.W.T., Instructions, on M. for Ret., 37 (i).
 Fisheries Treaty, papers respecting (Ques.) 62 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1^o, 1063 (ii).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1408 (ii)
 Graving Dock, Kingston, in Com. of Sup., 1672 (ii).
 I. C. R., Receipts and Expenditure (Ques.) 65 (i).
 Kingston Deputy Postmaster's Irregularities (Ques.) 899 (ii).
 Maritime Court of Ont., extension of Jurisdiction (B. 40, 1^o*) 124 (i).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1281 (ii).
 Order (Ques. of) *re* Reciprocity deb., 523 (i).
 Ry. Act. Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1177 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amt., 206-223 (i).
 ——— newspaper Cor. *re* entry of certain articles free of Duty, 493, 521 (i).
 Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1446 (ii).
 Shannon, Wm, payment by Govt. of defalcations (Ques.) 965 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
 Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1446 (ii).
 Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1672. Kingston Graving Dock, 1672 (ii).
 Ventilation of House of Commons (remarks) 171 (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1672 (ii).
 Welland River, Bridge at Chippawa Village (Ques.) 65 (i).
 Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2^o, 772 (i).
 Wrecking Vessels in American waters, on M. for papers, &c., 667 (i).

Chisholm, Mr. D., New Westminster.

- SUPPLY:
 Mounted Police, 1662 (ii).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., Montmagny.

- Criminal Laws, distribution to Members (Ques.) 86 (i).
 Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com. (Translators) on M. to conc., 1501 (ii).
 Dorchester Election, delay in issuing Warrant (Ques.) 59 (i).
 I. C. R., Receipts and Expenditure (Ques.) 27 (i).
 ——— St. Charles Branch, Expenditure (Ques.) 97 (i).
 Land Villa Postmastership (M. for Ret.) 102 (i).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 294-293 (i).
 Voters' Lists under Franchise Act, Amount paid (Ques.) 27 (i).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R., Centre Toronto.

- Federal Bank of Canada (B. 51, 1^o*) 270 (i).
 Lake Nipissing and James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 37, 1^o*) 124 (i).

Cockburn, Mr. G. R. R.—Continued.

- N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1496 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 322-328 (i).
 SUPPLY:
 Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives, payment to O. C. Chipman) 1150; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1612 (ii).
 Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1450 (ii).
 Immigration (Pauper) 1158 (ii).
 Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 1462 (ii)

Colby, Mr. C. C., Stanstead.

- Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1298. [See also "Chairman" and "Speaker, Deputy."]

Cook, Mr. H. H., East Simcoe.

- Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1462, 1539 (ii).
 Bridges (Ottawa) in Com. of Sup., 1572 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1277 (ii).
 Engineers, Examination and Licensing provision (B. 103, 1^o*) 899 (ii).
 Fabre, Mr. (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1613 (ii).
 Fishery Overseers, in Com. of Sup., 1583 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1462, 1568 (ii).
 High Commissioner's Office, application of Civil Service Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1506 (ii).
 Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1023 (ii).
 Midland Harbor Improvements (M. for Cor.)* 1259 (ii)
 Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1496 (ii).
 Ottawa, additional Building, in Com. of Sup., 1462 (ii).
 Patents of Invention Act Amt B. 38 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1511 (ii).
 Penetanguishene Custom House, vacancy, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1020 (ii).
 ——— Midland, &c., Public Works (Ques.) 647 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. (B. 94, 1^o) 598 (i)
 ——— B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1185 (ii).
 Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2^o, 762 (i).
 Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1572 (ii).
 Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1442 (ii).
 Sherwood, Mr. A. P., and C. Breton Ry. (Ques.) 965 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1590 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
 Canals—Capital (Murray) 1453; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1442; (Trent River Nav.) 1454 (ii).
 Fisheries (salaries, &c., Overseers) 1583 (ii).
 Indians (Ont. and Que.) 1607 (ii).
 Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary) 1613 (ii).
 Penitentiaries (Man.) 1023 (ii).
 Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 1462. Harbors and Rivers, 1462, 1568. *Income*: Buildings (Ont.) 1539. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 1572 (ii).
 Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1454 (ii).

Cook, Mr. H. H.—Continued.

Ventilation of the House, in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1114, 1120 (ii).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 756 (i).

Costigan, Hon. J., Victoria, N.B.

Adulteration Act Amt. (B. 47, 1°) 238 (i); in Com., 932 (ii).
 Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 1619 (ii).
 Analysis of Intoxicating Liquors (Ans.) 965 (ii).
 Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1619 (ii).
 Excise (salaries, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1618 (ii).
 Ferries Act Amt. (B. 39, 1°) 124 (i); in Com., 895 (ii).
 Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 122, 1°) 1137; in Com., 1401 (ii).

Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1620 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Inland Revenue) 95 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Adulteration of Food) 1619; (Culling Timber) 1619; (Excise) 1618; (Slides and Booms) 1620; (Weights and Measures) 1618 (ii).
 Tobacco, Canadian Leaf, Purchase and Sale (Ans.) 66.
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. (Ans.) 97 (i).
 ——— (B. 118, 1°) 1093 (ii).
 ——— salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1618 (ii).

Coughlin, Mr. T., North Middlesex.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1470 (ii).

Coulombe, Mr. C. J., Maskinongé.

Maskinongé and Nipissing Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 52, 1°*) 270 (i).

Couture, Mr. P., Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Buttermaking, Translation of Pamphlet (Ques.) 93 (i).
 Fatre, Mr., in Com. of Sup., 1615 (ii).
 Lake St. John Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 1627 (ii).
 Quebec and Dequen Mail Service (Ques.) 98 (i).
 ——— and Lake St. John Ry. Subsidy (Ques.) 1432 (ii).
 Saguenay and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s transfer (Ques.) 1433 (ii).
 ——— River Buoys, Contract for maintaining, &c. (Ques.) 1433 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1615 (ii).

Curran, Mr. J. J., Centre Montreal.

Analysis of Intoxicating Liquors (Ques.) 965 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1440 (ii).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1407 (ii).
 G. T. R. Co.'s (B. 36, 1°*) 124 (1).
 ——— Double Track, application for assistance (Ques.) 1432 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, dismissal of Laborers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1647 (ii).
 Merchants Marine Ins. Co.'s winding-up (B. 11, 1°*) 62; 2° m., 125; adjd. deb. for 2° rsmd., 322 (i).

Curran, Mr. J. J.—Continued.

Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1289 (ii).
 ——— Govt. Relief (Ques.) 27 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 3°, 1509 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 310–317 (i).
 South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. *Hall*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 953 (ii).
 SUPPLY.
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1170 (ii).
 Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 921 (ii).

Daly, Mr. T. M., Seikirk.

C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1352; in Com., 1382 (ii).
 Church and Manse Building Fund Act Amt. (B. 97, 1°*) 711 (i).
 Great N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 25, 1°*) 85 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H., Queen's, P.E.I.

Allen, Warren, compensation for loss of Ice-boat (M. for Ret.) 833 (ii).
 Adulteration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 934 (ii).
 Archives, in Com. of Sup., 1149 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 971 (ii).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1358 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act. Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 1247 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1247 (ii).
 ——— on Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 83 (i).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 807 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1436–1468 (ii).
 ——— Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 113, 130 (i).
 Criminal Procedure Act. Amt. B. 123 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 1173 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 959 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Ques. of Order, 720 (i).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1269; in Com., 1278 (ii).
 Divorce, publication of Evidence (remarks) 1414 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 945 (ii).
 Dom. Notes, Printing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 90 (i).
 Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1154 (ii).
 Fisheries Protection, on M. for adjmnt., 1403 (ii).
 ——— Treaty, omission of papers (remarks) 141 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

- Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2^o, 693-704 (i); in Com., 876 (ii).
- Franchise Electoral Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1^o, 1064 (ii).
- Fraudulent Practices on Farmers, on Res. (Mr. *Brown*) for Com., 1244 (ii).
- Fraudulent Trade Marks on Merchandise Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1002 (ii).
- Gordon, Commander, Reps. *re* Fishery Protection (M. for copies*) 86 (i), 866 (ii).
- Govt. Savings Banks (Interest on Deposits) B. 127 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2^o, 1401 (ii).
- Govt. Wharves and Piers in P.E.I. (Ques.) 965 (ii).
- Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House, 926 (ii).
- Hawke, John T. (Ques. of Priv.) Imprisonment for contempt of Court, 1299 (ii).
- Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1153 (ii).
- I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1225 (i)
- Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1401 (ii).
- Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 909 (ii).
- Kent (Ont.) Controverted Election, on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 22 (i).
- Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii)
- Lévis Graving Dock, Expenditure (Ques.) 1136 (ii).
- Lobster Fishery, Rep. of Commissioners (Ques.) 73; (remarks) 139 (i).
- Merchants Marine Ins. Co.'s B. 11 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2^o, 126 (i).
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1285; in Com. on B., 1391 (ii).
- Northern Light* and Steam Communication with P.E.I. (Ques.) 140 (i).
- Northumberland Straits subway, Engineers' Reps., &c., on M. for copy, 663 (i).
- North Sydney (C.B.) Pilots, Rets. to Govt. (Ques.) 1067.
- Onderdonk Arbitration *re* Plant taken over by Govt. under Award (remarks) 112 (i).
- Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1231.
- Personal Explanation *re* speech on Reciprocity, 239 (i).
- P.E.I. Mail Service, Cor., &c. (M. for Ret.) 47 (i).
- Quebec Harbor Commissioners, Amount advanced by Govt. (Ques.) 1232 (ii).
- (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1297; on M. to conc. in Res., 1393 (ii).
- Real Property in Ter. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1412; in Com. on Res., (ii).
- Rebellion (1885) Claims of Scouts, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to reconsider, 1243 (ii).
- Reciprocity with U. S., entry of certain articles free of Duty (remarks) 519 (i).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

- Reciprocity with U.S., newspaper Cor. *re* entry of certain articles free of Duty, 492 (i).
- on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 172-183 (i).
- proposals of Plenipotentiaries (remarks) on presentation, 87 (i).
- St. Louis Lake, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
- St. Lawrence River Improvements, Montreal and Lake St. Peter (Ques.) 1135 (ii).
- St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 138 (i).
- Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1442 (ii).
- Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).
- Summary Convictions Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1417 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice* (Miscellaneous) 114, 121 (i).
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics*, (Archives) 1149; (Dominion Exhibition) 1148; (Experimental Farms) 1154; (Health Statistics) 1152 (ii).
- Canals—Capital* (Lachine) 1452; (Lake St. Louis) 1453; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1442 (ii).
- Charges of Management* (Printing Dom. Notes) 90 (i).
- Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners, salaries) 113, 130.
- Legislation*: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1025 (ii).
- Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 138 (i).
- Railways—Capital* (O. P. R.) 1231; (I. O. R.) 1225; (Oxford and New Glasgow Ry.) 1231 (ii).
- Supreme and Exchequer Courts (Ques.) 1011 (ii).
- Terms of Union with P. E. I., carrying out (Ques.) 140 (i).
- Territories Real Property Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1412; on Res., 1416 (ii).
- Travis, ex-Judge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
- Ways and Means—The Tariff*, in Com., 1126 (ii).

Dawson, Mr. S. J., Algoma.

- C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1357 (ii).
- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 945 (ii).
- Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 22, 1^o *) 73 (i).
- Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1590 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Canals—Capital* (Sault Ste. Marie) 1442 (ii).
- Indians* (Ont. and Que.) 1605 (i).
- Wrecks on the Great Lakes (M. for Ret.) 19; adjd. deb. rsmd., 723 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F. West Assiniboia.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1258 (ii).
- C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1363 (ii).
- Civil Service List, Errors, &c. (Ques.) 965 (ii).
- Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 51.
- 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 823, 1298 (ii).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—Continued.

- Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 735 (i).
 Debt., Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1267 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) on Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) to M. for 3^o, 1404 (ii).
 Dom. Lands Agents in Man. and N.W.T., Instructions, on M. for Ret., 45 (i).
 Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1406 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Davies*) 1326 (ii).
 Imperial Federation, on Res. (Mr. *Marshall*) (remarks) 1091 (ii).
 Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1011 (ii).
 Personal Explanation *re* paragraph in *Evening Telegram*, 270 (i).
 Privilege (Ques. of) "Flies on the Wheel," 1093 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1194 (ii).
 Real Property in Ter. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1412 (ii).
 Rebellion (1885) Claims of Scouts, &c. (prop. Res. to reconsider) 1242 (ii).
 ——— Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 1202 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amt., 223-234 (i).
 Regina, accommodation for Immigrants (Ques.) 712 (i).
 SUPPLY:
 Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 120 (i).
 Pensions (Rebellion of 1885) 1202 (ii).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 754 (i).

Davis, Mr. D. W., Alberta.

- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. (B. 68, 1^o*) 454 (i).
 Grazing Lands, Lessees and Leases (M. for Ret.*) 866 (ii).
 Inspector of Ranches, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 965 (ii).
 Land Leases, old and unoccupied (Ques.) 825 (ii).
 Mounted Police Headquarters, Edmonton District (Ques.) 965 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1482 (ii).
 Ont., Man. and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 81, 1^o*) 489 (i).
 SUPPLY:
 Indians (B. C.) 1683 (ii).

Denison, Mr. F. C., West Toronto.

- Bottles, &c., Owners Protection (B. 3, 1^o*) 27; 2^o m., 759 (i).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1437 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 51 (i).

Denison, Mr. F. C.—Continued.

- Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1213 (ii).
 Fenian Raid (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 G. T. R. Crossings in Toronto and decision of Ry. Com. of Privy Council (Ques.) 59 (i).
 Neely, Private T., provision for Widow, &c., on M. for Ret., 650 (i).
 Ry. Accidents reported to Govt. and Actions pending (M. for Ret.*) 62 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1186, 1431, 1469, 1494 (ii).
 Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 2^o m., 762 (i); M. to dsehg. Order and ref. B. to Com. on B. 24, 1247 (ii).
 SUPPLY.
 Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 1213 (ii).
 Pensions (Fenian Raid) 1201 (ii).
 Telegraph Lines, acquisition by Govt. (M. for Sel. Com.) 101 (i).

Desjardins, Mr. A., Hochelaga.

- Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 25 (i).
 (M. to conc.) 51 (i).
 ——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (M. to conc.) 489 (i), 823 (ii).
 ——— 3rd Rep. of Com. (M. to conc.) 1501 (ii).
 ——— dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 744 (i).
 ——— distribution to Press (remarks) 750 (i).
 Criminal Procedure Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1513 (ii).
 Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House, 928 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1292 (ii).
 ——— Govt. Relief (Ques.) 27 (i).
 Montreal Island Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 70, 1^o*) 454 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1186 (ii).
 SUPPLY.
 Administration of Justice, conc., 1685 (ii).

Dessaint, Mr. A., Kamouraska.

- Léduc, Chas., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 140 (i).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amt., 203-205 (i).

Dickinson, Mr. G. L., Carleton, O.

- Fraternal and Benevolent Societies incorp. (B. 115) 1^o, 1062 (ii).

Doyon, Mr. C., Laprairie.

- Caughnawaga Indians, Election of Chiefs (M. for Cor., &c.) 899 (ii).
 ——— (Ques.) 1680 (ii).
 ——— Survey of Reserve (Ques.) 495 (i), 1680 (ii).

Dupont, Mr. F., Bagot.

- St. Hyacinthe Public Buildings (M. for Ret.) 651 (i).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 396-401 (i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., West Ontario.

- Adulteration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 933 (ii).
 Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 96 (i).
 Behring's Sea, Clearances to Vessels (Ques.) 44 (i).
 ——— Navigation by Canadian Vessels (Ques.) 44 (i).
 ——— Seizures, on M. for Cor., 973 (ii).
 Bresaylor Half-breeds, Grievances, &c. (remarks) on adjmt. of House, 1259 (ii).
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1515 (ii).
 Bottles and Vessels, &c., Protection to Owners B. 3 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2°, 761 (i).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 1245 (ii).
 Can. Fishing Vessels reporting, &c. (Ques.) 24 (i).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1372; in Com. on B., 1389; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1587 (ii).
 ——— Mortgage, Security for Bonds (Ques.) 1195 (ii).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 936 (ii).
 Copyright, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 98 (i).
 Counterfeit Money, Advertising, B. 108 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1138 (ii).
 Criminal Law of England (extension to Man.) B. 41 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1402 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on presentation of papers, 41 (i).
 ——— on Ques. of Order, 721 (i).
 ——— distribution to Press (remarks) 751 (i).
 Divorce Bills, on M. (Mr. *Small*) to suspend Rule 65, 1468 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 942; in Com., 944, 1138 (ii).
 Ferries Act Amt. B. 39 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 895 (ii).
 Fisheries Commission, Instructions (Ques.) 270 (i).
 ——— Trade Matters, Date of proposal (Ques.) 112.
 ——— Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 861; in Com., 863 (ii).
 ——— papers respecting (remarks) 101 (i).
 ——— further papers respecting (remarks) 238 (i).
 Fraudulent Trade Marks on Merchandise Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1004 (ii).
 ——— (M. for Ret.) 653 (i).
 Free List, O.C. respecting (remarks) 649 (i).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1405 (ii).
 Great N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. *Daly*) on M. for 2°, 128 (i).
 ——— Amount deposited with Govt. (Ques.) 141 (i).
 Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House, 930 (ii).
 Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1007 (ii).
 Insolvency, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 495 (i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—Continued.

- Insurance Act Amt. Bill 126 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1401 (ii).
 Man. and North-Western Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Scarth*) on M. to recom., 953 (ii).
 Man. and N. W. T. Ry. Bills, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to withdr., 1585 (ii).
 Merchants Marine Ins. Co's. B. 11 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 126 (i).
 Militia and Defence Dept., in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
 Monck, Richard, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 899 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1485 (ii).
 Ont. and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ques.) 1432 (ii).
 Oriental, Rep. of Inspector Risley on Loss (Ques.) 966 (ii).
 Patents of Invention, on Res. (Deputy Commissioner of Patents) 125 (i).
 ——— Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1511.
 Post Office, Montreal, Electric Light (Ques.) 1625 (ii).
 Printing Dom. Notes, Contract (M. for copy) 649 (i).
 Printing and Stationery, Public, Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1005 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 93 (i).
 Procedure in Criminal Cases Act Amt. B. 48 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 942 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1175, 1417, 1492; on M. for 3°, 1507; (Amt.) 1507; neg. (Y. 54; N. 93) 1510 (ii).
 Rebellion of 1885 (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1208 (ii).
 Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 890; in Com., 932, 943 (ii).
 St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co's B. 61, on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1315 (ii).
 Sailors, Protection against Wrecks, &c., Legislation (Ques.) 966 (ii).
 Securities to the Crown, Discharge B. 4 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 762 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 99 (Mr. *Foster*) in Com., 1403 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
 Civil Government (Agriculture) 96; (Militia and Defence) 92; (Printing and Stationery) 93 (i).
 Pensions (Rebellion of 1885) 1208 (ii).
 Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) for Sel. Com., 29; (Amt.) 31 (i).
 Treason and Felony Forfeitures Abolition B. 88 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1147 (ii).
 "Trusts" or "Combines" (M. for Sel. Com.) withdn., 60 (i).
 Welland Canal, deepening Section "A" (Ques.) 496 (i).
 Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 918 (ii).
 Wrecking Vessels in American Waters (M. for papers, &c.) 665 (i).

Eisenhauer, Mr. J. D., Lunenburg.

Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 78°-790 (i).

Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 908 (ii).

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1588 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1465 (ii).

Dredging, 1570 (ii).

Fisheries (Bounty, expenses, &c.) 1604 (ii).

Ellis, Mr. J. V., St. John, N.B., City.

Albert Ry. Co.'s Loan Account (Ques.) 826 (ii).

Banks, Supervision by Govt., on Res. (Mr. Casgrain) 672 (i).

Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1468 (ii).

Cavalry and Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 1220 (ii).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 936 (ii).

Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1274 (ii).

Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1570 (ii).

Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 857 (ii).

Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1563 (ii).

I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1229 (ii).

Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 906 (ii).

Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. to conc. in Res., 1397 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 335-344 (i).

St. John Harbor Improvements, Mr. Perley's Rep. (Ques.) 86 (i).

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1593 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Militia (Cavalry and Infantry Schools) 1220 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Water Police) 1581 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N. B.) 1468. *Dredging*, 1570. Harbors and Rivers, 1563 (ii).

Railways—Capital (I. O. R.) 1229 (ii).

Tobique Valley Ry. (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1626 (ii).

Water Police, in Com. of Sup., 1581 (ii).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., Leeds and Grenville.

Debates, Official, distribution to Press (remarks) 752(i).

Ferguson, Mr. J., South Renfrew.

Ottawa and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 75, 1°*) 454 (i).

Ferguson, Mr. J., Welland.

Buffalo, Chippawa and Niagara Falls Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 67, 1°*) 415 (i).

Ferguson, Mr. J.—Continued.

Can. Southern and Erie and Niagara Ry. Co.'s (B. 9, 1°*) 51 (i).

Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1267 (ii).

Detroit River Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 31, 1°*) 110 (i).

Great Western and Lake Ont. Shore Junction Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 18, 1°*) 73 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 453-463 (i).

St. Clair River Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s. (B. 17, 1°*) 73 (i).

Fiset, Mr. J. B. R., Rimouski.

Fortin, N., accident on I. C. R. (M. for Cor.) 902 (ii).

Gauvreau, Dr. E. D., grant for preparing Vaccine (Ques.) 140 (i).

I. C. R., Matane Branch Line Subsidy (Ques.) 1299 (ii).

Matane and River Blanche Wharves (Ques.) 1067 (ii).

Mégantic county Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 1232.

Public Works in Rimouski county, Expenditure (Ques.) 1067 (ii).

Quarantine Service of Can. (M. for Sp. Com.) 657 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 612-613 (i).

Rimouski Customs Collector (Ques.) 1067 (ii).

Fisher, Mr. S. A., Brome.

Can. Temp. Act, Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 982; (Amt.) 984; in Com., 1245 (ii).

— B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) on M. for 2°, 938, 998; in Com., 1249 (ii).

— on Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 78 (i).

— (remarks) 922 (ii).

Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. Laurier) 742 (i).

Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1574 (ii).

Imperial Federation, on Res. (Mr. Marshall) 1081 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 832 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1423 (ii).

Repairs, &c., to Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1543 (ii).

Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1027, 1669 (i).

Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Ry. Co.'s (B. 73, 1°*) 454 (i).

— M. to suspend Rules, 1563 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1027; (Sessional Clerks) 1669 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Experimental Farms) 1574; (Repairs, &c.) 1543 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1127 (ii).

Flynn, Mr. E. P., Richmond, N.S.

Cape Breton Ry., Cor. re Sims & Slater (M. for copies*) 1259 (ii).

Flynn, Mr. E. P.—*Continued.*

- Fishery Bounty Cheques, distribution (Ques.) 825 (ii).
- Lobster Commissioners Rep (M. for copies) 86 (i).
- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 571-576 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *King's, N. B.*

- Atlantic Ocean, obstructions to Shipping (Ans.) 1432.
- Behring's Sea Seizures (Ans.) 779 (i).
- on M. for Cor., 968 (ii).
- Buoys (maintenance, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1582 (ii).
- Can. Temp. Act, on Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 82 (i).
- Can. Fishing Vessels, reporting, &c. (Ans.) 24 (i).
- Cap Chat and Grand Vallée Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 1233 (ii).
- Culling, in Com. of Sup., 1668 (ii).
- Fisheries, Bounty Cheques, distribution (Ans.) 825 (ii).
- (expenses, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1604 (ii).
- Protection, appointment of Magistrates (Ans.) 826 (ii).
- on M. for adjmnt. (Ans.) 1403. (ii).
- Overseers (salaries, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1583 (ii).
- Reps. *re* superannuation of Valiquette (Ans.) 1506 (ii).
- Steamers (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup. 1603 (ii).
- Treaty, papers respecting (remarks) 100 (i).
- Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 813-820 (i); in Com., 868 (ii).
- Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1673 (ii).
- International Regulations *re* Trading and other Vessels (Ans.) 826 (ii).
- Life-boat Service, in Com. of Sup., 1577 (ii).
- Lobster Commissioners Rep., on M. for Ret., 86 (i).
- Fisheries, Restrictions, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1554 (ii).
- Marine, depl. Rep. (presented) 138 (i).
- McCuaig, Mr. A. F., appointment as Exciseman at Picton (Ans) 1432 (ii).
- Northern Light* and *Alert*, Cor., Tels, &c., on M. for Ret., 827 (ii).
- and Steam Communication with P.E.I. (Ans.) 141 (i).
- Cor. *re* Captain (remarks) 456 (i).
- on M. for Com. of Sup., 1560 (ii).
- Employés, papers (Ans.) 1601 (ii).
- North Sydney (C.B.) Pilots, Rets. to Govt. (Ans.) 1067 (ii).
- Obstructions, &c., in Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1531 (ii).
- Oriental*, Rep. of Insp. Risley on Loss (Ans.) 966 (ii).
- P. E. I., Winter Navigation (Ans.) 712 (i).
- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 183; (Amt.) 194; agreed to (Y. 124; N. 67) 646 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

- Reciprocity with U.S. (remarks) on personal explanation (Mr. *Davies*) 240 (i).
- Saguenay River Buoys, Contract for maintaining, &c. (Ans.) 1433 (ii).
- Sailors, Protection against Wrecks, &c., Legislation (Ans.) 966 (ii).
- Salmon Rivers (Hudson's Bay) Lease (Ans.) 8-6 (ii).
- Ships' Safety Act Amt. (B. 112, 1°) 1000; M. to dschg. Order for 2°, 1413 (ii).
- Signal Service, in Com. of Sup., 1582 (ii).
- Stag Island (Ont.) Lighthouse (Ans.) 1174 (ii).
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt (B. 99, 1°) 750 (i); in Com., 1402 (ii).
- SUPPLY:
 - Civil Government* (Fisheries) 98 (i).
 - Collection of Revenues* (Culling, contingencies) 1668 (ii).
 - Fisheries* (Govt. Steamers, &c.) 1603; (Life-boat service) 1577; (Obstructions, &c., in Rivers) 1581; (Overseers salaries, &c.) 1583 (ii).
 - Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Buoys, &c, maintenance) 1582; (Lighthouses, &c.) 1681; (Signal Service) 1582 (ii).
 - Ocean and River Service* (Water Police and investigation into wrecks) 1579 (ii).
 - Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1673 (ii).
- Surveys, Lakes Superior and Huron conc., 1688 (ii).
- Vessels, overloading, Legislation respecting (Ans) 130 (i).
- Water Police, in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
- Whale Fishery in Hudson's Bay (Ans.) 826 (ii).
- Wrecks, investigation, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
- Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 20, 754 (i).

Freeman, Mr. J. N., *Queen's, N. S.*

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*), 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 993; in Com., 1256 (ii).
- on Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 77, 86 (i).
- Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House, 929 (ii).
- Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 499-508 (i).

Gigault, Mr. G. A., *Rouville.*

- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 274 (i).

Gillmor, Mr. A. H., *Charlotte.*

- Debates, Official, distribution to Press (remarks) 750 (i).
- Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 912 (ii).
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1292 (ii).
- Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. to conc. in Res., 1399 (ii).
- Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 635-642 (i).

Gillmor, Mr. G. H.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY :

- Immigration* (Agents salaries, &c) 1169 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1130 (ii).

Girouard, Mr. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

- G. T. R. Double Track, application for assistance (Ques.) 1432 (ii).
 Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House 927 (ii).
 Kent, Representation of (remarks) 309 (i).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1288 (ii).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1296 (ii).

Gordon, Mr. D. W., *Vancouver Island.*

- Behring's Sea Seizures (M. for Cor.) 966 (ii).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis*

- Hadlow Cove Pier, extension (Ques.) 140 (i).
 St. Lawrence River Navigation Repeal (B. 28, 1°*) 97 (i).
 Coal Supply to Govt., Tenders, &c., for past year (M. for Ret.*) 866 (ii).

Guillet, Mr. G., *West Northumberland.*

- Ellis, J. V., Esq., M.P., and Annexation (Ques.) 44 (i).
 Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) for Sel. Com., 31 (i).
 ——— B. 138 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to introd., 1545; M. to add clause, 1691 (ii).
 Vessels, overloading, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 140 (i).

Haggart, Mr. J. G., *Lanark.*

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. to recom., 1245 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) on M. for 2° (M. to adjn. deb.) 995; neg. (Y. 44; N. 88) 1000; in Com., 1258 (ii).
 ——— on Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 84 (i).
 Exchequer Court contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 121 (ii).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1407 (ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Davin*), 1093 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 527–532 (i).
 South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. *Hall*) Speaker's attention called to expiration of time for Private Bills, 916 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1587 (ii).

Haggart, Mr. J. G.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY :

- Administration of Justice* (Miscellaneous) 121 (i).
 Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 496 (i).
 Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 2° m., 770 (i).

Hall, Mr. R. N., *Sherbrooke.*

- Bank of London winding-up (B. 80) on M. to ref. back to Com., 963 (ii).
 Hereford Branch Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act. Amt. (B. 33, 1°*) 110 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1177, 1429 (ii).
 South-Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54, 1°*) 270 (i); on Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) 6 m. h., to M. for 3°, 914 (ii).

Hesson, Mr. S. R., *North Perth.*

- Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1240 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on printing papers (remarks) 43 (i).
 ——— distribution to Press (remarks) 750 (i).
 Govt. Savings Banks, Interest on Deposit B. 127 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 1401 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Davies*) 1331 (ii).
 Ry. Act. Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1499 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 583–588 (i).
 Sarnia and Port Huron submarine Tunnel (Ques.) 1432 (ii).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1026 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Canals—Capital* (Sault Ste. Marie) 1449 (ii).
Legislation : House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1026. Miscellaneous (Library, salaries, &c.) 1030 (ii).
 Supreme Court Librarian, in Com. of Sup., 1030 (ii).
 Trade Combinations B. 138 (Mr. *Wallace*) on M. to introd., 1545 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1113, 1129 (ii).

Hickey, Mr. C. E., *Dundas.*

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 1246 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1250 (ii).
 Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 50, 1°*) 270 (i).
 Privilege (Ques. of) paragraph in *Evening Journal re* New York, Waddington and Ottawa Ry. Co., 778 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1498 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 483–487 (i).

Holton, Mr. E., Chateauguay.

- Dom. Plate Glass Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 32, 10*) 110 (i).
- Ry. Commission, distribution of Rep. (Ques.) 778 (i).
- Evidence (Ques.) 867 (ii).
- Wateret, P., employment as Immigration Agent (Ques.) 963 (ii).

Hudspeth, Mr. A., Victoria, O.

- SUPPLY:
- Canals—Capital (Trent Riv. Nav.) 1456 (ii).
- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 467-473 (i).

Innes, Mr. J., South Wellington.

- Banking Act (General) Amt. (Ques.) 19 (i).
- Banks, Supervision by Govt., on Res. (Mr. *Caagrain*) 669 (i).
- Libel Law, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 141 (i).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1181, 1423 (ii).

Ives, Mr. W. B., Richmond and Wolfe.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com. (Amt.) 984 (ii).
- Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on presentation of papers, 40 (i).
- on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 722 (i).
- Neely, Private T., provision for Widow, &c., on M. for Ret., 651 (i).
- Order (Ques. of) reference to paragraph in *Free Press*, 524 (i).
- Reciprocity with U. S., entry of certain articles free of Duty, 522 (i).

Jamieson, Mr. J., North Lanark.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 978; in Com. on Amt. (Mr. *Ives*) 984; in Com., 1245 (ii).
- (B. 10, 1°) 52 (i); 2° m., 985-994; in Com., 1247 (ii).
- on Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 75 (i).
- (remarks) 922 (ii).
- Privilege (Ques. of) deb. on Prohibition, 867 (ii).
- Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors (prop. Res.) 827 (ii)

Joncas, Mr. L. Z., Gaspé.

- Address, The (seconded) 7 (i).
- Cap Chat and Grand Vallée Fisheries (M. for Ret.) 1232 (ii).
- Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 854 (ii).
- Ste. Anne des Monts, &c. (M. for Ret.) 1233 (ii).

Jones, Mr. H. L., Digby.

- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 605 (i).

Jones, Hon. A. G., Halifax.

- Adams, David J.*, in Com. of Sup., 1657 (ii).
- Adulteration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 933 (ii).
- Ammunition, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1211 (ii).
- Antwerp and Canada Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1679 (ii).
- Barracks (B.C.) in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).
- Bridges (Ottawa) in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).
- Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1466 (ii).
- Buoys, in Com. of Sup., 1582 (ii).
- C. P. R., in Com. of Sup., 1223 (ii).
- Cap Chat and Grand Vallée Fisheries, on M. for Ret., 1233 (ii).
- Cape Breton Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1230 (ii).
- Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).
- Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 935 (ii).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1470 (ii).
- Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 132 (i).
- Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1212 (ii).
- Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).
- Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 897; in Com., 898, 946 (ii).
- in Com. of Sup., 1629 (ii).
- Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1275; in Com., 1279 (ii).
- Divorce, publication of Evidence (remarks) 1414 (ii).
- Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1151 (ii).
- Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1570 (ii).
- Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1213 (ii).
- Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1654 (ii).
- Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
- Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1154, 1574 (ii).
- Fenian Raid (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
- Fisheries Commission, Chart showing delimitation (remarks) 646 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).
- Protection (remarks) on adjamt. of Hse., 1403.
- Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 779, 786 (i); in Com., 869 (ii).
- non-ratification by U. S., Policy of Govt. (Ques.) 1433 (ii).
- Overseers (salaries, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1583, 1602 (ii).
- Reports, re superannuation of Valiquette (Ques.) 1506 (ii).
- Steamers (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1603.
- Bounty (expenses, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1603.
- Franchise Electoral, Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1°, 1064; on M. for 2°, 1550 (ii).
- Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1405 (ii).
- Govt. Savings Banks (Interest on Deposits) B. 127 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 1332 (ii).

Jones. Hon. A. G.—Continued.

- Halifax and St. John Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
- Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1561, 1673 (ii).
- Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1153 (ii).
- High Commissioner's Office, application of Civil Service Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1504 (ii).
- Hot Springs, Banff (construction, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (ii).
- Insurance Act Amt. B. 126 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 1401 (ii).
- I. C. R., Expenditure on Capital Account (M. for Ret.) 103 (i).
- in Com. of Sup., 1224, 1645, 1650 (ii).
- Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 905, 911 (ii).
- Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
- Lake St. Louis Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
- Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1196, 1207 (ii).
- Military Properties, in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
- Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1282; in Com., 1294 (ii).
- N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 1486 (ii).
- Ottawa, additional Building, in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).
- Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1230.
- Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1600 (ii).
- Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Carling) in Com., 1511 (ii).
- Permanent Forces, in Com. of Sup., 1219 (ii).
- Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 1632 (ii).
- Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1296; in Com., 1298; on M. to conc. in Res., 1391 (ii).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1422 (ii).
- Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. Denison) on M. for 2°, 762 (i).
- Rebellion of 1885 (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1202, 1207.
- Receiver Gen., Halifax, in Com. of Sup., 88 (i).
- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amt., 246; (Amt. to Amt.) 257; neg. (Y. 67; N. 124) 646 (i).
- Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1542, 1668 (ii).
- Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1671 (ii).
- Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1677 (ii).
- Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 1218 (ii).
- Lake St. Louis, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
- Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1446 (ii).
- Ships' Safety Act Amt. B. 112 (Mr. Foster) on M. for 1°, 1001; on M. to dschg. Order for 2°, 1473 (ii).
- Statistical Diagrams, in Com. of Sup., 1665 (ii).
- Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1588 (ii).

Jones. Hon. A. G.—Continued.

SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice* (Miscellaneous) 119 (i).
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Dominion Exhibition) 1151; (Experimental Farms) 1154, 1574; (Health Statistics) 1153 (ii).
- Canals—Capital* (Lachine) 1452; (Lake St. Louis) 1453; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1446; (Tay) 1459; (Williamsburg) 1453
- Income*: (Rideau) 1671; (Trent River Nav.) 1460 (ii).
- Charges of Management* (Receiver Gen., Halifax) 88 (i).
- Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 132 (i); (Post Office) 1638 (ii).
- Collection of Revenues* (Customs) 1619; (Post Office) 1638; (Public Works) 1632; (Railways, repairs, &c) 1668 (ii).
- Fisheries* (David J. Adams) 1657; (Fishing Bounty) 1603; (Overseers salaries, &c.) 1583, 1602; (Steamers, repairs, &c.) 1603 (ii)
- Immigration* (Agents salaries, &c.) 1160; (Pamphlets) 1158 (ii).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Maintenance of Buoys) 1582 (ii).
- Mail Subsidies* (Antwerp and Canada) 1679; (Halifax and St. John) 1678 (ii)
- Miscellaneous* (Banff Springs, construction, &c.) 1666; (Fishery Commission) 1663; (Statistical Diagrams) 1665 (ii).
- Militia* (Ammunition, &c.) 1211; (Barracks, B. O.) 1644; (Clothing, &c.) 1212; (contingencies) 1644; (Drill Pay, &c.) 1213; (Military Properties) 1221; (Permanent Forces) 1219; (Royal Military College) 1218 (ii).
- Ocean and River Service* (Maintenance, &c.) 1577; (Water Police) 1580; (Wrecks, investigation, &c.) 1578 (ii).
- Pensions* (Fenian Raid) 1201; (N. W. T.) 1642; (Rebellion of 1885) 1202, 1207 (ii).
- Public Works—Capital* (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1463; (Esquimaux Graving Dock) 1654. Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 1461. *Income*: Buildings (N. S.) 1466; (Repairs, &c.) 1542. Dredging, 1570. Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1561, 1673; (P.E.I.) 1662. Roads and Bridges, 1571, 1677. Telegraph Lines, 1574, 1678 (ii).
- Quarantine* (Medical Inspection) 1196, 1207 (ii).
- Railways—Capital* (C.P.R.) 1223; (I.O.R.) 1224, 1645, 1650; (Cape Breton Ry.) 1230; (Oxford and New Glasgow Ry.) 1230 (ii).
- Tay Canal**, in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
- Telegraph Lines**, in Com. of Sup., 1574, 1678 (ii).
- Tobique Valley Ry**, Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1626 (ii).
- Trent Riv. Nav.**, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- Water Police**, in Com. of Sup., 1580 (ii).
- Ways and Means—The Tariff*, in Com., 1125 (ii).
- Williamsburg Canal**, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
- Wrecks, investigation, &c.**, in Com. of Sup., 1578 (ii).

Kenny, Mr. T. E., Halifax.

- Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 787 (i).
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1167 (ii).
- Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 907 (ii).
- Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. to conc. in Res., 1395 (ii).
- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 381–392 (i).

Kirk, Mr. J. A., Guysborough.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 1256 (ii).
- Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).
- Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1570 (ii).

Kirk, Mr. J. A.—Continued.

- Eastern Extension Ry., Tenders for Fencing (M. for copies*) 866 (ii).
 — Refund to Municipalities (M. for Cor.) 903 (ii).
 Eight Island Lake Post Office (Ques.) 86 (i).
 Fisheries and Fishing (B. 58, 1^o) 309 (i).
 Lobster Commissioners' Rep., on M. for copies, 86 (i).
 — Fisheries, Restrictions, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1551 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 593-598 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Capital: Harbors and Rivers (Oape Tormentine Harbor) 1463. *Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 1467. Dredging, 1570. Telegraph Lines, 1574 (ii).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A., Frontenac.

- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com. 1436 (ii).
 Concurrence, 1687 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on reading papers (remarks) 41 (i).
 Divorce Bills, on M. (Mr. *Small*) to suspend Rule 65, 1468 (ii).
 Merchants Marine Ins. Co's. B. 11 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2^o, 126 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1177, 1493, (ii).
 Royal Military College, conc., 1687 (ii).
 St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co's B. 137 (Mr. *Boyle*) in Com., 1522 (ii).
 Securities to the Crown, &c., Discharge (B. 4) 2^o m., 761 (i).
 SUPPLY:
Canals—Income (Miscellaneous) 1647 (ii).
Militia (Royal Military College) conc., 1687 (ii).
Pensions (N.W.T.) 1644; (Veterans of 1812) 1202.
 Wrecked Vessels Aid (B. 7, 1^o) 44; 2^o m., 770 (i), 918; 2^o neg. (Y. 61; N. 84) 921 (ii).
 Wrecking Vessels in American Waters, on M. for papers, &c., 667 (i).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 754 (i).

Labelle, Mr. J. B., Richelieu.

Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1029 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues (Culling, contingencies) 1668 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1029 (ii).

Labrosse, Mr. S., Prescott.

Prescott and Russell Judicial District, Vacancy (Ques.) 27 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G., South Grey.

Books for Mechanics' Institutes, removal of Duties (Ques.) 899 (ii).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1655 (ii).
 Brant and Haldimand Indian Reserves, appointment of Doctor (Ques.) 647 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—Continued.

- Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 738 (i).
 Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1216 (ii).
 Emigration from Dakota to Man. (Ques.) 495 (i).
 Employés, Public Service of Canada (Ques.) 495 (i).
 Experimental Farm at Grenfell, N.W.T. (M. for Cor., &c.*) 866 (ii).
 Indemnity to Members, in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, dismissal of Laborers, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1650 (ii).
 Lynch's Pamphlet on Dairy Practice, German Translation (Ques.) 496 (i).
 Macdonald, Geo. J., and Centennial Exhibition of 1876 (M. for papers*) 866 (ii).
 N.W.T. Representation B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1483 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1598 (ii).
 Post Office Irregularities, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1021 (ii).
 Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1189, 1427, 1492 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 476-483 (ii).
 — Rep. of Min. of Customs, re entry of certain articles free of Duty (Ques.) 554, 647 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Privy Council Office) 91 (i).
Legislation: House of Commons (Indemnities) 1670 (ii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 1216 (ii).
Ocean and River Services (Water Police) 1579 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1655 (ii).
 Water Police, in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
 Winkler, Mrs. Barbara, payment for loss of Registered Letter (Ques.) 750 (i).

Landry, Mr. P. A., Kent, N. B.

- Business of the House, on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Wednesdays, 1061 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1250 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 823 (ii).
 Fishery Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2^o, 860 (ii).
 Travis, ex-Judge, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 116 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 116 (i).

Langelier, Mr. C., Montmorency.

- Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 728 (i).
 Halle, Rev. Charles, Pet. for protection against Artillery practice (M. for copy*) 672 (i).

Langelier, Mr. F., East Quebec.

- Bridges (Ottawa) in Com. of Sup., 1572 (ii).
 Bridge at Que., Govt. aid (Ques.) 1625 (ii).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1584 (ii).
 Cartridge Factory, &c., Water Supply (M. for Cor.*) 1092 (ii).
 Customs Seizures at Quebec (M. for Cor.) 1068 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com. (Translators) on M. to conc., 1501 (ii).
 Diamonds, Seizure from D. Levi (M. for Cor.*) 1092 (ii).
 I.C.R., claim of A. Pion & Co., for damages (M. for Cor.*) 1092 (ii).
 Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1196 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release Bill 134 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1290; in Com., 1294 (ii).
 North Stukely Postmaster, resignation (M. for O. C's. &c.*) 1092 (ii).
 Ocean Mail Service, Tenders (M. for copies) 1067 (ii).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1297 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1177 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1592 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Public Works—Incomes:* Buildings (Que.) 1534. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 1572 (ii).
Quarantine (Medical Inspection) 1196 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Water Police) 1581 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L., K. C. M. G., Three Rivers.

- Alberton Harbor, increasing Depth (Ans.) 712 (i).
 Albert Ry. Co.'s Loan Account (Ans.) 826 (ii).
 Allen, Warren, compensation for loss of Ice-boat, on M. for Ret., 833 (ii).
 Business of the House (remarks) 125; (M.) to change hour of meeting, 1500 (ii).
 Bridges (Ottawa) in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1461, 1533, 1655 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. (remarks) 922 (ii).
 C. P. R., B. C. Sections (Ans.) 86 (i).
 ——— Guaranteed Bonds (prop. Res.) 1001 (ii).
 Cape Breton Ry. Contractors' Sureties (Ans.) 1067 (ii).
 ——— Steam Dredge, substitute (Ans.) 1432 (ii).
 Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).
 Caughnawaga Indians, Election of Chiefs, on M. for Cor., &c., 901.
 Cayuga P. O., purchase of Site (Ans.) 28 (i).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s (B. 101) on Res., 778 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1469 (ii).
 Claya, Mr. G., late M.P., deceased (remarks) 62 (i).
 Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Amyot) on M. for 1^o, 18; on Order for 2^o, 73 (i).
 Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 52 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—Continued.

- Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 489 (i), 824; (Amt.) 1298 (ii).
 ——— distribution of extra copies *re* Reciprocity deb. (remarks) 239 (i).
 ——— distribution to Press (remarks) 751 (i).
 ——— dismissal of Translators, on reading papers (remarks) 42, 128 (i).
 Divorce Bills, on M. (Mr. Small) to suspend Rule 65, 1468 (ii).
 Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1569 (ii).
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1653 (ii).
 Estimates, suppl., papers *re* certain Items (remarks) 1433 (ii).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1574 (ii).
 Fisheries Commission, Chart showing delimitation (remarks) 647 (i).
 ——— Commissioners' Instructions (Ans.) 270 (i).
 ——— Treaty, further papers respecting (remarks) 239 (i).
 Fortin, Noël, accident on I.C.R., on M. for Cor., 902 (i).
 Gauvreau, Dr. E. D., grant for preparing Vaccine (Ans.) 140 (i).
 German Emperor's Death, Official Information (Ans.) 110 (i).
 Great N. W. Central Ry. Co., Amount deposited with Govt. (Ans.) 141 (i).
 G. T. R. Double Track, application for assistance (Ans.) 1432 (ii).
 Hadlow Cove Pier, extension (Ans.) 140 (i).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1462, 1561, 1655, 1673 (ii).
 Ice-breakers in the county of Berthier (Ans.) 45 (i).
 I. C. R. (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1620 (ii).
 ——— Matane Branch Line Subsidy (Ans.) 1299 (ii).
 Inverness and Richmond Ry. Subsidy by Govt. (Ans.) 1232 (ii).
 Isbester & Reid, Messrs., completion of Contract (Ans.) 1067 (ii),
 Isle aux Noix Wharf (Ans.) 965 (ii).
 Kent, representation (remarks) 270 (i).
 King, James, claim of, M. to substitute name on Sp. Com., 1245 (ii).
 Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1672 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, discharge of Laborers (Ques. of Order) 1564 (ii).
 Labor Commission, complaints against Chairman, (Ans.) 171 (i).
 ——— Evidence before (Ans.) 98 (i).
 Land Leases, old and unoccupied (Ans.) 825 (ii).
 Land Villa Postmastership, on M. for Ret., 102 (i).
 Leduc, Chas., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 140 (i).
 Man. and N.W.T. Ry. Bills (M. to withdr.) 1585 (ii).
 ——— Legislation (remarks) 1403 (ii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—Continued.

- Matane and River Blanche Wharves, repairs (Ans.) 1067 (ii).
 Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
 Merchants Marine Ins. Co.'s B. 11 (Mr. Curran) on M. for 2°, 126 (i).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1283; in Com., 1294, 1391 (ii).
 ——— Relief by Govt. (Ans.) 27 (i).
 Morin, Dr. J. A., claim for services, on M. for copy, 656 (i).
 Newfoundland and Confedrn., on M. for Cor., 664 (i).
 Northumberland Straits Subway, Engineers' Reps., &c., on M. for copy, 664 (i).
 Ocean Mail Service, on M. for copies of Tenders, 1067 (ii).
 Olivier, Geo., dismissal as Postmaster, on M. for Cor., 655 (i).
 Ont. and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (Ans.) 1432 (ii).
 Ottawa, additional Building, in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).
 ——— River Improvements for Timber, &c., on M. for Stmt. of cost, 827 (ii).
 Papineauville Harbor, dredging (Ans.) 495 (i).
 Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1598 (ii).
 Peace and Athabasca Rivers, Treaty with Indians (Ans.) 825 (ii).
 Pelée Island and Mainland Cable, on M. for Pets., &c., 827 (ii).
 ——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1012 (ii).
 Penetanguishene, Midland, &c., Public Works (Ans.) 647 (ii).
 Pinette Harbor, dredging of Bar (Ans.) 140 (i).
 Point Tupper Ry. Pier, Tenders (Ans.) 1299 (ii).
 Post Office, Montreal, Electric Light (Ans.) 1625 (ii).
 Prince Edward Co. Election, admitting Member on certificate (M.) 380 (i).
 ——— construction of Public Works (Ans.) 1432 (ii).
 Printing and Stationery Dept., in Com. of Sup., 93 (i).
 Private Bills, Rep. from Com., Ms. to extend time, 514 (i), 1031 (ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Mitchell) *re* Disallowance (remarks) 111 (i).
 ——— (Mr. Laurier) dismissal of Debates Translators (remarks) 128 (i).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 833 (ii).
 Public Works in Rimouski county, expenditure (Ans.) 1067 (ii).
 Public Works Rep. (presented) 18 (i).
 Quebec and Lake St. John Ry. Subsidy (Ans.) 1432 (ii).
 ——— Harbor Commissioners (Jévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1297 (ii).
 Rys. and Canals, Cost (Ans.) 170 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—Continued.

- Rys. and Canals, Dept., in Com. of Sup., 96 (i).
 Ry. Commission, copies of Rep. (Ans.) 646, 778 (i).
 ——— Cost (Ans.) 494 (i).
 Repairs, &c., to Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1542, 1655 (ii).
 Returns, on enquiry for (remarks) 1131, 1433 (ii).
 Revenue and Audit Act B. 87 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 891 (ii).
 Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1571, 1675 (ii).
 Robertson, Mr. Alex., decease of (remarks) 61 (i).
 Russell Representation, Issue of Writ (Ans.) 516 (i).
 ——— (M.) to admit Member on certificate of Returning Officer, 1415 (ii).
 Ste. Anne des Monts, &c., on M. for Ret., 1236 (ii).
 St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s B. 61, on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1345 (ii).
 St. Hyacinthe Public Buildings, on M. for Ret., 653 (i).
 St. Johns and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Co.'s B. 7 (Mr. Vanasse) on M. for 2°, 531 (i).
 St. John Harbor Improvements, Mr. Perley's Rep. (Ans.) 86 (i).
 St. Lawrence River Floods (Ans.) 899 (ii).
 ——— on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 60 (i).
 ——— Navigation, Montreal and Quebec, on M. for Ret., 71 (i).
 Saguenay and Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s transfer (Ans.) 1433 (ii).
 Sarnia and Huron Submarine Tunnel (Ans.) 1432 (ii).
 Saufage, P.E.I., Improvement of Navigation, Rep. of Engineer, on M. for copy, 71 (i).
 Select Standing Coms. (M. to add names) 598 (i).
 Sessional Clerks, number and amounts paid (Ans.) 1299 (ii).
 Sherwood, Mr. A. P., and Cape Breton Ry. (Ans.) 965 (ii).
 Slides and Booms (salaries) in Com. of Sup., 1624 (ii).
 Snetsinger, Mr., employment and dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 825 (ii).
 Strathroy Public Buildings, selection of Site (Ans.) 66 (i), 1174 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1593 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Civil Government (Public Printing and Stationery) 93; (Railways and Canals) 96 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Public Works) 1632; (Rys., I.C.R.) 1620; (Slides and Booms, salaries, &c.) 1684 (ii).
Public Works—Capital: Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 1461. (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1463; (Esquimaux Graving Dock) 1653; (Harbors and Rivers) 1462; (Kingston Graving Dock) 1672. *Income*: Buildings (Experimental Farms) 1574; (Man.) 1542; (N.B.) 1468; (N.S.) 1465; (N.W.T.) 1672; (Ont.) 1655; (Que.) 1533; (Repairs, &c.) 1542, 1655. Dredging, 1566. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1563, 1673; (N.S.) 1561, 1673; (N.W.T.) 1655; (Ont.) 1566, 1655; (P.E.I.) 1562; (Que.) 1563, 1674. Roads and Bridges, 1571, 1675. Telegraph Lines, 1677. Miscellaneous, 1678 (ii).
Quarantine (Medical Inspection) 1200 (ii).
 Telegraph Lines acquisition by Govt., on M. for Sel Com., 102 (i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir H. L.—Continued.

- Terms of Confederation, non-fulfilment with P. E. I. (Ans.) 86 (i).
 Thorold Canal, Water Power (Ans.) 647 (i).
 Tignish and Miminegash Breakwater (Ans.) 86, 712 (i).
 Trent Valley Canal Commission, on M. for Ret., 72 (i).
 Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. White, Renfrew) on M. for 2°, 322, 497 (i).
 Ventilation of House of Commons (remarks) 171 (i).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1200, 1672 (ii).
 Welland Canal, deepening Section "A" (Ans.) 496 (i).
 Wharves and Piers in P.E.I. (Ans.) 965 (ii).
 White, Hon. Thomas, decease of (remarks) 962 (ii).
 Wood Island Harbor, P.E.I., dredging (Ans.) 140 (i)

Laurie, Gen. J. W., Shelburne.

- Antwerp and Canada Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1679 (ii).
 Atlantic Ocean, obstructions to Shipping (Ques.) 1433
 Campbellton and Gaspé Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup. 1678 (ii).
 Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).
 Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1215 (ii).
 Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 790-793 (i).
 Imperial Federation (remarks) on Res. (Mr. Marshall) 1091 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with (M. for Cor.) 903, 911 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1596 (ii).
 Permanent Forces, in Com. of Sup., 1219 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 371-377 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Immigration* (Agents salaries, &c.) 1167 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Antwerp and Canada) 1679; (Campbellton and Gaspé) 1678 (ii).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 1215; (Permanent Forces) 1219 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging, 1571 (ii).
 Trent Valley Canal Commission, Cor., &c., on M. for Ret., 72 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1132 (ii).
 York-Simcoe Battalion, Kit Allowance, on M. for Ret., 70 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W., East Quebec.

- Address, on The, 9 (i).
 — to Gov. Gen., Farewell (seconded) 1586 (ii).
 Adulteration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 932 (ii).
 Bressaylor Half-breeds, Grievances, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1521 (ii).
 Bridge at Quebec, Govt. aid (Ques.) 1625 (ii).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1466, 1533, 1654 (ii).
 Business of the House, on M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) to take in Wednesdays, 1061 (ii).
 — on M. to take in Thursdays, 711 (i).

Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.

- Can. Temp. Act. Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 979; in Com., 981; on Amt. (Mr. Ives) 984; on M. to recom., 1245 (ii).
 — on Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 75 (i).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles Tupper) on Res., 1001; on M. for Com., 1339; in Com., 1379; (Amt.) 1345; neg. (Y. 63; N. 111) 1370; in Com., 1389 (ii).
 — Lands, sold and unsold, acreage (Ques.) 1174, 1195 (ii).
 Cattle Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
 Caughnawaga Indians, election of Chiefs, on M. for Cor., &c., 902 (ii).
 Choquette, Mr., M.P., Pet. against return (objection) 1332, 1458 (ii).
 Cincinnati Centennial Exhibition, Canadian representation (Ques.) 1136 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1434, 1471 (ii).
 Claves, Mr. G., late M. P., decease of (remarks) 62 (i).
 Criminal Procedure Act Amt. B. 123 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1513 (ii).
 Concurrence, 1685 (ii).
 Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1668, 1684 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 489 (i), 824, 1298 (ii).
 — 3rd Rep. of Com. (Translators) on M. to conc., 1501 (ii).
 — distribution of extra copies *re* Reciprocity deb. (remarks) 239 (i).
 — distribution to Press (remarks) 751 (i).
 — dismissal of Translators (Ques. of Priv.) 20, 39 (i).
 — on presentation of papers by Mr. Speaker, 39, 128 (i).
 — (prop. Res.) 713; on Amt (Sir John A. Macdonald) 747; Res. neg., 749 (i).
 — on Ques. of Order, 719 (i).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1265 (ii).
 Disallowance of Man. Ry. Acts (M. for Cor.*) 672 (i).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 946, 1143 (ii).
 Dom. Lands Agents in Man. and the N. W. T., Instructions, on M. for Ret., 37 (i).
 Easter, adjmt. for (remarks) 415 (i).
 Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 5 (Mr. Chapleau) on M. for 3°, (Amt.) neg. (Y. 53; N. 74) 1587 (ii).
 — B. 117 (Mr. Chapleau) on M. for 1°, 1063; on M. for 2°, 1550 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1642 (ii).
 Fraudulent Practices on Farmers, on Res. (Mr. Brown) for Sp. Com., 1244 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.

- Fraudulent Trade Marks on Merchandise Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1002 (ii).
- Fisheries Treaty, papers respecting (remarks) 20, 98, 141 (i).
- Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 851-854; in Com., 871 (ii).
- Fortin, Noël, accident on I.C.R., on M. for Cor., 902 (ii).
- Gowanlock, Mrs., claim for compensation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks), 1017 (ii).
- G. T. R. Co.'s Agreements B. 26 (Mr. *Small*) on M. to authorise Ry. Com. to divide Bill, 415 (i).
- Haldimand, Dep. Returning Officer, on M. to adjn Hse., 925 (ii).
- Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1673 (ii).
- High Commissioner's Office, application of Civil Service Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1503 (ii).
- Indemnity to Members (remarks) 1586, 1670 (ii).
- I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1226 (ii).
- Kingston Post Office defalcations, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1017 (ii).
- Kent, Ont., Controverted Election, on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to ref. Judge's Rep. to Sel. Com. on Priv. and Elec., 18, 20 (i).
- Representation, Issue of Writ (remarks) 381 (i).
- L'Assomption Election, Issue of Writ (Ques.) 110 (i).
- Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
- Merchants Marine Ins. Co.'s B. 11 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 127 (i).
- Montmagny Representation, Pet. against return of Member Elect (remarks) 1332, 1458 (ii).
- Neely, Private T., provision for Widow, &c., on M. for Ret., 651 (i).
- Newfoundland and Confederation (M. for Cor.) 664 (i).
- N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 454 (i), 1475; in Com., 1485 (ii).
- Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1697 (ii).
- Plumb, Hon. J. B., decease of (remarks) 124 (i).
- Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1685 (ii).
- Printing and Stationery, Public, Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com. (remarks) *re* absence of Dep. Speaker, 1006 (ii).
- Private Bills, Reps. from Com., on M. to extend time, 514 (i).
- Privilege (Ques. of) dismissal of Debates Translators, 20, 39, 128 (i).
- *re* Disallowance (Mr. *Mitchell*) 111 (i).
- Quarantine Service of Can., on M. (Mr. *Fiset*) for Sp. Com., 661 (i).
- Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., and in Com., 1296 (ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.

- Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1182, 1418; on M. for 3°, 1508 (ii).
- Ry. Commission, distribution of Rep. (remarks) 778 (i).
- Ry. Employés B. 5 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 917.
- Real Property in Ter. Act Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1412 (ii).
- Rebellion Losses Commission, Reps. (M. for copy) 73.
- Reciprocity with U. S., newspaper Cor. *re* entry of certain articles free of Duty, 491 (i).
- on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 554-565 (i).
- Repairs, &c., to Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1655 (ii).
- Returns, enquiry for, 1136, 1433 (ii).
- Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 891 (ii).
- Robertson, Mr. Alex., decease of (remarks) 62 (i).
- Russell Representation, Issue of Writ (M.) 416, 455 (i).
- (Ques.) 499, 516, 525 (i).
- St. Hyacinthe Public Buildings, on M. for Ret., 658 (i).
- St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 127.
- Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1641 (ii).
- Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1027 (ii).
- Slides and Booms (salaries) in Com. of Sup., 1684 (ii).
- Standing Committees (M. to add names) 823 (ii).
- Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1546; in Com., 1590 (ii).
- SUPPLY:
- Administration of Justice* (Miscellaneous) 114, 119 (i); conc., 1685 (ii).
- Civil Government* (Sec. of State) 1641 (ii).
- Collection of Revenues* (Ualling Timber) 1638, 1684; (Post Office) 1685; (Slides and Booms, salaries, &c.) 1684 (ii).
- Indians* (Ont. and Que.) 1606 (ii).
- Legislation*: House of Commons (Indemnities) 1670; (salaries, &c.) 1047. Miscellaneous (Franchise Act) 1642 (ii).
- Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 137 (i); conc., 1686 (ii).
- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 1466; (N. W. T.) 1672; (Ques.) 1533, 1654; (Repairs, &c.) 1655. Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1673 (ii).
- Quarantine* (Cattle, Que.) 1200; (Medical Inspection) 1200 (ii).
- Railways—Capital* (I.C.R.) 1226 (ii).
- Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 1°, 964 (ii).
- Travis, ex-Judge, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 114 (i).
- White, Hon. Thomas, decease of (remarks) 962 (ii).
- Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 917 (ii).

Lavergne Mr. J., Drummond and Arthabaska.

- Hay Duties by U.S., Refund (Ques.) 712 (i).
- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amt., 234-237 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F., West Lambton.

- Adams, David J.*, in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
- Arkona Postmaster, dismissal (Ques.) 712 (i).
- on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1019 (ii).
- Banks, Supervision by Government, on Res. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 671 (i).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—*Continued.*

- Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1465 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 1250 (ii).
 Clothing, &c. (Militia) in Com. of Sup., 1212 (ii).
 Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1151 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 51 (i).
 Debt., Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1267 (ii).
 Ellis, J. V., Esq., M.P., and annexation, objection taken to Ques. put by Mr. Guillet, 45 (i).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1405 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Davies) 1324 (ii).
 Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1152 (ii).
 Indian Act Amt. B. 166 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1009.
 Kettle and Stoney Point Reserves, claims of Indians (M. for Ret.*) 1259 (ii).
 Midland Harbor Improvements (M. for Cor.*) 1259 (ii).
 Monek, Richard, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 712 (i)
 N. W. T. Representation B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 1483 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. McNeill) in Com. of Sup., 1208 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1189, 1420, 1494; on M. for 3^o (Amt.) 1507, 1509 (ii).
 Ry. Crossings Provisions (B. 111, 1^o) 964 (ii).
 Ry. Employes Protection B. 5 (Mr. Denison) on M. for 2^o, 765 (i)
 Sault Ste Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1443 (ii).
 Smyth, Henry, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 495 (i).
 Stag Island Lighthouse, construction (M. for Cor.*) 1259 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics.* (Archives, care of, payment to C. C. Chipman) 1149; (Criminal Statistics) 1151; (Health Statistics) 1152 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1443; (Trent River Nav.) 1454 (ii).
Fisheries (David J. Adams) 1858 (ii).
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1161 (ii).
Militia (Clothing, &c.) 1212 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1465 (ii).
 Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Sel. Com., 31 (i).
 Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1454 (ii).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 753 (ii).

Lovitt, Mr. J., Yarmouth.

- Banks, Supervision by Govt., on Res. (Mr. Casgrain) 672 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Fisheries* (Overseers salaries, &c.) 1602 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses, &c.) 1582, 1681 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Halifax and St. John) 1678 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging, 1871. Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1561, 1673 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Water Police) 1590 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A., G.C.B., Kingston.

- Address, on the, 12 (i).
 — His Ex.'s reply (presented) 172 (i).
 — Farewell, to His Ex. (M.) to consider, 1561 (ii).
 — (M.) to conc., 1586 (ii).
 Adams, David J., in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).
 Administration of Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1^o*) 2 (i).
 Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
 Banks and Banking, Legislation respecting (remarks) 415 (i).
 Barracks, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 971 (ii).
 Books for Mechanics' Institutes, removal of Duties (Ans.) 899 (ii).
 Boundary between Alaska and Canada (Ans.) 171 (i).
 Boundaries of Ont. (Ans.) 823 (i).
 Bridge at Que., Govt. aid (Ans.) 1625 (ii).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1673 (ii).
 Business of the House (remarks) 139, 416, 498, 711 (i); 1061, 1259, 1332 1507, (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 2^o, 979; in Com., 1247 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).
 — on Res. (Mr. Mills, Bethwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 75 (i).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1388 (ii).
 — Lands held by Govt. west of Man. (Ans.) 1174 (ii).
 — Taxes (Ans.) 495 (i).
 — sold and unsold, acreage (Ans.) 1174, 1195 (ii).
 Cattle Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 Caughnawaga Reserve, Election of Chiefs, &c. (Ans.) 1680 (ii).
 — Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 1680 (ii).
 Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1242 (ii).
 Choquette, Mr., M.P., Pet. against return (remarks) 1332 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1440 (ii).
 Compensation for Injuries, in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).
 Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 104 (i), 1644, 1667 (ii).
 Culbertson, Archibald, dismissal, on M. for Cor., 978 (ii).
 Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1667, 1684 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators (remarks) 20 (i).
 — on presentation of papers, 39 (i).
 — on Res. (Mr. Laurier) (Amt.) 747; agreed to (Y. 113; N. 61) 749 (i).
 — (Ques. of Order) 719 (i).
 — 3rd Rep. of Com. (Translators) on M. to conc., 1501 (ii).
 Delaney, Mrs. (pension) in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 Divorce, publication of Evidence (remarks) 1414 (ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1143 (ii).
- Dom. Exhibition, in Com of Sup., 1149 (ii).
- Dom. Lands Act Amt. B., M. to introd. withdn., 1232.
 — (B. 131) 1°*, 1382; 2° m., 1514; 3° m., 1548 (ii).
 — (Mines) in Com of Sup., 1635 (ii).
- Easter, Adjmt. for (Ans.) 344; (remarks) 415; (M.) 494 (i).
- Employés in Public Service of Can. (Ans.) 495 (i).
- Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1667 (ii).
- Extra Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1615, 1637; conc., 1688.
- Fabre, Mr. (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1613 (ii).
- Fisheries Treaty, papers respecting, omission (remarks) 141 (i).
 — Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 849-851 (ii).
 — non-ratification by U.S., Policy of Govt. (Ans.) 1433 (ii).
- Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1°, 1066 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1642 (ii).
- Fraudulent Practices on Farmers, on Res. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sp. Com., 1244 (ii).
- Free List, O. C., respecting (remarks) 643 (i).
- German Emperor (late Crown Prince) rumored death (Ans.) 206 (i).
- Govt. Business (remarks) 139, 416, 498 (i).
 — Legislation respecting (remarks) 1507 (ii).
 — (M.) to take in Thursdays, 711 (i).
 — (M.) to take in Wednesdays, 1061 (ii).
 — (M.) to take in Saturdays, 1259 (ii).
 — (M.) to take in Mondays, 1332 (ii).
- Govt. in N. W. T. (expenses) in Com. of Sup., 1611.
- Gold as Legal Tender (Ans.) 171 (i).
- Gowanlock, Mrs., claim for compensation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1016 (ii).
- Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1639 (ii).
- Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House, 926 (ii).
- Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1562 (ii).
- Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1153 (ii).
- High Commissioner's contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 107 (i).
 — Office, application of Civil Service Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1506 (ii).
- Hot Springs (roads, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1617, 1666 (ii).
- Imperial Federation, on Res. (Mr. *Marshall*) (remarks) 1091 (ii).
- Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1007 (ii).
- Indian Affairs, in Com. of Sup., 1637 (ii).
- Indemnity to Members (remarks) 1586, 1670 (ii).
- Insolvency, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 495 (i).
- Inspector of Ranches, Duties (Ans.) 965 (ii).
- Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 27 (i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- I. C. R. (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1623 (ii).
- Jubilee Address to the Queen, Mess. from His Ex., despatch from Colonial Sec. conveying thanks of Her Majesty, 24 (i).
- Kent (Ont.) Controverted Election (M.) to ref. Judge's Rep. to Sel. Com. on Priv. and Elec., 18, 19; on adjd. deb., 23; agreed to on a div., 24 (i).
 — Representation, Issue of Writ (remarks) 381, 494 (i).
 — Issue of Writ (Ans.) 499 (i).
- Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 123 (i).
 — Post Office defalcations, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1014, 1020 (ii).
- Labor Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1659 (ii).
- Library of Parl., in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
- Man. Lunatic Asylum, in Com. of Sup., 1666 (ii).
- Man. and N. W. T. Ry. Bills, on M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to withdr., 1586 (ii).
- Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1199 (ii).
- Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 24, 27, 173 (i), 1231 (ii).
- Monck, Richard, employment by Govt. (Ans.) 899 (ii).
- Mounted Police Headquarters, Edmonton District, (Ans.) 965 (ii).
 — Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 499 (i).
 — Dept., in Com. of Sup., 93 (i).
- Northern Light*, Cor. re Captain (Ans.) 416 (i).
- N. W. T. Legislation, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1231 (ii).
 — Representation Act Amt. (B. 76, 1°) 454 (i); (prop. Res.) 1174; 2° of B. m., 1473; in Com., 1480.
- Oaths of Office. See "Administration."
- O'Donoghue, W. F., employment by Govt. (Ans.) 899 (ii).
- Order (Ques. of) deb. objected to, Orders of the Day having been called, 554 (i).
- Pairing of Members (remarks) 1371 (ii).
- Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1598 (ii).
- Plumb, Hon. J. B., decease of (remarks) 124 (i).
- Printing and Stationery, Public, Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com. (remarks) re absence of Dep. Speaker, 1006 (ii).
- Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 90 (i).
- Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Mitchell*) re Disallowance (remarks) 111 (i).
 — (Mr. *McMillan*, *Huron*) Reciprocity deb., 345.
- Quarantine Service of Can., on M. (Mr. *Fiset*) for Sp. Com., 661 (i).
- Rys. in Can., Cost up to Jan., 1888 (Ans.) 141 (i).
- Rebellion (1885) Claims of Scouts, &c., on Res. (Mr. *Davin*) to reconsider, 1243 (ii).
 — Total Cost (Ans.) 171 (i).
- Reciprocity with U. S., on fixing day for discussion (remarks) 27 (i).
 — newspaper Cor. re entry of certain articles free of Duty, 490, 522 (i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- Repairs to Buildings, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1623; conc., 1688 (ii).
 Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 894 (ii).
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1671 (ii).
 Russell Representation, on M. (Mr. Laurier) for Mr. Speaker to Issue Writ, 416, 455 (i).
 — — Issue of Writ (Ans.) 499, 525, 554 (i).
 Schools, Indian (Man.) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (ii).
 Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
 Select Standing Committees (M.) 2 (i).
 — — (M.) for Sp. Com. to prepare Lists, 17 (i).
 — — Com. appointed, Rep. presented, 20 (i).
 — — Lists presented, 25 (i).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1028, 1669 (ii).
 Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1684 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture, and Statistics* (Dom. Exhibition) 1149; (Health Statistics) 1153 (ii).
Canals—Income (Rideau) 1671 (ii).
Civil Government : (Agriculture) 96; (contingencies) 104; (High Commissioner's contingencies) 107 (i); (Indian Affairs) 1637 (ii); (Mounted Police) 93; (Privy Council) 90; (Sec. of State) 92 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Culling Timber) 1667, 1684; (Excise) 1667; (Slides and Booms, salaries, &c.) 1684 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Income (Mines) 1635 (ii).
Fisheries (David J. Adams) 1656 (ii).
Geological Survey, 1604 (ii).
Immigration (Gratuities) 1639 (ii).
Indians (B.C.) 1682; (Man., schools) 1681; (Man. and N.W.T.) 1605; (Ont. and Que.) 1605 (ii).
Legislation : House of Commons (Members Indemnity) 1670; (Salaries, &c.) 1028; (Sessional Clerks) 1669. *Miscellaneous* (Franchise Act) 1642; (Library of Parl.) 1638 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, conc., 1690 (ii).
Militia (Barracks, B.C.) 1644; (contingencies) 1644 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Banff Springs, construction, &c.) 1666; (Can. Temp. Act) 1612; (Compensation for Injuries) 1612; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1613; (Govt. Expenses, N. W. T.) 1611; (Labor Commission) 1659; (Man. Asylum) 1666; (preparing Returns) 1615, 1637; conc., 1688 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1661, 1683 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Kingston) 123 (i).
Pensions 1201, 1639, 1643 (ii).
Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ont.) 1673; conc., 1688. Harbors and Rivers, 1662 (ii).
Quarantine (Cattle, Que.) 1201; (Medical Inspection) 1199 (ii).
 Terms of Union with P. E. I., carrying out (Ans.) 140 (i).
 Trade Combinations B. 138 (Mr. Wallace) on M. to introd., 1545 (ii).
 — — M. to suspend Rule 78, as to number of Sel. Com., 36 (i).
 Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. White, Renfrew) on Ques. of Procedure, 1148 (ii).
 Veterans of 1812 (Pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1202 (ii).
 Wrecking Vessels in American Waters, on M. for papers, &c., 666 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., East Huron.

- Can. Temp. Act, on Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 76 (i).
 O'Donoghue, W. F., employment by Govt. (Ques.) 899 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 276–287 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 1155; (Health Statistics) 1153 (ii).

Macdowall, Mr. D. H., Saskatchewan.

- Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert incorp. (B. 15, 1°*) 62 (i).
 N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 1477; in Com., 1483 (ii).
 Rebellion (1885) Claims of Scouts, &c., on Res. (Mr. Davin) to reconsider, 1242 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Mounted Police (expenses) 1611 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 1610 (ii).

Mackenzie, Hon. A., East York.

- Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 969 (ii).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1383 (ii).
 Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1242 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1435 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1262 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1144 (ii).
 Fisheries Treaty, production of Papers (remarks) 65 (i).
 Fraudulent Practices on Farmers, on Res. (Mr. Brown) for Sp. Com., 1241 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., on Mr. Speaker's ruling (remarks) 1301 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 1473; in Com., 1480 (ii).
 Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Carling) in Com., 1512 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 832 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1177 (ii).
 Rebellion (1885) Claims of Scouts, &c., on Res. (Mr. Davin) to reconsider, 1243 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1583 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Income (Miscellaneous) 1646 (ii).
Civil Government (contingencies) 104 (i).
Militia (Barracks, B. C.) 1644 (ii).
Railways—Capital (I. C. R.) 1615, 1650 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. D., North Simcoe.

- Business of the House, on M. to take in Wednesdays, 1062 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. D.—Continued.

Can. Temp. Act Amt. (B. 6, 1°) 44; 2° m., 973; in Com., 980 (ii).
 Imperial Federation, on Res. (Mr. *Marshall*) 1069 (ii).
 Letters Patent (Defective) Act Amt. (B. 4, 1°) 44 (i).
 Ry. Employés Protection (B. 5, 1°) 44 (i); adjnd. deb. rsmd., 916 (ii).

McCulla, Mr. W. A., Peel.

York Farmers Colonisation Co.'s (B. 107, 1°*) 1031 (ii).

McDonald, Mr. J. A., Victoria, N.S.

Point Tupper Ry. Pier, Tenders (Ques.) 1299 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1252 (ii).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., Cape Breton.

Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 864 (ii).

McIntyre, Mr. P. A., King's, P.E.I.

Naufrage, P.E.I., Improvement of Navigation, Rep. of Engineer (M. for copy) 70 (i).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 487-489 (i).

McKay, Mr. A., Hamilton.

Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1591 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 1215 (ii).

McKeen, Mr. D., Cape Breton.

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 547-553 (i).

McLelan, Hon. A. W., Colchester.

Arkona Postmaster, dismissal (Ans.) 712 (i).
 — on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1019 (ii).
 Bexley Postmaster, appointment (Ans.) 59 (i).
 Civil Service List, typographical errors (Ans.) 966 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan, B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1266 (ii).
 Eight Island Lake Post Office (Ans.) 86 (i).
 Fort McLeod and Pincher Creek Mail Service (Ans.) 712 (i).
 Ingoldsby Station Post Office, on M. for Ret., 1244 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 912 (ii).
 Kingston Deputy Postmaster's irregularities (Ans.) 899 (ii).
 — defalcations, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1013 (ii).
 Lakes Huron and Superior Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
 Letter Carriers, Town of Barrie (Ans.) 1299 (ii).
 Lotbinière Mail Service (Ans.) 98 (i).

McLelan, Hon. A. W.—Continued.

Mégantic County Mail Service, Contract (Ans.) 825, 1232 (ii).
 Northumberland, N.B., Mail Service (remarks) 1388.
 Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 20 (i).
 Post Office and Finance Depts., computing Interest, in Com of Sup., 112 (i).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1633, 1638, 1684 (ii).
 P. E. I. Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 50, 52, 58 (i).
 Quebec and Dequen Mail Service (Ans.) 98 (i).
 Shannon, Wm., defalcations, payment of by Govt. (Ans.) 965 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Post Office and Finance, computing Interest) 112 (i); (Post Office) 1638 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 1684 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Lakes Huron and Superior) 1678 (ii).
 Victoria (B.C.) superannuation of Postmaster (Ans.) 826 (ii).
 Victoria County (Ont.) Postal Service (Ans.) 825 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1093-1101 (ii).
 Winkler, Mrs. Barbara, payment for loss of Registered Letter (Ans.) 750 (i).

McMillan, Mr. J., South Huron.

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1428 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amt., 194-199 (i).
 Privilege (Ques. of) Reciprocity deb., 345 (i).
 Weights and Measure Acts Amt. (Ques.) 97 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J., North Wellington.

Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1540, 1655 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1253 (ii).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1345 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1223 (ii).
 Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1241 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1435 (ii).
 — Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 135 (i).
 Colonisation and Homestead Inspectors, N.W.T., &c. (M. for Ret.*) 866 (ii).
 — in N.W.T. and Man. (M. for Ret.*) 498 (i).
 Contingencies, deptl., in Com. of Sup., 104 (i).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1272 (ii).
 Dom. Lands Agents Instructions, &c., 45 (i).
 — in Man. and N.W.T., Instructions (M. for Ret.) 36 (i).
 Experimental Farm in N.W., Rep of Prof. Saunders (M. for Ret.*) 498 (i).
 Fabre, Mr. (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).
 Fort McLeod and Pincher Creek Mail Service (Ques.) 712 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Govt. in N.W.T. (expenses) in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).
 Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1639 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1674 (ii).
 High Commissioner's contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 109 (i).
 ——— application of Civil Service Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1504 (ii).
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1225, 1645 (ii).
 Jones, Walter, and Haldimand Election, on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1532 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, dismissal of Laborers, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1648 (ii).
 Letter Carriers, Town of Barrie (Ques.) 1299 (ii).
 Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1022 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 1488 (ii).
 Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Carling) in Com., 1512 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1598 (ii).
 Post Office and Finance Depts., computing Interest, in Com. of Sup., 112 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1186 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 441-454 (i).
 Repairs, &c., to Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1542 (ii).
 Returns (enquiry) 1136 (ii).
 Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1675 (ii).
 St. Catharines Milling and Lumbering Co. vs. the Queen, Sums paid for Costs (M. for Ret.*) 20 (i).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 136.
 Sessional Clerks, number and amounts paid (Ques.) 1299. ——— in Com. of Sup., 1030, 1668 (ii).
 Smyth, Henry, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 495, 647. ——— (M. for Ret.*) 866 (ii).
 Strathroy Public Buildings, Site (M. for Ret.*) 498 (i). ——— (Ques.) 1174 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Civil Government* (contingencies) 104; (High Commissioner's contingencies) 109; (Post Office and Finance, computing Interest) 112; (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 135 (i).
Immigration (Gratuities) 1639.
Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 1608 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1030; (Sessional Clerks) 1030, 1668 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1612; (Govt. in N.W.T.) 1611 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 1022 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 136 (i).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1540, 1655; (Repairs, &c.) 1542. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1674. Roads and Bridges, 1675 (ii).
Railways—Capital (C. P. R.) 1223; (I. C. R.) 1225, 1645 (ii).
 Trade Combinations B. 138 (Mr. Wallace) on M. to introd., 1545 (ii).
 Victoria (B.C.) superannuation of Postmaster (Ques.) 826 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1128 (ii).
 Winkler, Mrs. Barbara, payment for loss of Registered Letter (Ques.) 750 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A., North Bruce.

- Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 972 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1436, 1470 (ii).
 Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1616 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. Laurier) 713 (i).
 Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1639 (ii).
 Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adju. House, 928 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1569 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 906 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of (M. that Com. rise) in Com. of Sup., 1208 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 1157 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1190, 1419, 1496; on M. for 3°, 1508 (ii).
 Rebellion of 1885 (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1207 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amt., 240-246 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice* (Miscellaneous) 117 (i).
Immigration (Gratuities) 1639; (Pauper) 1157 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) 1616 (ii).
Pensions (Rebellion of 1885) 1207 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1569 (ii).
 Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Sel. Com., 35 (i).
 Travis, ex-Judge, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 117 (i).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 757 (i).

Madill, Mr. F., North Ontario.

- Carriers by Water (Liability) Act Amt. (B. 49, 1°) 238 (i).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1272 (ii).
 Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adju. House, 928 (ii).
 Mississauga Indians' Claims (M. for Cor.*) 866 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1430 (ii).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1027 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Legislation*: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1027 (ii).

Mara, Mr. J. A., Yale.

- County Court Judges (B. C.) additional appointment (Ques.) 66 (i).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1575 (ii).
 Parmalee, Mr., Rep. to Minister re Kamloops as an outport of entry (M. for copy*) 498 (ii).
 Sushwap and Okanagan Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 43, 1°*) 206 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 1575 (ii).
Indians (Ont. and Que.) 1607 (ii).

Marshall, Mr. J. H., East Middlesex.

- Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1241 (ii).
 Imperial Federation (prop. Res.) 1069 (ii).
 Privilege (Ques. of) Pairing of Members, 1403 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1431 (ii).

Masson, Mr. J., North Grey.

- Belleville and Lake Nipissing Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 90, 1^o*) 866 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1251 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1193 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 539-543 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1569 (ii).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 755 (i).

Mills, Hon. D., Bothwell.

- Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 95. (i).
 Bank of London, winding-up (B. 80, 1^o*) 489 (i).
 ——— Rep. of Com. on Banking, &c. (M. to ref. back) 963 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Seizures (Ques.) 778 (i).
 ——— on M. for Cor., 968 (ii).
 Boundaries of Ont. (Ques.) 822 (i).
 Brigade Majors, in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1655, 1673 (ii).
 Business of the Hse., on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Wednesdays, 1062 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2^o, 979; in Com., 980 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) on Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2^o, 990 (ii).
 ——— prop. Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 74; neg. (Y. 57; N. 109) 84 (i).
 Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 114, 134 (i).
 Clothing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1213 (ii).
 Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1615 (ii).
 Criminal Law (England) application to Can. B. 100 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 1^o, 825 (ii).
 ——— Extension to Man. B. 41 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 1^o, 139 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 946 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1667 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on presentation of papers, 39 (i).
 ——— on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 717, 721 (i).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 944, 1140 (ii).
 Dom. Savings Banks, in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).
 Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1667 (ii).
 Fisheries Commission, Chart showing delimitation (remarks) 647 (i).
 ——— production of papers (remarks) 65, 101 (i).
 ——— omission of certain papers (remarks) 142 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

- Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2^o, 833-841; in Com., 868 (ii).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1^o, 1063 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1642 (ii).
 Fraudulent Trade Marks on Merchandise Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1002 (ii).
 Free List, O. C.'s respecting (remarks) 649 (i).
 Govt. Measures (remarks) 138, 416, 456 (i).
 Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1639 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1655 (ii).
 High Commissioner's contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 105 (i).
 Hot Springs, Banff (roads, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1617.
 Imperial Federation, on Res. (Mr. *Marshall*) 1088 (ii).
 Indemnity (Members) in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
 Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com. 1008 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 911 (ii).
 Kent (Ont.) Controverted Election, on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to ref. Judge's Rep. to Sel. Com. on Priv. and Elec., 23 (i).
 ——— Representation (remarks) 270, 434 (i).
 ——— Issue of Writ (remarks) 380, 499 (i).
 ——— on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec. (remarks) 380 (i).
 Labor Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1660 (ii).
 Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 93 (i).
 Northern Light and Alert, Cor., Tels., &c., on M. for Ret., 827 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 1^o, 454 (i); on Res., 1174 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1597 (ii).
 Post Office Irregularities, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1020 (ii).
 Printing and Stationery, Public, Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com. (remarks) *re* absence of Dep. Speaker, 1005 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1617 (ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *McMillan*) Reciprocity deb., 345 (i).
 Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 90 (i).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 829 (ii).
 ——— on member being checked (remarks) 867 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1176 (ii).
 Ry. Commission, copies of Rep. (Ques.) 646 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., newspaper Cor. *re* entry of certain articles free of Duty, 491, 516 (i).
 ——— on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 606-610 (i).
 ——— on M. to adjn. deb. (remarks) 822 (i).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 890; in Com. on Res., 894, (ii).
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1671 (ii).
 Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1676 (ii).
 Russell Representation, Issue of Writ (Ques.) 554 (i).
 Schools, Indian (Man.) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (ii).
 Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1640 (ii).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1025, 1669 (ii).
 Speedy Trials Act Amt. B. 93 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1005 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 116 (i).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Dom. Exhibition) 1148; (Health Statistics) 1151 (ii).
Canals—Income (Miscellaneous) 1647; (Rideau) 1671 (ii).
Charges of Management (Dom. Savings Banks) 89 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 95; (Civil Service Examiners, salaries) 114, 134; (High Commissioner's contingencies) 105; (Mounted Police) 93; (Privy Council Office) 90 (i); (Sec. of State) 1640 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1667; (Excise) 1667 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Income (Extra Clerks) 1637 (ii).
Geological Survey, 1605 (ii).
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1161; (Gratuities) 1639 (ii).
Indians (B. C.) 1683; (Man. and N. W. T.) 1608; (Man., schools) 1681; (Ont. and Que.) 1606 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Members Indemnity) 1670; (salaries, &c.) 1025; (Sessional Clerks) 1025, 1669. Miscellaneous (Franchise Act) 1642; (Library, salaries, &c.) 1030 (ii).
Militia (Brigade Majors salaries) 1209; (Clothing, &c.) 1213 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) 1615; (Franchise Act) 1642; (Hot Springs, Banff) 1617; (Labor Commission) 1660 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1662 (ii).
Pensions (N. W. T.) 1643 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1655, 1673. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1655. Roads and Bridges, 1676 (ii).
 Supreme Court Librarian, in Com. of Sup., 1030 (ii).
 Travis, ex-Judge, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 116 (i).
 Treason and Felony Forfeitures abolition B. 88 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1148 (ii).
 Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.'s B. 20 (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) in Com. (Ques. of procedure) 1148 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1122 (ii).
 Wrecking Vessels in American Waters, on M. for papers, &c., 667 (i).

Mills, Mr. John B., Annapolis.

Annapolis and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 82, 1°*) 489 (i).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 983 (ii).
 — B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1255 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 910 (ii).
 Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Ives*) paragraph in *Free Press*, 524 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 323-335 (i).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1588 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 1466 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P., Northumberland, N.B.

Adams, David J., in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).
 Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
 Antwerp and Canada Mail Subsidy, conc., 1690 (ii).
 Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 969 (ii).
 Bryanton, Albert and Allan, re Derby Branch Ry. (M. for Cor., &c.*) 866 (ii).
 Business of the House, on M. to meet at 10 a.m., 1625.
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. *Tisdale*) 981 (ii).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1370; (Amt.) neg., 1371; in Com., 1381, 1388 (ii).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 938; on M. for 3°, 942 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1468 (ii).
 — Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 129 (i).
 Clancey, Patrick, damages re Derby Branch Ry. (M. for Ret.*) 866 (ii).
 Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1638.
 Combines and Tariff Changes (remarks) 24 (i).
 Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1615 (ii).
 Concurrence, 1687 (ii).
 Cornmeal, Flour, &c., removal of Duties (Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 44; N. 89) 1560 (ii).
 Cornwall Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
 Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1619, 1684 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 953; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1472 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1631 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on presentation of papers, 40 (i).
 — on Amt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 748 (i).
 — distribution to Press (remarks) 750 (i).
 — 1st Rep. of Com. (remarks) 25 (i).
 — 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1298 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1269; in Com., 1278 (i).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1146 (ii).
 Esquimaux Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1654 (ii).
 Estimates, The, remarks on presentation, 50 (i).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1154, 1575 (ii).
 Fabre, Mr. (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1613 (ii).
 Fisheries Treaty, papers respecting (remarks) 64, 100, 142 (i).
 — Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2° (remarks) 684; on M. for 2°, 793-813 (i); in Com., 867 (ii).
 — Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).
 — Bounty (expenses, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1604 (ii).
 — Overseers (salaries, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1601.
 — Steamers (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1603.

Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.

- Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., Gold as Legal Tender (Ques.) 171 (i).
 Gowanlock, Mrs., claim for compensation (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1563, 1674 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Davies) 1327 (ii).
 High Commissioner's contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 110 (i).
 ——— Office, application of Civil Service Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1502, 1505 (ii).
 Hot Springs, Banff (roads, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1617, 1666 (ii).
 Indemnity to Members (remarks) 1586 (ii).
 ——— on M. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 1681 (ii).
 Indian Affairs Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1637 (ii).
 I. C. R., Receipts and Expenditures, on Ques. (remarks) 66 (i).
 ——— Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1620, 1650 (ii).
 Interest on Public Debt, in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).
 Justice Dept., in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).
 Knight, John and Allen, claims for damages (Derby Branch Ry.) (M. for Rets.*) 866 (ii).
 Labor Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1658 (ii).
 Lachine Canal, dismissal of Laborers (Ques. of Order) in Com. of Sup., 1648 (ii).
 Library of Parl., in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
 Magdalen Islands Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1678.
 Man. Lunatic Asylum, in Com. of Sup., 165 (i).
 Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
 Merchants Marine Insurance Co.'s B. 11 (Mr. Curran) on M. for 2°, 125; on M. to same. adjd. deb for 2°, 322 (i).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1281 (ii).
 Newfoundland and Confedn., on M. for Cor., 665 (i).
 Northumberland, N.B., Mail Service (remarks) 1382.
 N.W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 1°, 455 (i); in Com., 1488 (ii).
 Obstructions, &c., in Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1581 (ii).
 Ottawa, additional Building, in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).
 Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Carling) in Com., 1511 (ii).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1633, 1698 (ii).
 ——— Irregularities, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1020 (ii).
 Prince Edward Co. Election, on M. admitting Member on certificate (remarks) 380 (i).
 Printing Bureau, Plant, &c., conc. 1689 (ii).
 Printing and Stationery, Public, Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com. (remarks) *re* absence of Dep. Speaker, 1006 (ii).
 Privilege (Ques. of) Despatches *re* admission of Newfoundland into Confedn., 111 (i).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.

- Privilege (Ques. of) (Mr. McMillan, Huron) Reciprocity deb., 345 (i).
 ——— Disallowance, 110 (i).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1297 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1176, 1418 (ii).
 Rys. and Canals Dept., in Com. of Sup., 97 (i).
 Ry. Expenditure (remarks) 922 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., newspaper Cor. *re* entry of certain articles free of Duty, 459 (i).
 ——— (remarks) 516 (i).
 ——— proposals of Plenipotentiaries (remarks) 87 (i).
 ——— on M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) Res. First Order of the Day (remarks) 44 (i).
 Returns, on enquiry (remarks) 1136 (ii).
 Repairs to Buildings, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1544 (ii).
 Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 1675 (ii).
 Royal Military College, conc., 1637 (ii).
 Russell, Saml., claim for damages (Derby Branch Ry.) (M. for Cor., &c.*) 866 (ii).
 St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s B. 137 (Mr. Boyle) in Com., 152 (i), 1522 (ii).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com., of Sup., 138 (i).
 Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com., of Sup., 1442 (ii).
 Schools, Indian (Man.) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (ii).
 Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1640 (ii).
 Slides and Booms, in Com. of Sup., 1620; (salaries) 1684 (ii).
 Statistical Diagrams, in Com. of Sup., 1664 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1588 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Census, &c.) 1155; (Colonial and Indian Exhibition) 1638; (Dom. Exhibition, &c.) 1149 (Experimental Farms) 1154 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 1452; (Sault Ste Marie) 1442 (ii).
Charges of Management (Interest on Public Debt) 89 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 95; (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 129; (High Commissioner's contingencies) 110 (i); (Indian Affairs) 1637 (ii); (Justice) 91; (Mounted Police) 94 (i); (Post Office) 1638 (ii); (Railways and Canals) 97 (i); (Secretary of State) 1640 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Customs) 1631; (Calling Timber) 1619, 1684; (I. C. R., Repairs, &c.) 1620, 1650; (Post Office) 1633; (Public Works, Agency, B. O.) 1633; (Slides and Booms, salaries, &c.) 1620, 1684 (ii).
Fisheries (David J. Adams) 1656; (Overseers salaries, &c.) 1601; (Steamers, repairs, &c.) 1603 (ii).
Geological Survey, 1604 (ii).
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1165 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 1608; (Man., schools) 1681; (Ont. and Que.) 1607 (ii).
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Library of Parl.) 1638; (Printing, Paper, &c.) 1031 (ii).
Lighthouses and Coast Service (Lighthouses) 1681 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Antwerp and Canada) conc., 1689; (U. S. and Victoria, B. C.) 1680 (ii).
Militia (Royal Military College) conc., 1637 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

- Miscellaneous* (Commercial Agencies) 1615; (Fishing Bounty) 1604; (Fishery Commission) 1663; (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1613; (Govt. Printing Bureau, Plant, &c.) conc., 1689; (Hot Springs, Banff) 1617, 1666; (Labor Commission) 1658; (Man. Lunatic Asylum) 1665; (Statistical Diagrams) 1664 (ii).
- Mounted Police* (expenses) 94 (i); 1611, 1658 (ii).
- Ocean and River Service* (Obstructions, &c., in Rivers) 1581; (Water Police) 1580 (ii).
- Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 138 (i).
- Pensions*, 1640 (ii).
- Public Works—Capital*: Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 1461. (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1654. *Income*: Buildings, 1540; (N.S.) 1465; (Ont.) 1461, 1540; (Repairs, &c.) 1461, 1544. Experimental Farms, 1575. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1563, 1673; (Ont.) 1674; (P.E.I.) 1562. Roads and Bridges, 1675 (ii).
- Quarantine* (Medical Inspection) 1195 (ii).
- Railways—Capital* (I. C. R.) 1629, 1650. *Income* (Surveys, &c.) 1460 (ii).
- Tobique Valley Ry., Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com., 1626 (ii).
- Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Sel. Com., 34 (i).
- U. S. and Victoria (B. C.) Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1630 (ii).
- Upper Ottawa Improvement Co.'s, B. 20 (Mr. White, Renfrew) on for 2°, 322 (i).
- Water Police, in Com. of Sup., 1580 (ii).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff, in Com., 1121 (ii).
- Wrecking Vessels in American Waters, on M. for papers, &c., 667 (i).

Moncrieff, Mr. G., East Lambton.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 1258 (ii).
- Personal explanation *re* newspaper paragraph, 392.
- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 351-355 (i).
- Stag Island (Ont.) Lighthouse (Ques.) 1174 (ii).
- Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Sel. Com., 35 (i).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff, in Com., 1133 (ii).

Montague, Mr. W. H., Haldimand.

- Address, The (moved) 2 (i).
- Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 973 (ii).
- Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 19, 1°*) 73 (i).
- Jones, Walter, and Haldimand Election, on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1525.
- Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1029 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Legislation*: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1029 (ii).
- Public Works—Income*: Roads and Bridges, 1675 (ii).

Mulock, Mr. W., North York.

- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1434, 1470 (ii).
- Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 128 (i).

Mulock, Mr. W.—Continued.

- Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Bowell) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1472 (ii).
- Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on printing papers (remarks) 41 (i).
- Ques. of Order, 719 (i).
- on Res. (Mr. Laurier) 725 (i).
- Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1271 (ii).
- Divorce, publication of Evidence (remarks) 1415 (ii).
- Estimates, Suppl., papers *re* certain Items (remarks) 1433 (ii).
- Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1154 (ii).
- Fisheries Treaty, production of papers (Ques.) 64, 143.
- Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 119 (Mr. Chapleau) on M. for 2°, 1550 (ii).
- Free List, O.C.'s respecting (remarks) 648 (i).
- G. T. R. Co.'s Agreements B. 26 (Mr. Small) on M. to authorise Ry. Com. to divide Bill, 415 (i).
- Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1563 (ii).
- Lachine Canal, discharge of Laborers (Affidavit read) 1563 (ii).
- Liquor License Act, amounts paid by Govt. (M. for Ret.*) 526 (i).
- Neely, Private T., provision for Widow, &c. (M. for Ret.) 649 (i).
- N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) in Com., 1481 (ii).
- Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1175, 1423, 1492; on M. for 3°, 1509 (ii).
- Rebellion in N. W. T., Total Cost (Ques.) 171 (i).
- (M. for Ret.*) 498 (i).
- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 626-632 (i).
- Summary Convictions Act Amt. B. 113 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1417 (ii).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Experimental Farms) 1154 (ii).
- Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners, salaries, &c.) 128 (i).
- Immigration* (Agents salaries) 1164 (ii).
- Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1563 (ii).
- Trent Valley Canal Commission, Cor. &c., on M. for Ret., 72 (i).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff, 1114, 1121 (ii).
- York-Simcoe Battalion, Kit Allowance (M. for Ret.) 66, 69 (i).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., Muskoka.

- Antwerp and Canada Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1679 (ii).
- Brigade Majors, in Com. of Sup., 1210 (ii).
- Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1537 (ii).
- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6 m. h., 989; withdn., 1000 (ii).
- Central Railway Co.'s Pet. (M.) to ref. back to Com. on Standing Orders, 750 (i).
- Children, care and reformation Provision (B. 109, 1°) 963 (ii).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E.—Continued.

- Clothing, &c. (Militia) in Com. of Sup., 1212 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1265 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1146 (ii).
 Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1213 (ii).
 Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
 Fishery Overseers (salaries, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1533 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1568 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1184, 1426 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 525-527 (i).
 SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 119 (i).
Fisheries (Overseers salaries, &c.) 1583 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 1582 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Antwerp and Canada) 1879 (ii).
Militia (Brigade Majors) 1210; (Clothing, &c.) 1212; (Drill Pay, &c.) 1213 (ii).
Pensions (N.W.T.) 1643 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1537. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1568 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1121 (ii).
 Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for 2°, 777 (i).
 York-Simcoe Battalion, Kit Allowance, on M. for Ret., 69 (i).

Paterson, Mr. W., South Brant.

- Adulteration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 933 (ii).
 Bottles and Vessels Protection to Owners B. 3 (Mr. Denison) on M. for 2°, 759 (i).
 Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s further Provision (B. 53, 1°*) 270 (i).
 Buildings (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1544, 1672 (ii).
 Business of the Hse., on M. to meet at 10 a.m., 1725 (ii).
 Can. and Michigan Tunnel Co.'s incorp. (B. 8, 1°*) 51 (i).
 Can. Temp. Act, on Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 80 (i).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1380 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Bowell) in Com., 898, 946 (ii).
 Customs, in Com. of Sup., 1632, 1666 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1266 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1145 (ii).
 Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1667 (ii).
 Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise Act Amt. B. 91 (Mr. Thompson) on M. for 2°, 942; in Com., 944 (ii).
 Free List, O. C. respecting (remarks) 649 (i).

Paterson, Mr. W.—Continued.

- Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. Hse., 928 (ii).
 Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1007 (ii).
 Kingston Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1672 (ii).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1634, 1638 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1192, 1429 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., newspaper Cor. re entry of certain articles free of Duty, 494, 517 (i).
 — on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 401-415 (i).
 Repairs, &c., to Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1544, 1672 (ii).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
 Statistical Diagrams, in Com. of Sup., 1665 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Post Office) 1638 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Oustoms) 1682, 1666; (Excise) 1667; (Post Office) 1634 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 1607; (Ont. and Que.) 1607 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1670 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Statistical Diagrams) 1665 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1662 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Kingston Graving Dock) 1672. *Income*: Buildings (N. W. T.) 1672; (Repairs, &c.) 1544, 1672. Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1561 (ii).
 Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Sel. Com., 35 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1101-1113, 1121 (ii).

Patterson, Mr. J. C., North Essex.

- Chippawa and Ottawa Nation Indians Claims (M. for Ret.*) 498 (i).
 Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer, on M. to adjn. House, 930 (ii).
 Indemnity to Members (M.) 1681 (ii).
 Pelée Island and Mainland Cable (M. for Pets., &c.) 826 (ii).
 Sarnia and Port Huron Submarine Tunnel (Ques.) 1432.
 Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for 2°, 778 (i), 918 (ii).

Perley, Mr. W. D., East Assiniboia.

- C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1367 (ii).
 — Lands, Taxes (Ques.) 494 (i).
 Experimental Farms, in Com. of Sup., 1576 (ii).
 Chinook Belt and Peace River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 16, 1°*) 73 (i).
 N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 1478; in Com., 1480 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Experimental Farms) 1576 (ii).
Immigration (Agents salaries) 1161 (ii).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 1609 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Experimental Farms, 1576 (ii).
 Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 63, 1°*) 380 (i).

Perley, Mr. W. G., Ottawa City.

Bronsons' and Weston Lumber Co.'s incorp. (B. 27, 1°*) 97 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 632-635 (i).

Perry, Mr. S. F., Prince, P. E. I.

Alberton Harbor, increasing Depth (Ques.) 712 (i).

Lobster Fisheries, Restrictions, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1555 (ii).

Northern Light, number of Trips and Passengers (M. for Ret.) 61, 672 (i).

Northumberland Straits Subway, Rep. of Engineers, &c. (M. for copy) 661 (i).

Pairing of Members (remarks) 1372 (ii).

P. E. I. Mail Service, on M. for Cor., 55 (i).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income : Harbors and Rivers (N.S.) 1561 (ii).

Terms of Confedn., P. E. I., compensation for non-fulfilment (Ques.) 86 (i).

— Despatches, &c. (M. for copies) 61 (i).

Tignish and Miminegash Breakwaters (Ques.) 86, 712 (i).

Winter Communication with P. E. I. (Ques.) 712 (i).

Platt, Mr. J. M., Prince Edward Co.

Bay of Quintè Bridge at Belleville (M. for Cor.*) 922 (ii).

Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1539 (ii).

Debates, dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 746 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 945 (ii).

McCuaig, Mr. A. F., appointment as Exoiseman at Picton (Ques.) 1432 (ii).

Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

Picton Public Buildings (M. for Cor., &c.*) 866 (ii).

Prince Edward County, construction of Public Works (Ques.) 1432 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 599-605 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Capital (Murray) 1453 (ii).

Fisheries (Overseers salaries, &c.) 1584 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Liteboat Service, Rewards, &c.) 1577.

Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ont.) 1539. Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1567 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, 1128 (ii).

Wellbank, David, mail carrier, dismissal (remarks) 1383 (ii).

Wellington Harbor of Refuge (M. for Cor., &c.*) 866 (ii).

Pope, Hon. J. H., Compton.

Fenelon River Navigation (Ans.) 97 (i).

G. T. R. Crossings in Toronto and decision of Ry. Com. of Privy Council (Ans.) 59 (i).

I. C. R., Capital Acct., amount charged (Ans.) 59 (i).

— Casualties, &c., Officials dismissed, on M. for Ret. 61 (i).

Pope, Hon. J. H.—Continued.

I. C. R., Expenditure on Capital Acct., on M. for Ret. 103 (i).

— Receipts and Expenditure (Ans.) 27, 65, 112 (i).

— Rolling Stock purchased, on M. for Ret., 61 (i).

— St. Charles Branch, Expenditure (Ans.) 97 (i).

Onderdonk Arbitration, plant taken over by Govt. under Award (Ans.) 93, 111 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 24, 1°) 73 (i).

Railways and Canals, deptl. Rep. (presented) 73 (i).

Railways, Rep. of Royal Commission (presented) 26 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Government (Railways and Canals) 96 (i).

Welland River, Bridge at Chippawa Village (Ans.) 65 (i).

Porter, Mr. R., West Huron.

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 199-203 (i).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income : Buildings (Ont.) 1540 (ii).

Préfontaine, Mr. R., Chambly.

Debates, Official, French Translation, delay (Ques.) 554 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 642-646 (i).

St. Lawrence River Floods (Ques.) 899 (ii).

South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. *Hall*) on Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) 6 m. h., to M. for 3°, 915 (ii).

Superior Court Judges, Montreal Dist. (Ques.) 647 (i).

Prior, Mr. E. G., Victoria, B. C.

Behring's Sea Seizures, on M. for Cor., 966 (ii).

Boundaries of Alaska and B.C. (Ques.) 495 (i).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (Overseers salaries, &c.) 1801 (ii).

Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 1215 ; (Permanent Forces) 1220 (ii).

Public Works—Capital (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1653 (ii).

Purcell, Mr. P., Glengarry.

SUPPLY :

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1445 (ii).

Veterans of 1837, pensions (Ques.) 85 (i).

Reid, Mr. J., Cariboo.

Boundaries of Alaska and B. C. (Ques.) 495 (i).

Rinfret, Mr. C. I., Lotbinière.

Criminal Laws, distribution to Members (Ques.) 86 (i).

Lotbinière Mail Service (Ques.) 98 (i).

Olivier, Geo., dismissal as Postmaster (M. for Cor.) 654 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 271-274 (i).

Robertson, Mr. J. E., King's, P. E. I.

- Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).
 Naufrage, P.E.I., Improvement of Navigation, Rep. of Engineer, on M. for copy, 70 (i).
 Northumberland Straits Subway, Engineers' Reps., &c., on M. for copy, 664 (i).
 P. E. I. Mail Service, on M. for Cor., &c., 55 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 377-380 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1463 (ii).

Roome, Mr. W. F., West Middlesex.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com. 1246 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 1249 (ii).

Royal, Mr. J., Provencher.

- Choquette, Mr., M.P., Pet. against Ret., 1332 (ii).

Rowand, Mr. J., West Bruce.

- Kincardine Harbor Tolls Authorisation (B. 30, 1°*) 97; 2° m., 220 (i).
 Kincardine and Teeswater Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 74, 1°*) 454 (i).

Rykert, Mr. J. C., Lincoln and Niagara.

- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 416-438 (i).
 St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 61, 1°*) 380 (i); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1345 (ii).
 Gowanlock, Mrs., claim for compensation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1015 (ii).

Scarth, Mr. W. B., Winnipeg.

- Man. and N. W. Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 46, 1°*) 238.
 Merchants Marine Insurance Co.'s B. 11 (Mr. Curran) on M. for 2°, 125 (i).
 Young, Capt. Geo. H., and others, claim for services at Batoche (M. for Cor., &c.*) 866 (ii).
 G.N.W. Central Ry. Co.'s B. 25 (Mr. Daly) 2° m., 128.

Scriver, Mr. J., Huntingdon.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 1246 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 1255 (ii).
 ——— on Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 77 (i).
 Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1240 (ii).
 Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 51 (i).
 ——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 824 (ii).
 Divorce, publication of Evidence (remarks) 1415 (ii).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1411 (ii).
 Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, on Res. (Mr. Jamieson) 833 (ii).

Scriver, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1589 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues (Rys., I. O. R.) 1621 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Harbors and Rivers (Que.) 1568 (ii).
Indians (Ont. and Que.) 1608 (ii).

Semple, Mr. A., Centre Wellington.

- Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 578-583 (i).
 Subsidies to Rys. since 1880, Amount voted (M. for Ret.*) 110 (i).

Shanly, Mr. W., South Grenville.

- Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1438 (ii).
 Grenville International Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 62, 1°*) 380 (i).
 I. C. R. (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1621 (ii).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1291 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1138, 1418, 1494 (ii).
 Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. Denison) on M. for 2°, 765 (i).
 South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. Hall) on Amt. (Mr. Bergin) 6 m. h., to M. for 3°, 913 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1445; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 1455. *Income* (Rideau) 1671 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Esquimaux Graving Dock) 1653 (ii).
 Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for 2°, 772 (i).

Skinner, Mr. C. N., St. John, N. B., City and County.

- Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 904 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 355-358. (i).

Small, Mr. J., East Toronto.

- C. P. R. Co.'s (Bonds) Branch Lines (B. 44, 1°*) 206.
 Divorce, Bills 128, 129, 130 (M. to suspend Rule) 65 (i), 1468 (ii).
 ——— Irvine, Andrew Maxwell, Relief (B. 129, 1° on div.) 1345 (ii).
 ——— Morrison, Catherine, Relief (B. 130, 1° on div.) 1345 (ii).
 ——— Tudor, Eleonora Elizabeth, Relief (B. 128, 1° on div.) 1345 (ii).
 G. T. R. Co.'s confirmation of Agreements (B. 26, 1°*) 85; 2° m., 128 (i).
 ——— (M.) to authorise Ry. Com. to divide Bill, 415. Ont. and Que. Ry. Co.'s (B. 45, 1°*) 206 (i).
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 1371 (ii).
 Superior Courts (Law or Equity) retired Judges (M. for Ret.*) 62 (i).
 Toronto Board of Trade Acts, Amt. (B. 114, 1°*) 1031.

Smith, Sir Donald A., K.C.M.G., West Montreal.

Prorogation (remarks) 1692 (ii).

St. Lawrence River, Montreal and Quebec Channel (M. for Ret.*) 922 (ii).

Somerville, Mr. J., North Brant.

Plattsburg Post Office, appointment of Postmaster, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1019 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., entry of certain articles free of Duty (remarks) 524 (i).

— on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 618-624 (i).

Six Nation Indians Claims for compensation (M. for copies*) 672 (i).

Veterans of 1866-70, Medals (Ques.) 965 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. JOSEPH ALDRIC OUMET) Laval.

Address, The, His Ex.'s reply (read) 172 (i).

Beauharnois Controverted Election, Judge's Rep., 825.

Bruce, West, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Carleton (Ont.) Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Charlevoix, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Colchester, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Controverted Elections, 1, 73, 309, 514, 554 (i).

Cumberland, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, papers &c., respecting (presented) 38 (i).

— on printing papers (remarks) 42 (i).

— French Translation, delay (Ans.) 554 (i).

Digby, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Dorchester, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Ellis, J. V. Esq., M. P., and Annexation, Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) ruled out of Order, 45 (i).

Estimates, The, 1888-89, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 50 (i).

— Suppl., 1887-88, 962 (ii).

— Suppl., 1888-89, 1403 (ii).

Fisheries Treaty, Mess. from His Ex. transmitting copy (read) 86 (i).

— non-production of papers, Members' remarks checked, 143, 239 (i).

Glengarry Controverted Election, Judgment of Supreme Court, 554 (i).

Haldimand, Dep. Returning Officer (Ques.) 923 (ii).

— Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Halton, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Hastings, West, vacancy in Representation, 85 (i).

— Ret. of Member Elect, 238 (i).

Hawke, John T., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1301 (ii).

Indemnity to Members, on M. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 1681 (ii).

Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 27 (i).

Jubilee Address to the Queen, Mess. from His Ex., despatch from Colonial Sec. conveying thanks of Her Maj. through Sec. of State for the Colonies, 24 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—Continued.

Kent (Ont.) Representation, Issue of Writ (explanation) 381 (i).

— Ret. of Member Elect, 1544 (ii).

L'Assomption Controverted Election, Judge's Rep., 73 (i).

— Ret. of Member Elect, 866 (ii).

Library of Parlt., Rep. of Librarians (presented) 2 (i).

Mess. from His Ex., 24, 27, 50, 86, 172 (i), 962, 1231, 1403 (ii).

Middlesex, West, Ret. of Member Elect, 309 (i).

Missisquoi Controverted Election, Judge's Rep., 309 (i).

— Ret. of Member Elect, 646 (i).

— Vacancy in Representation (announced) 124 (i).

Montmagny Controverted Election, Judgment of Supreme Court, 309 (i).

Montmorency Controverted Election, Judgment of Supreme Court, 73 (i).

New Members, 1, 238, 309, 380, 646 (i), 866, 1522, 1544.

Northumberland, East, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Order, Ques. of, *re* Reciprocity deb., 523 (i).

Parliament, Opening, Commons summoned to Senate, 1 (i); Prorogation, 1693 (ii).

Prince Edward Co. Election, Ret. of Member on certificate, 380 (i).

— notification of Ret. of Member Elect, 415 (i).

Printing and Stationery, Public, Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com. (remarks) *re* absence of Dep. Speaker, 1006 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Davin*) ref. to previous deb. checked, 1093 (ii).

— (Mr. *McMillan*) Reciprocity deb., 345 (i).

Procedure, Ques. standing in Member's name, party asking same must state authority for so doing, otherwise irregular, 750 (i).

Prohibition, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Jamieson*) remarks of Member checked, 867 (ii).

Prorogation, Letter from Gov. Genl. Sec. (read) 1686 (ii).

Quebec County, Controverted Election, Judgment of Supreme Court, 309 (i).

Quebec, West, Controverted Election, Supreme Court Judgment, 309 (i).

Queen's, N. B., Election, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Ry. Commission, deb. on Ques. checked, 867 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) on personal explanation (Mr. *Davies*) 239 (i).

— newspaper Cor. *re* entry of certain articles free of Duty, 491 (i).

— Member checked in deb., 554 (i).

Renfrew, South, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Royal Assent to Bills, 1195, 1692 (ii).

Russell Representation, Ret. of Member Elect, 1522 (ii).

Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1025, 1668 (ii).

Shelburne, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. *Hall*) time having expired, ruled further discussion out of Order, 916 (ii).

Speaker, Mr.—Continued.

South-Western Ry. Co.'s B., on Ques. of Order, 954 (ii).
Speech from the Throne (reported) 2 (i).

Stanstead Controverted Election, Judge's Rep., 514 (i).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1025; (Sessional Clerks) 1668 (ii).

Vacancies, 1, 85, 124 (i).

Victoria, B.C., Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

— N. S., Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Writs issued for new Elections, 1 (i).

Yarmouth, Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. C. C. COLBY) Stanstead.

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1437 (ii).

Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, Member checked in remarks, 719, 721 (i).

Russell Election, Return of Member on certificate of Returning Officer, 1415 (ii).

Sproule Mr. T., East Grey.

Cheese Branding, Legislation (prop. Res.) 1236 (ii).

Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1438, 1471 (ii).

Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Res. (Mr. Laurier) 740 (i).

— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M to conc., 1293 (ii).

— distribution to Press (remarks) 751 (i).

Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1216 (ii).

Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1406 (ii).

Govt. Savings Banks (Interest on Deposits) B. 127 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1401 (ii).

Lakes Huron and Superior Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).

Lard, Rendered, Legislation respecting, Res. (Mr. Taylor) on M. for Com. of Whole, 59 (i).

Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1199 (ii).

Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1596 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1431, 1492 (ii).

Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. Denison) on M. for 2°, 769 (i).

Rebellion of 1885 (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1204 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 362-371 (i).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Overscers salaries, &c.) 1584.

Mail Subsidies (Lakes Huron and Superior) 1878 (ii).

Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 1216 (ii).

Pensions (Rebellion of 1885) 1204 (ii).

Quarantine (Medical Inspection) 1199 (ii).

Trade Combinations, on M. (Mr. Wallace) for Sel. Com., 32 (i).

Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 755 (i).

Sutherland, Mr. J., North Oxford.

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 1246 (ii).

York-Simcoe Battalion, Kit Allowance, on M. for Ret., 70, (i).

Taylor, Mr. G., South Leeds.

Cheese Branding, Legislation respecting, on Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1239 (ii).

Lard, Rendered, Legislation respecting (M. for Com. of Whole) 59 (i).

Pairing of Members (remarks) 1372 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 438-441 (ii).

Thousand Island Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 84, 1°*) 489 (i).
Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 758 (i).

Temple, Mr. T., York, N. B.

Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. Denison) on M. for 2°, 768 (i).

Thérien, Mr. O., Montcalm.

Tobacco, Canadian Leaf, Purchase and Sale (Ques.) 66 (i).

Thompson, Hon. J. S. D., Antigonish.

Adams, David J., in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).

Adulteration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Costigan) in Com., 933 (ii).

Bank Acts Amt. (B. 119, 1°) 1135 (ii)

Bottles and Vessels Protection to Owners B. 3 (Mr. Denison) on M. for 2°, 759 (i).

Bresaylor Half-breeds Grievances, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1518 (ii).

B. C. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1024 (ii).

Buildings (repairs, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1655 (ii).

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Tisdale) 983 (ii).

— B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson) in Com., 1253 (ii).

C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com. on Res., 1374, 1391; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1587 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 1224 (ii).

— Mortgage for Guaranteed Bonds (remarks) 1506.
— on enquiry for papers, 1586 (ii).

Civil Service Act. Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1434, 1472 (ii).

Concurrence, 1685 (ii).

Consolidation of Statutes, in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).

Controverted Elections Act (Ans.) 516, 752 (i).

Copyright Act Amt. (B. 124, 1°) 1173 (ii).

— Legislation respecting (Ans.) 98 (i).

Counterfeit Money, Advertising (B. 108, 1°) 963; 2° m., 1137 (ii).

County Judges (B. C.) additional appointment (Ans.) 66 (i).

— (Ont.) salaries, increase (Ans.) 899 (ii).

Criminal Laws, distribution to Members (Ans.) 86 (i).

Thompson, Hon. J. S. D.—*Continued.*

- Criminal Law (England) application to Can. (B. 100, 1°) 825 (ii).
 ——— Extension to Man. (B. 41, 1°) 139 (i); in Com., 1402 (ii).
 Criminal Procedure Act Amt. (B. 123, 1°) 1173; in Com., 1513 (ii).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 947, 1002 (ii).
 Debates, Official, dismissal of Translators, on Ques. of Order, 720 (i).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 89, 1°) 514 (i); 2° m., 941; in Com., 944, 1138; 3° m., 1403 (ii).
 Dorchester Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1021 (ii).
 Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
 Fisheries Treaty Ratification (B. 65, 1°) 380; on M. for 2°, 704-711 (i); in Com., 872 (ii).
 Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise Act Amt. (B. 91, 1°) 515 (i); 2° m., 942, in Com.; 943, 1002 (ii).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c. (B. 95, 1°*) 750 (i); in Com., 1404 (ii).
 Govt. Measures (remarks) 457 (i).
 Haldimand, Deputy Returning Officer (Ans.) 648 (i); M. to adja. House, 924, 930 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1561 (ii).
 Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Davies*) 1301-1307 (ii).
 Hay Duties by U. S., Refund (Ans.) 712 (i).
 Indian Act Amt. (B. 106, 1°) 922; 2° and in Com., 1007 (ii).
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1226 (ii).
 Justice Dept., in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).
 Kent Controverted Election, on M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to ref. Judge's Rep. to Sel. Com. on Priv. and Elec., 21 (i).
 Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).
 Labor Commiseion, in Com. of Sup., 1661 (ii).
 Libel, Law of, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 141 (i).
 Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1021 (ii).
 Merchants Marine Ins. Co.'s B. 11 (Mr. *Curran*) on M. for 2°, 127 (i).
 Muskoka and Parry Sound Judicial Dist. (Ans.) 1232 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation Act Amt. (B. 125, 1°*) 1231; 2° m., 1551; in Com., 1485 (ii).
 Orders in Council, collecting, in Com. of Sup., 1618 (ii).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1231 (ii).
 Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 18 (i).
 Prescott and Russell Judicial Dist., Vacancy (Ans.) 27 (i).
 Procedure in Criminal Cases further Act Amt. (B. 48, 1°) 238 (i); 2°, 942 (ii).
 Provincial Courts Judges, increase of salaries (prop. Res.) 866 (ii).
 ——— Act Amt. (B. 14, 1°*) and in Com., 1690 (ii).
 Punishments, Pardons, &c. (B. 90, 1°) 515; 2° and in Com., 942 (ii).

Thompson, Hon. J. S. D.—*Continued.*

- Ry. Act Amt. (B. 24) in Com., 1175, 1417, 1492; 3° m., 1507 (ii).
 Real Property (Territories) further Act Amt. (B. 104, 1°) 899; in Com., 1412 (ii).
 ——— Inspector of Land Titles (prop. Res.) 1259; in Com., 1416 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., newspaper Cor. re entry of certain articles free of Duty, 492 (i).
 Regina Jail, in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).
 Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 892; on M. to conc. in Res., 931 (ii).
 Revised Statutes of Can. Act Amt. (B. 12, 1°*) 62 (i).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 136 (i).
 Securities to the Crown, &c., Discharge B. 4 (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) on M. for 3°, 916 (ii).
 Speedy Trials Act Amt. (B. 93, 1°) 598 (i); 2° m., 942; in Com., 1005 (ii).
 Stenographer, Exchequer Court, in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
 Submarine Cables, Preservation (B. 98, 1°*) 726 (i); 2° m., 942 (ii).
 Summary Convictions Act Amt. (B. 113, 1°) 1001; in Com., 1417; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts, 1629 (ii).
 Superior Court Judges, Montreal Dist. (Ans.) 647 (i).
 SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Exchequer Court) 119; (Miscellaneous) 114, 119 (i); conc., 1685 (ii).
Civil Government (Justice) 91 (i).
Fisheries (David J. Adams) 1656 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Consolidation of Statutes) 1663; (Labor Commission) 1661; (Orders in Council, collecting) 1618 (ii).
Ocean and River Services (Water Police) 1579 (ii).
Penitentiaries (B. C.) 1024; (Dorchester) 1021 (ii); (Kingston) 122 (i); (Man.) 1021; conc., 1686; (Regina Jail) 1025 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 136 (i); conc., 1686 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Repairs, &c.) 1655. Harbors and Rivers (N. S.) 1561 (ii).
Railways—Capital (O. P. E.) 1224; (I. O. R.) 1226; (Oxford and New Glasgow Ry.) 1231 (ii).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. (B. 110, 1°) 964; withdn., 1402 (ii).
 ——— (B. 120, 1°) 1135; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1549 (ii).
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts (Ans.) 1011 (ii).
 Travis, ex-Judge, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 114 (i).
 Treason and Felony Forfeitures Abolition (B. 88, 1°) 514; 2° m., 1147 (ii).
 Tobique Valley Ry. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1626 (ii).
 Water Police, in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1130 (ii).
- Tisdale, Mr. D., South Norfolk.**
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 980; (Amt.) 980; M. to recom., 1245; in Com., 1346 (ii).
 ——— B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1248 (ii).
 Man. and North-Western Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. 46 (Mr. *Scarth*) on M. to recom., 953 (ii).

Tisdale, Mr. D.—Continued.

Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1175.
Ry. Employees Protection B. 5 (Mr. *Denison*) on M
for 2°, 767 (i).

South Norfolk Ry. Co.'s (B. 34, 1°*) 110 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia (Clothing, &c.) 1213 (ii).

Treason and Felony Forfeitures Abolition B. 88 (Mr.
Thompson) on M. for 2°, 1148 (ii).

Trow, Mr. J., South Perth.

Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1541 (ii).

Debates, Official, distribution of extra copies of Reci-
procity deb. (remarks) 238 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) on
M. for 1°, 515 (i).

Excise, in Com. of Sup., 1667 (ii).

Fishery Reps., *re* superannuation of Valiquette
(remarks) 1507 (ii).

High Commissioner's Office, application of Civil Service
Act, &c., B. 136 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res.
1504 (ii).

Hot Springs, Banff (roads, &c) in Com. of Sup. 1618 (ii)

Indemnity to Members (remarks) 1586 (ii).

Library, in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).

Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1022 (ii).

Merrick, Richard, employment by Govt. (Ques.) 647 (i).

Pairing of Members (remarks) 1371, 1403 (ii).

Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks)
1596 (ii).

Peace and Athabasca Rivers, Treaty with Indians
(Ques.) 825 (ii).

Penetanguishne, &c., Public Works (Ques.) 647 (i).

Prorogation (remarks) 1691 (ii).

Rys. and Canals Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1637 (ii).

Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).

Snetsinger, Mr., employment and dismissal by
Govt. (Ques.) 825 (ii).

Strathroy Public Building, selection of Site (Ques.)
66 (i).

Superior Court Judges, Montreal District (Ques.) 647.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, (Archives, payment to C. G.
Chipman) 1150; (Health Statistics) 1154 (ii).

Civil Government (Rys. and Canals) 1637 (ii).

Collection of Revenues (Excise) 1667 (ii).

Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1170; (Pauper) 1158 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (Sessional Clerks) 1670. *Mis-
cellaneous* (Library) 1638 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Hot Springs, Banff) 1618 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Man.) 1022 (ii).

Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1541 (ii).

Victoria County (Ont.) Postal Service (Ques.) 825 (ii).

Voters' Lists, Suspension of Revision (Ques.) 965 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1114 (ii).

Tupper, Mr. C. H., Pictou.

Cape Breton Steam Dredge Substitute (Ques.) 1432.

Exchequer Court, contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).

Tupper, Mr. C. H.—Continued.

Imperial Federation, on Res. (Mr. *Marshall*) 1086 (ii).
King, James, claim against Govt. (M. for Sel. Com.)
865 (ii).

N. S. Telephone Co.'s (B. 59, 1°*) 344 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cart-
wright*) and Amts., 257-270 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 122 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles, G.C.M.G., Cumberland.

Agriculture Dept., in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).

Antwerp and Canada Mail Subsidy, in Com of Sup.,
1679; conc., 1689 (ii).

Auditor Gen.'s Office, in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).

—— increase of Salary (prop. Res.) 498 (i).

Banking Act (General) Amt. (Ans.) 19 (i).

Banks, Supervision by Govt. (Ans.) 19 (i).

Behring's Sea, navigation by Canadian Vessels (Ans.)
44 (i).

—— Seizures, on M. for Cor., 969 (ii).

Boundaries of Ont., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks)
1629 (ii).

BUDGET, The (Ans.) 97, 822 (i); (Annual Statement)
1031-1048 (ii).

Can. Temp. Act (remarks) 922 (ii).

C.P.R. (Guaranteed Bonds) (B. 123) prop. Res., 1001;
M. for Com. on Res., 1332; in Com., 1372; M. for
Com. on B., 1388; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1587.

—— in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).

—— Mortgage for Guaranteed Bonds (Ans.) 1195,
1506 (ii).

—— on enquiry for papers, 1586 (ii).

Campbellton and Gaspé Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup.,
1678 (ii).

Cape Breton Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1230 (ii).

Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).

Chambly Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).

Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s (B. 101) in
Com. on Res., 896; 2° m., 935; agreed to (Y. 84;
N. 52) 941; 3° m., 943 (ii).

Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1615 (ii).

Canada and Antwerp Mail Subsidy, 1679; conc. 1689.
Concurrence, 1687 (ii).

Contingencies, deptl., in Com. of Sup., 104 (i).

Cornwall Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1452; conc., 1687 (ii).

Oulbute Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).

Culling (contingencies) in Com. of Sup., 1668 (ii).

Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 957 (ii).
—— (B. 121, 1°) 1137; in Com., 1400 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 1629 (ii).

Debt, Public, Loan (B. 133) prop. Res., 1136; M. for
Com., 1263, in Com., 1278; M. to conc. in Res., 1383;
1° of B., 1387 (ii).

Dom. Notes, Printing, &c., in Com., of Sup., 90 (i).

Dom. Savings Banks, in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).

Eastern Extension Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1231 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles—Continued.

- Estimates, The, for 1888-89 (presented) 50 (i).
 ——— Suppl. for 1887-88 (presented) 962 (ii).
 ——— Suppl. for 1888-89 (presented) 1403 (ii).
 Fabre, Mr. (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1613 (ii).
 Finance and Treasury Board, in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
 Fisheries Commission, in Com. of Sup., 1662 (ii).
 ——— Treaty, papers respecting (remarks) 62, 98 (i).
 ——— Letter to Mr. Bayard and Ans. (presented) 110 (i).
 ——— Mess. from His Ex. transmitting copy (presented) 86 (i).
 ——— Ratification (B. 65, 1°) 380; 2° m., 673, 692 (i); in Com., 870 (ii).
 Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1639, 1646 (ii).
 Grenville Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
 Govt. Savings Banks, Interest on Deposits (B. 127, 1°) 1332; 2° m., 1401 (ii).
 Half-breeds Claims, in Com. of Sup., 1666 (ii).
 Halifax and St. John Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1562 (ii).
 High Commissioner's Office, application of Civil Service Act, &c. (B. 136) in Com on Res., 1502; 1°* of B., 1505; 3° m., 1547 (ii).
 ——— contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 105 (i).
 Indian Affairs, in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
 Indemnities (Members) in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
 Inland Rev. Dept., in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
 Insurance Act Amt. (B. 126, 1°) 1332; 2° m., 1400 (ii).
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1224, 1620, 1629, 1644, 1650.
 Interest on Public Debt, in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).
 Interior Dept., in Com. of Sup., 93 (i).
 Justice Dept., in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).
 Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1451 (ii).
 ——— dismissal of Laborers, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1648 (ii).
 Lake St. Louis, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
 Lévis Graving Dock, Expenditure (Ans.) 1136 (ii).
 Magdalen Islands Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1678.
 Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 50, 86 (i), 962, 1403.
 Militia and Defence Dept., in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release (B. 134) prop. Res., 1031; M. for Com., 1280; in Com., 1295; in Com. on B., 1391 (ii).
 Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 93 (i), 1658 (ii).
 Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1646 (ii).
 Ques. of Order (Mr. McNeill) in Com. of Sup., 1208.
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry, in Com. of Sup., 1230.
 Pairing of Members (remarks) 1371 (ii).
 Post Office and Finance Depts., computing Interest, in Com. of Sup., 112 (i), 1634 (ii).
 Printing and Stationery Dept., in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
 Printing Bureau, in Com. of Sup., 1616 (ii).
 Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 90 (i).
 Public Accounts of Canada (presented) 18 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles—Continued.

- Public Works Dept., in Com. of Sup., 96 (i).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners, Amount advanced by Govt. (Ans.) 1232 (ii).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) (B. 135) prop. Res., 1031; M. for Com. on Res., 1296; in Com., 1296; M. to conc. in Res., 1391; 1°* of B., 1400 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1186, 1418, 1492 (ii).
 Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 2°, 769 (i), 916 (ii).
 Ry. Expenditure (remarks) 922 (ii).
 Rys. and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1637 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) Res. First Order of the Day (remarks) 43 (i).
 ——— protocols (remarks) 74 (i).
 ——— proposals of Plenipotentiaries, 87 (i).
 ——— entry of certain articles free of Duty (explanation) 516 (i).
 ——— on M. to adjn. deb. (remarks) 822 (i).
 Revenue and Audit Act (Consolidated) Amt. (B. 87, 1°) and prop. Res., 498 (i); 2° m., 889; in Com. on Res., 891; in Com., on B., 931, 943 (ii).
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1646, 1671 (ii).
 Ste. Anne's Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
 St. Lawrence River and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
 St. Lawrence River Improvements, Montreal and Lake St. Peter (Ans.) 1135 (ii).
 St. Ours Locks, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
 Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1442, 1624 (ii).
 Sec. of State's Dept., in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1669 (ii).
 Sinking Fund, in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).
 Statistical Diagrams, in Com. of Sup., 1664 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. (B. 140) Res. prop. and M. for Com., 1546; in Com. on Res., 1587 (i).
 SUPPLY—Ms. for Com., 17, 74 (i), 1524, 1551, 1595, 1629 (ii):
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives, payment to C. C. Chipman) 1149; (Dom. Exhibition) 1148, 1151; (Health Statistics) 1152 (ii).
Canals—Capital (Cornwall) 1452; conc., 1687; (Oulbute) 1460; (Gratuities) 1646; (Grenville) 1459; (Lachine) 1452; (Lake St. Louis) 1453; (Murray) 1646; (Ste. Anne's) 1459; (St. Lawrence River and Canals) 1453; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1442, 1624; (Tay) 1459; (Trent River Nav.) 1454; (Welland) 1453; conc., 1688. *Income* (Chambly) 1460; (Miscellaneous) 1646; (Rideau) 1646, 1671; (St. Ours Locks) 1460; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 1460; (Welland) 1460, 1671 (ii).
Charges of Management (Auditor and Asst. Rec. Gen., Winnipeg) 88; (Dom. Savings Banks) 89; (Interest on Public Debt) 89; (Printing Dom. Notes) 90; (Rec. Gen., Halifax) 88; (Sinking Fund) 89 (i).
Civil Government (Agriculture) 95; (Auditor General's Office) 95; (contingencies) 104; (Finance and Treasury Board) 95; (Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office) 85; (High Commissioner's contingencies) 105; (Indian Affairs) 95; (Interior) 93; (Inland Revenue) 95; (Justice) 91; (Militia and Defence) 92; (Mounted Police) 93; (Post Office and Finance, computing Interest) 112; (Privy Council Office) 90; Printing

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

- and Stationery) 92; (Public Works) 96 (i); (Rys. and
and Canals) 1637 (ii); (Sec. of State) 92 (i).
Collection of Revenues (Culling, contingencies) 1663; (Cus-
toms) 1629; (Post Office) 1634. Rys. (I. C. R.) 1620;
(Repairs, &c.) 1668; (Windsor Branch Ry) 1623 (ii).
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1160; (Gratuities) 1639 (ii).
Indians (Ont. and Que.) 1405 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Indemnities) 1670; (Ses-
sional Clerks) 1669. Miscellaneous (Library, catalogue)
1030 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Maintenance, &c.) 1577 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Antwerp and Canada) 1679; Campbellton
and Gaspé) 1678; (Halifax and St. John) 1678; (Magdalen
Islands) 1678 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1613;
(Commercial Agencies) 1615; (Fishery Commission) 1662;
(Half-Breeds' Claims) 1666; (Printing Bureau, Plant, &c.)
1616; (Statistical Diagrams) 1664 (ii).
Mounted Police, 1658 (ii).
Pensions (N.W.T.) 1642; (P.E.I.) 1671 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1463. *In-
come*: Harbors and Rivers (P.E.I.) 1563.
Railways—Capital (C.P.R.) 1221; (Cape Breton Ry) 1230;
(Eastern Extension Ry.) 1231; (I.C.R.) 1224, 1629, 1644,
1650; (Oxford and New Glasgow Ry.) 1230; (Surveys, &c.)
1460 (ii).
Subsidies to Provinces, 1604 (ii).
Supply (B. 141) Res. in Com., and 1°*, 2°* and
3°*, 1690 (ii).
Surveys, &c., Railways, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
Tariff Changes (remarks) 24 (i).
Tay Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 1454, 1460 (ii).
Tobique Valley Ry. (prop. Res.) M. for Com. and in
Com., 1626; withdn., 1627 (ii).
Ways and Means (Res. for Com.) 17 (i).
—— The Budget, 1031–1048 (ii).
—— The Tariff, in Com., 1121 (ii).
Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1453, 1460, 1671;
conc., 1688 (ii).
Windsor Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 1623 (ii).
Wrecked Vessels Aid B. 7 (Mr. Kirkpatrick) on M. for
2°, 770 (i), 917 (ii).

Turcot, Mr. G., Megantic.

- Megantic County Mail Service (Ques.) 825 (ii).
—— Contract (Ques.) 1232 (ii).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., South Simcoe.

SUPPLY:

- Militia* (Clothing, &c.) 1212 (ii).
York-Simcoe Battalion, Kit Allowance, on M. for Ret.,
69 (i).

Vanasse, Mr. F., Yamaska.

- St. John's and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing
Co's. (B. 71, 1°*) 454 (i).

Wallace Mr. N. C., West York.

- Debates, Official, 1st. Rep. of Com., on M. to conc.,
51 (i).
Trade Combinations (M.) for Sel. Com., 28, 32, 33 (i).
—— Prevention (B. 138) M. to introd., 1554 (ii).

Ward, Mr. H. A., East Durham.

- Ont. Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 14, 1°*) 62 (i).

SUPPLY:

- Public Works—Income*: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 1569 (ii).

Watson, Mr. R., Marquette.

- Assiniboine River Bridges Authorisation (B. 86, 1°*)
489 (i).
C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir Charles
Tupper) on M. for Com. on Res., 1348; in Com.,
1381 (ii).
—— Lands held by Govt. west of Man. (Ques.) 1174.
Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 948 (ii).
Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1571 (ii).
Dom. Lands Agents in Man. and N. W. T., Instructions,
on M. for Ret., 37, 46 (i).
Emerson and North-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 85,
1°*) 489 (i).
Experimental Farms in Man. (Ques.) 495 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 1576 (ii).
Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1655 (ii).
Homestead Inspectors in Man. and N. W. T., Reps.
(M. for Ret.) 71 (i).
Indian Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1007.
Man. and N.W.T. Ry. Legislation (remarks) 1403 (ii),
Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1023 (ii).
N. W. T. Representation Act. Amt. B. 76 (Sir *John A.
Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1479 in Com., 1480;
on M. for 3°, (Amt.) 1551; neg (Y 62; N. 89)
1551 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1189.
1427 (ii).
Rebellion of 1885 (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1206 (ii).
South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 54 (Mr. *Hall*) on
Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) 6 m. h., to M. for 3°, 915 (ii).
Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*)
on Res., 1591 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Penitentiaries (Man.) 1023 (ii).
Pensions (Rebellion of 1885) 1206 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Dredging, 1571. Experimental Farms,
1576. Harbors and Rivers (N.W.T.) 1655 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1125 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. R. C., Albert.

- Exchequer Court, contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 120.
Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*)
on M. for 2°, 841, 844 (ii).
Hawke, John T., impugning Judge's decision, on Ques.
of Priv. (Mr. *Davies*) 1322 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. R. C.—Continued.

- Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 908 (ii).
 Kent (Ont.) Representation, Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec. (M. to conc.) 380 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 576-578 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Administration of Justice* (Miscellaneous) 120 (i).
Immigration (Agents salaries, &c.) 1167 (ii).
 Treason and Felony Forfeitures Abolition B. 88 (Mr. *Thompson*) on M. for 2°, 1148 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. C. W., St. John, N.B., City and County.

- Antwerp and Canada Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1679 (ii).
 Bridges, &c. (Ottawa) in Com. of Sup., 1573 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt B. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*) in Com., 1248 (ii).
 C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1372; in Com. on B., 1389.
 ——— Lands, Stmt. of Sales (Ques.) 496 (i).
 Campbellton and Gaspé Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
 Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1463 (ii).
 Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 69, 1°*) 454 (i).
 Chatham Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 64, 1°*) 380 (i).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 940 (ii).
 Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 1615 (ii).
 Compensation for Injuries, in Com. of Sup., 1612.
 Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 948 (ii).
 Debt, Public, Loan B. 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1279 (ii).
 Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. 89 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1144 (ii).
 Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 1570 (ii).
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 1654 (ii).
 Fishery Overseers (salaries, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1583 (ii).
 Fisheries Treaty, on non-production of papers (remarks) 143 (i).
 ——— Ratification B. 65 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 883 (ii).
 Franchise, Electoral, Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Chapleau*) on M. for 1°, 1065; on M. for 2°, 1151 (ii).
 Fraudulent Practices on Farmers, on Res. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sp. Com., 1244 (ii).
 Gaming in Stocks, &c., B. 95 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1404 (ii).
 Grand Falls and Edmundston Mail Service (remarks) 1382 (ii).
 Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1639 (ii).
 Grazing Leases in the N. W. T. (Ques.) 495 (i).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1673 (ii).
 Hawke, John T. impugning Judge's decision, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Davies*) 1318 (ii).

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—Continued.

- Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 122 (Mr. *Costigan*) in Com., 1402 (ii).
 Insolvency, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 495 (i).
 I. C. R., Capital Account, amount charged (Ques.) 59.
 ——— Casualties, &c., Officials dismissed (M. for Ret.) 61 (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1224, 1621, 1645 (ii).
 ——— Inquest on body of W. L. Duncan (M. for Ret.*) 498 (i).
 ——— Rolling Stock purchased (M. for Ret.) 61 (i).
 Keystone Fire Ins. Co.'s (B. 78, 1°*) 489 (i).
 King, James, Claim against Govt., on M. for Sel. Com., 865 (ii).
 Labor Commission, composition and amounts paid (Ques.) 1468 (ii).
 ——— Cost (Ques.) 494 (i).
 Logs, Shingle-bolts, &c., Duties collected (Ques.) 86 (i).
 Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com. on Res., 1283 (ii).
 N. W. T. Representation Act. Amt. B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1486 (ii).
 Onderdonk Arbitration, Plant taken over by Govt. under Award (Ques.) 98 (i).
 Ottawa, additional Building, in Com. of Sup., 1462 (ii).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 1634 (ii).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. to conc. in Res., 1397.
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1176, 1417, 1492; on M. for 3°, 1510 (ii).
 Ry. Commission, Cost (Ques.) 494 (i).
 Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 1621, 1645 (ii).
 Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 890; in Com. on Res., 891 (ii).
 Sault Ste. Marie Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1450 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com. on Res., 1593 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 117 (i).
Canals—Capital (Sault Ste. Marie) 1450 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 1634; (Rys., I. C. R.) 1621.
Fisheries (Overseers, salaries, &c.) 1583, 1601 (ii).
Immigration (Gratuities) 1639 (ii).
Mail Subsidies (Canada and Germany) 1679; (Campbellton and Gaspé) 1678 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) 1615; (Compensation for Injuries) 1612 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Water Police) 1579 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1463; (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 1654. Buildings (Ottawa, additional) 1642. Income: Dredging, 1570. Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) 1673; (Ont.) 1674. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 1572 (ii).
Railways—Capital (I. C. R.) 1224, 1645 (ii).
 Travis, ex-Judge, in Com. of Sup. (remarks) 117 (i).
 Tobique Valley Ry. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for Com., 1626 (ii).
 Voters' Lists, Suspension of Revision (Ques.) 965 (ii).
 Water Police, in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff, in Com., 1133 (ii).
 Welland Canal, Section "A" (Ques.) 496 (i).

Welsh, Mr. W., Queen's, P.E.I.

- Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 1462 (ii).
 Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co's B. 101 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. for 2°, 935 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. Chapleau) in Com., 1471 (ii).
 Debate, Official, distribution to Press (remarks) 750 (i).
 Exchequer Court, contingencies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 120 (i).
 Fraudulent Practices on Farmers, on Res. (Mr. Brown) for Sp. Com., 1244 (ii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 1566 (ii).
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 1227 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with on M. for Cor., 908 (ii).
 Lobster Fisheries, Restrictions, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 1556 (ii).
 Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1023 (ii).
 Merchants Marine Insurance Co's B. 11 (Mr. Curran) on M. for 2°, 126 (i).
 Mail Service, P.E.I., on M. for Cor., &c., 55 (i).
 Northern Light and Alert, Cor., Tels., &c. (M. for Ret.) 827 (ii).
 ——— Captain's Salary, &c. (M. for Ret.) 37 (i).
 ——— (Ques.) 416, 456 (i).
 ——— Employés, papers (Ques.) 1001 (ii).
 ——— Capt. Finlayson's salary, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1558 (ii).
 Pinette Harbor, Dredging of Bar (Ques.) 140 (i).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper) on M. to conc. in Res., 1399 (ii).
 Rebellion (1885) Claims of Scouts, &c., on Res. (Mr. Davin) to reconsider, 1243 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 317-321 (i).
 Surveys, &c., Railways, in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous) 120 (i).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 1023 (ii).
Public Works—Capital (Cape Tormentine Harbor) 1462. *Income: Harbors and Rivers* (Que.) 1566 (ii).
Railways—Capital (I. C. R.) 1227. *Income* (Surveys, &c.) 1460 (ii).
 Wood Island Harbor, dredging (Ques.) 140 (i).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 756 (i).

White, Mr. P., North Renfrew.

- Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 1684 (ii).
 Govt. Savings Banks (Interest on Deposits) B. 127 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1401 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1597 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. Thompson) in Com., 1181, 1188, 1425, 1492 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 624-626 (i).

White, Mr. P.—Continued.

- Slides and Booms (salaries) in Com. of Sup., 1684 (ii).
 Subsidies (Money) to Rys. B. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper) in Com., 1590 (ii).
 SUPPLY :
Collection of Revenues (Culling Timber) 1684; (Slides and Booms, salaries, &c.) 1684 (ii).
 Upper Ottawa Improvement Co's (B. 20, 1°*) 73; 2° m., 322, 496; (M. for Com.) 1148 (ii).

White, Hon. Thos., Cardwell.

- Boundaries of Alaska and B. C. (Ans.) 495 (i).
 Brant and Haldimand Indian Reserves, appointment of doctor (Ans.) 647 (i).
 C.P.R. Lands, Stmt. of Sales (Ans.) 496 (i).
 Caughnawaga Indian Reserve Survey (Ans.) 495 (i).
 Cayuga, Indian lands near, appointment of Commissioners (Ans.) 27 (i).
 Dom. Lands Agents in Man. and N.W.T., Instructions, on M. for Ret., 36, 45 (i).
 Dom. Lands in Man. and N.W.T., Receipts from Sales (Ans.) 44 (i).
 Geological Survey of Ottawa County (Ans.) 495 (i).
 Gowanlock, Mrs., pension to (Ans.) 58 (i).
 Grazing Leases in the N.W.T. (Ans.) 495 (i).
 Homstead Inspectors in Man. and N.W.T., Reps., on M. for Ret., 71 (i).
 Indian Affairs, depl. Rep. (presented) 38 (i).
 Interior, depl. Rep. (presented) 18 (i).
 Rebellion (N.W.T.) Rep. of Royal Commission (presented) 97 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 161-170 (i).

Wilson, Mr. J. C., Argenteuil.

- Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) and Amts., 613-618 (i).
 South-Western Ry. Co's incorp. B. 54 (Mr. Hall) on Amt. (Mr. Bergin) 6 m. h., to M. for 3°, 913 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. J. H., East Elgin.

- Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 1619 (ii).
 Bridges, &c. (Ottawa) in Com. of Sup., 1573 (ii).
 Buildings, in Com. of Sup., 1537 (ii).
 Can. Temp. Act, on Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 79 (i).
 Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. Bowell) in Com., 955 (ii).
 Fabre, Mr. (salary, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1614 (ii).
 Gratuities, in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
 Kingston Post Office defalcations, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1013 (ii).
 Man. and N.W.T. Ry. Bills, on M. (Sir Hector Langevin) to withdr. 1585 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. J. H.—Continued.

- Medical Inspection, in Com. of Sup., 1198 (ii).
 N.W.T. Representation Act Amt. B. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1481 (ii).
 Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. *Carling*) in Com., 1512; on M. for 3^o, 1547; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 60; N. 93) 1548 (ii).
 Pauper Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 1598 (ii).
 Rys. and Canals Dept., in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1188, 1424, 1492; on M. for 3^o, 1508 (ii).
 Ry. Employés Protection B. 5 (Mr. *Denison*) on M. for 2^o, 763 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts, 588-593 (i).
 Regina Gaol, in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 136 (i).
 Scrip issued in Man. and N.W.T. (M. for Ret.*) 866 (ii).
 Sessional Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, payment to C. O. Chipman) 1149; (Health Statistics) 1151 (ii).
Civil Government (Rys. and Canals) 1638 (ii).
Collection of Revenues (Adulteration of Food) 1619; (Weights and Measures) 1618 (ii).
Immigration (Gratuities) 1638; (Pauper) 1156 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (salaries, &c.) 1025 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Fabre, Mr., salary, &c.) 1614 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 1022; (Regina Jail) 1025 (ii); (St. Vincent de Paul) 136 (i).
Pensions (Vets. of 1812) 1201 (ii).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (Ont.) 1537. Roads and Bridges (Ottawa) 1573 (ii).
Quarantine (Medical Inspection) 1198 (ii).
 Veterans of 1812 (pensions) in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 Weights and Measures (salaries, &c.) in Com. of Sup., 1618 (ii).
 Wrecks on the Great Lakes, on M. for Ret., 757 (i).

Wilson, Mr. U., Lennox.

- Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 1022 (ii).
 Reciprocity with U.S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 511-514 (i).

Wood, Mr. J. F., Brockville.

- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 1246 (ii).
 Central Ont. Ry. Co.'s (B. 102, 1^o*) 899 (ii).
 Civil Service Act Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Chapleau*) in Com., 1434 (ii).
 Jamaica and West Indies, Commercial Relations with, on M. for Cor., 905 (ii).
 N. Y., St. Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 72, 1^o*) 454 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., entry of certain articles free of Duty, 520 (i).
 Private Bills Petitions (M.) to extend time, 50 (i).

Wood, Mr. J., Westmoreland.

- Moncton Harbor Improvement Act Amt. (B. 83, 1^o*) 489 (i).
 Reciprocity with U. S., on Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) and Amts., 298-303 (i).

SUPPLY :

- Administration of Justice* (Miscellaneous) 118 (i).
 Travis, ex-Judge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 118 (i).

Wright, Mr. A., Ottawa County.

- Customs Act Amt. B. 92 (Mr. *Bowell*) in Com., 898 (ii).
 Geological Survey of Ottawa Co. (Ques.) 495 (i).
 Gowanlock, Mrs., claim for compensation (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1015, 1020 (ii).
 Papineauville Harbor, dredging (Ques.) 495 (i).
 Ry. Act Amt. B. 24 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 1187 (ii).
 Revenue and Audit Act Amt. B. 87 (Sir *Charles Tupper*) on M. for 2^o, 891 (ii).

INDEX.-PART II.

SUBJECTS.

- ACCIDENTS, RY., REPORTED TO GOVT. AND ACTIONS PENDING :
M. for Ret.* (Mr. Denison) 62 (i).
- ADDRESS, FAREWELL, TO HIS EX. : Mess. from Senate, 1561 ;
agreed to, 1586 ; presented, 1691 (ii).
- IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH : moved (Mr.
Montague) 2 ; seconded (Mr. Joncas) 7 (i).
- HIS EX.'S REPLY, 172 (i).
- TO HER MAJESTY ON JUBILEE : Her Majesty's reply,
24 (i).
- ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER : Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright)
344 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 415 (i).
- M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 494 (i).
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE : in Com. of Sup., 114 (i) ;
conc., 1685 (ii).
- Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1** (Sir
John A. Macdonald). 1^o*, 2 (*pro forma*) (i).
- Adulteration Act (Chap. 107, Rev. Statutes) Amt. B.
No. 47** (Mr. Costigan). 1^o, 238 (i) ; 2^o*, 898 ; in
Com., 932 ; 3^o*, 935 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 24.)
- ADULTERATION OF FOOD : in Com. of Sup., 1619 (ii).
- Advertising Counterfeit Money.** See "CRIMINAL
LAW."
- AGRICULTURE, IMMIGRATION, &c. :**
- AGENTS' TRAVELLING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 1167 (ii).
- AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES IN N. W. T. : in Com. of Sup., 1155 (ii).
- AGRICULTURE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
- DEPT. REP. : Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 26 (i).
— presented (Mr. Carling) 455 (i).
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS : in Com. of Sup., 1148, 1638 (ii)
- ARCHIVES, CARE OF : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (ii).
- BAKER, MR., IMMIGRATION AGENT : in Com. of Sup., 1161, 1169 (ii).
- BARNARDO, DR. : in Com. of Sup., 1167 (ii).
- BUTTER-MAKING, PAMPHLET, GERMAN TRANSLATION : Ques. (Mr. Lan-
derkin) 496 (i).
- FRENCH EDITION : Ques. (Mr. Couture) 98 (i).
- CATTLE QUARANTINE, EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
- CENSUS AND STATISTICS : in Com. of Sup., 1155 (ii).
- CINCINNATI CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION, CAN. REPRESENTATION : Ques.
(Mr. Laurier) 1136 (ii).
- CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION OF 1876, PAPERS, &c., *vs* G. J. MACDONALD :
M. for copies* (Mr. Landerkin) 866 (ii).
- CHIPMAN, C. C., PAYMENTS TO : in Com. of Sup., 1149 (ii).
- COLMER, MR. : in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
- COLONIAL AND INDIAN EXHIBITION : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
- CRIMINAL STATISTICS : Rep. presented (Mr. Carling) 1551 (ii).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARM FOR MAN. : Ques. (Mr. Watson) 495 (i).
— in Com. of Sup., 1154, 1574 (ii).
— IN N. W. T., LOCATION, PAPERS, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr.
Landerkin) 866 (i).
- AGRICULTURE, IMMIGRATION, &c.—Continued.**
- EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN N. W. T., PROF SAUNDERS' REP. : M. for Ret.*
(Mr. McMullen) 498 (i).
- HEALTH STATISTICS : in Com. of Sup., 1151 (ii).
- HORSE BREEDING IN CANADA, PAMPHLET, TRANSLATION : Ques. (Mr.
Amyot) 85 (i).
- IMMIGRANTS, ACCOMMODATION AT REGINA : Ques. (Mr. Davin) 712 (i).
- FROM DAKOTA FOR MANITOBA, PAYMENTS TO : Ques. (Mr.
Landerkin) 495 (i).
- IMMIGRATION : in Com. of Sup., 1155, 1638 ; conc., 1686 (ii).
- JOHNSON, GEO. : in Com. of Sup., 1001 (ii).
- MCEachern MR. : in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).
- MEDICAL INSPECTION, QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
- MORIN, DR. J. A., CLAIM FOR MEDICAL SERVICES : M. for copy (Mr.
Amyot) 655 (i).
- PAMPHLETS, &c, TRANSLATION : Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 85 (i).
- IMMIGRATION : in Com. of Sup., 1158, 1165 (ii).
- PATENTS, APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER : in Com. of Sup., 93 (i).
- "PATENT RECORD," EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 1150 (ii).
- PAUPER IMMIGRATION : Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 964 (ii).
— in Com. of Sup., 1155, 1168 (ii).
— Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright, &c.) on M. for Com. of
Sup., 1595 (ii).
- PLAYTER, DR., SUBSIDY TO "HEALTH JOURNAL" : in Com. of Sup.,
1198 (ii).
- QUARANTINE SERVICE OF CANADA : M. (Mr. Fiset) for Sp. Com.
657 (i).
— in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
- SAUNDERS, PROFESSOR, REP. ON EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN N.W.T. :
M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 498 (i).
- STATISTICAL DIAGRAMS, LITHOGRAPHING : in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).
- VACCINE, GRANT FOR PREPARING : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 140 (i).
- WATLETT, P., FOREIGN EMIGRATION AGENT, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT. :
Ques., 966 (ii).
- ALASKA AND B. C. BOUNDARY COMMISSION : Ques. (Mr.
Prior) 495 (i).
— Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 171 (i).
- ALBERTA CATTLE RANCHES. See "GRAZING LEASES."
- Alberta Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 68**
(Mr. Davis). 1^o*, 454 ; 2^o*, 612 (i) ; withdn., 1585 (ii).
- ALBERTON HARBOR, DEEPENING : Ques. (Mr. Perry) 712 (i).
- ALBERT RY. CO.'S LOAN ACCOUNT : Ques. (Mr. Ellis) 826 (ii).
- ALBERT RY. CO.'S (N.B.) SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir Charles
Tupper) 1546 ; in Com., 1594 (ii).
- "ALERT," COR. RESPECTING CONDITION : M. for Ret. (Mr.
Welsh) 827 (i).
- ALLEN, WARREN, CLAIM FOR ICE BOAT : M. for Papers,
&c. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 833 (ii).
- AMERICA, WORKS ON : in Com. of Sup., 1030 (ii).
- AMERICAN HISTORY (PRINTING CATALOGUE) : in Com. of Sup.,
1030 (ii).
- American Vessels, Aid.** See "WRECKED VESSELS."

- AMMUNITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1211 (ii).
- Annapolis and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 82** (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*). 1°*, 489; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 978 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 73.*)
- Animals, Cruelty to.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- ARCHIVES, CARE OF: in Com. of Sup., 1149 (ii).
- ARKONA POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1018 (ii).
- DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 712 (i).
- ARTILLERY PRACTICE ON ISLAND OF ORLEANS: M. for Copies of Pets, &c. (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 672 (i).
- ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1148, 1638 (ii).
- Assiniboine River Bridges (construction) B. No. 86** (Mr. *Watson*). 1°*, 489; 2°*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 978 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 92*)
- ATLANTIC OCEAN, OBSTRUCTIONS TO SHIPPING: Ques. (Gen. *Laurie*) 1433 (ii).
- AUBRY, REV. M., SERVICES AS MILITARY CHAPLAIN: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Amyot*) 654 (i).
- AUDETTE, ANTOINE, NORTH STUKELY POSTMASTER: M. for copies of O.C.'s, &c. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1092 (ii).
- AUDET, LIEUT. COL., AND FRENCH TRANSLATION OF FIELD EXERCISES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Amyot*) 655 (i).
- Audit Act.** See "REVENUE AND AUDIT."
- AUDITOR AND RECEIVER GENERAL, WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 88 (i).
- AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
- INCREASE OF SALARY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 493 (i).
- APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS: presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 18 (i).
- BAKER, MR., IMMIGRATION AGENT AT QU'APPELLE: in Com. of Sup., 1151, 1169 (ii).
- BANKS AND BANKING:**
- BANK OF LONDON IN CANADA. See B. 80.
- BANKS SUPERVISION BY GOVT.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 668 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 18 (i).
- FEDERAL BANK OF CANADA. See B. 51.
- GENERAL BANKING ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 19 (i).
- GOLD, REDEMPTION OF LEGAL TENDER NOTES: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 171 (i).
- LA BANQUE NATIONALE. See B. 23.
- LEGISLATION: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 415 (i).
- [See "FINANCE."]
- Bank Act (Chap. 120, Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 119** (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 1135; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1402 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 27.*)
- Bank of London winding-up B. No. 80** (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*). 1°*, 489; 2°*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1313 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 50.*)
- BARRACKS (B.C.): in Com of Sup., 1644 (ii).
- BAY FORTUNE, P. E. I., BREAKWATER, REP. OF ENGINEER: M. for Copy (Mr. *McIntyre*) 656 (i).
- BAY OF QUINTE, BRIDGE AT BELLEVILLE: M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. *Platt*) 922 (ii).
- BEAUHARNOIS CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. 825 (ii).
- BEHRING'S SEA, CLEARANCES TO VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 44 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 778 (i).
- NAVIGATION BY CANADIAN VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 44 (i).
- M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gordon*) 966 (ii).
- Deb. (Mr. *Prior*) 966; (Mr. *Foster*) 968; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 968; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 969; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 969; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 970; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 971; (Mr. *Davies*) 971; (Mr. *McNeill*) 972; (Mr. *Edgar*) 973; (Mr. *Montague*) 973; (Mr. *Baker*) 973 (ii).
- BELFAST IMMIGRATION AGENCY (GRATUITY TO LATE AGENT): in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
- Belleville and Lake Nipissing Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 96** (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°*, 866; 2°*, 954; in Com. and 3°*, 1067 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 68.*)
- Benevolent Societies B. No. 115** (Mr. *Dickinson*) 1°, 1062 (i).
- BEXLEY POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 58 (i).
- BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1°*, 2, *pro forma* (i).
- BILL (No. 2) To amend "The Dominion Controverted Elections Act."—(Mr. *Amyot*) 1°, 18 (i).
- BILL (No. 3) To protect the owners of certain bottles and vessels therein mentioned.—(Mr. *Denison*) 1°*, 27; 2° m., 759 (i).
- BILL (No. 4) To amend the Act respecting Defective Letters Patent and the Discharge of Securities to the Crown.—(Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°, 44; 2°, 761 (i); in Com. and 3°, 916 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 36.*)
- BILL (No. 5) For the protection of Railway Employés.—(Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°, 44; 2° m., 762; deb. adjd., 770 (i); rsmd., 916; 2°, 917; Order dischgd. and ref. to Com. on B. 24, 1247 (ii).
- BILL (No. 6) To amend the "The Canada Temperance Act."—(Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°, 44 (i); 2° m., 978; 2° and in Com., 980; recom., 1245; 3°*, 1259 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 34.*)
- BILL (No. 7) To permit American vessels to aid vessels wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 1°, 44; 2° m., 770; deb. adjd., 778 (i); rsmd., 917; 2° neg. (Y. 61, N. 84) 921 (ii).
- BILL (No. 8) To incorporate the Canada and Michigan Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 1°*, 51; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 392 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 93.*)
- BILL (No. 9) Respecting the Canada Southern and the Erie and Niagara Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) 1°*, 51; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 392 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 61.*)

BILL (No. 10) To amend "The Canada Temperance Act."
—(Mr. Jamieson.)

1^o, 52 (i); 2^o m., 985; Amt. (Mr. O'Brien) 6 m. h., 989; neg. (Y. 44, N. 88) and 2^o, 1000; in Com., 1247; 3^o*, 1259 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 35.)

BILL (No. 11) To empower the Merchants Marine Insurance Company of Canada to relinquish its Charter and to provide for the winding-up of its affairs.—(Mr. Curran.)

1^o*, 62; 2^o, 322; in Com. and 3^o*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 98.)

BILL (No. 12) To amend Chapter one hundred and twenty-seven of the Revised Statutes of Canada, intituled: "An Act respecting Interest."—(Mr. Landry.)

1^o*, 62 (i).

BILL (No. 13) To amend the Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.—(Mr. McNeill.)

1^o, 62 (i).

BILL (No. 14) To incorporate the Ontario Central Railway Company (name changed to Western Ontario).—(Mr. Ward.)

1^o*, 62; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 496 (i). (51 Vic., c. 69.)

BILL (No. 15) To incorporate the Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert.—(Mr. Macdowall.)

1^o*, 62; 2^o*, 219 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 954 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 108.)

BILL (No. 16) To incorporate the Chinook Belt and Peace River Railway Company.—(Mr. Perley, Assiniboia.)

1^o*, 73; 2^o*, 219; in Com. and 3^o*, 647 (i). (51 Vic., c. 74.)

BILL (No. 17) Respecting the River St. Clair Railway, Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

1^o*, 73; 2^o*, 219; in Com. and 3^o*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 94.)

BILL (No. 18) To amend the Acts relating to the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

1^o*, 73; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 392 (i). (51 Vic., c. 56.)

BILL (No. 19) To incorporate the Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Montague.)

1^o*, 73; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 496 (i). (51 Vic., c. 70.)

BILL (No. 20) Relating to the Upper Ottawa Improvement Company.—(Mr. White, Renfrew.)

1^o*, 73; 2^o m., 322; 2^o, 496 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 1148 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 102.)

BILL (No. 21) Respecting the Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

1^o*, 73; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 392 (i). (51 Vic., c. 84.)

BILL (No. 22) To incorporate the Eastern Assurance Company.—(Mr. McDougald.)

1^o*, 73; 2^o*, 219; in Com. and 3^o*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 96.)

BILL (No. 23) To reduce the capital stock of La Banque Nationale.—(Mr. Bryson.)

1^o*, 73; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 43.)

BILL (No. 24) To consolidate and amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Pope.)

1^o, 73 (i); 2^o*, 941; in Com., 1175, 1417, 1492; 3^o m. and M. to recom., 1507; Amt. (Mr. Edgar) 1508; neg. (Y. 54, N. 93) 1510; 3^o*, 1511 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 29.)

BILL (No. 25) To confirm the Charter of incorporation of the Great North-West Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Daly.)

1^o*, 85; 2^o m., 128; 2^o*, 220; in Com. and 3^o*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 85.)

BILL (No. 26) To confirm a certain agreement made between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, the Canada Southern Railway Company and the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)

1^o*, 85; 2^o, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 647 (i). (51 Vic., c. 59.)

BILL (No. 27) To incorporate the Bronsons and Weston Lumber Company.—(Mr. Perley, Ottawa.)

1^o*, 97; 2^o*, 220; in Com. and 3^o*, 612 (i). (51 Vic., c. 103.)

BILL (No. 28) To repeal an Act intituled: "An Act for facilitating navigation of the River St. Lawrence, in and near the Harbor of Quebec."—(Mr. Guay.)

1^o*, 97 (i).

BILL (No. 29) To make further provision as to the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.—(Mr. Brown.)

1^o, 97 (i).

BILL (No. 30) To authorise the Town of Kincardine, in the County of Bruce, to impose and collect certain Tolls at the Harbor in the said Town.—(Mr. Rowand.)

1^o*, 97; 2^o, 220 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 1049 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 104.)

BILL (No. 31) To incorporate the Detroit River Bridge Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

1^o*, 110; 2^o*, 497 (i); in Com., 912; 3^o*, 953 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 91.)

BILL (No. 32) To incorporate the Dominion Plate Glass Insurance Company.—(Mr. Holton.)

1^o*, 110; 2^o*, 322 (i); in Com., 946; 3^o*, 978 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 95.)

BILL (No. 33) To amend the Act incorporating the Hereford Branch Railway Company, and to change the name of the Company to the Hereford Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)

1^o*, 110; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 81.)

BILL (No. 34) Respecting the South Norfolk Railway Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)

1^o*, 110; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 496 (i). (51 Vic., c. 57.)

- BILL (No. 35)** To enable the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company to run a ferry between Beecher Bay, in British Columbia, to a point in the Straits of Fuca within the United States of America.—(Mr. Baker.)
1°*, 124; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 493 (i). (51 Vic., c. 89.)
- BILL (No. 36)** Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Curran.)
1°*, 124; 2°*, 220; in Com., 496; 3°*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 58.)
- BILL (No. 37)** Respecting the Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Cockburn.)
1°*, 124; 2°*, 220; in Com. and 3°*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 38)** To amend the Acts respecting Patents of Invention.—(Mr. Carling.)
1°*, 124 (i); prop. Res., 125; conc. in, 1513; 2°* and in Com., 1511; 3° m., 1547; Amt. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) neg. (Y. 60, N. 93) and 3°, 1548 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 39)** To amend the Act respecting Ferries, Chapter ninety-seven of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1°, 124 (i); 2°* and in Com., 895; 3°*, 896 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 40)** To extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.—(Mr. Charlton.)
1°*, 244 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1549 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 41)** Respecting the application of certain laws, therein mentioned, to the Province of Manitoba.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 139 (i); 2°*, 941; in Com. and 3°*, 1402 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 42)** To incorporate the Pontiac and Renfrew Railway Company.—(Mr. Bryson.)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 322; in Com. and 3°*, 611 (i). (51 Vic., c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 43)** To amend the Act incorporating the Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company.—(Mr. Mara.)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 322; in Com. and 3°*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 44)** Respecting Bonds on Branch Lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 322; in Com. and 3°*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 45)** Respecting the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Small.)
1°*, 206; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1207 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 46)** To amend the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Scarth.)
1°*, 238; 2°*, 497; in Com., 612 (i); reconsid. in Com. and 3°*, 953 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 86.)
- BILL (No. 47)** To amend "The Adulteration Act," Chapter one hundred and seven of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1°, 238 (i); 2°*, 898; in Com., 932; 3°*, 935 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 48)** Further to amend the Law respecting Procedure in Criminal Cases.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 238 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 942 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 49)** To amend an Act respecting the Liability of Carriers by Water.—(Mr. Madill.)
1°, 238 (i).
- BILL (No. 50)** To incorporate the Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hickey.)
1°*, 270; 2°*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 954 (ii).
- BILL (No. 51)** Respecting the Federal Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Cockburn.)
1°*, 270; 2°*, 497; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 52)** To amend the Act to incorporate the Mackinongé and Nipissing Railway Company.—(Mr. Coulombe.)
1°*, 270; 2°*, 497; in Com. and 3°*, 647 (i). (51 Vic., c. 82.)
- BILL (No. 53)** To make further provision respecting the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)
1°*, 270; 2°*, 497; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 62.)
- BILL (No. 54)** To incorporate the South-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Hall.)
1°*, 270; 2°*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3° m., 912; Amt. (Mr. Bergin) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 57, N. 86) 953; 3°, 954 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 52.)
- BILL (No. 55)** To amend "The Representation Act" as respects certain Constituencies in British Columbia.—(Mr. Baker.)
1°, 309 (i).
- BILL (No. 56)** To amend the Act respecting Elections of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Baker.)
1°, 309 (i).
- BILL (No. 57)** Further to amend "The Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act," Chapter one hundred and thirty-five of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Baker.)
1°, 309 (i).
- BILL (No. 58)** To make further provision respecting Fisheries and Fishing.—(Mr. Kirk.)
1°, 309 (i).
- BILL (No. 59)** To confer certain powers on the Nova Scotia Telephone Company, limited.—(Mr. Tupper.)
1°*, 344; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 954 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 100.)
- BILL (No. 60)** To amend Chapter twenty-seven of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Department of Public Printing, and Stationery.—(Mr. Chapleau.)
1°*, 344 (i); 2° and in Com., 1005; 3°*, 1137 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 61)** Respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1049; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1345 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 78.)

- BILL (No. 62) To incorporate the Grenville International Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Shanly*.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 954 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 63) To amend the Acts relating to the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. *Perley*, *Assiniboia*.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°*, 612 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the Chatham Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John*.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°*, 612 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 72.)
- BILL (No. 65) Respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States.—(Mr. *Thompson*.)
1°, 380; 2° m., 673; deb. adjd., 711; rsmd., 779 (i), 833; 2°, 865; in Com., 867; 3°*, 889 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 66) To incorporate the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergeron*.)
1°*, 380; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°* 612 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Buffalo, Chippawa and Niagara Falls Steamboat and Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ferguson*, *Welland*.)
1°*, 415; 2°*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 978 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 101.)
- BILL (No. 68) To incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 612 (i); withdn., 1585 (ii).
- BILL (No. 69) To confirm a Mortgage given by the Central Railway Company to the Central Trust Company of New York to secure an issue of debentures.—(Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John*.)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1067 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 83.)
- BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the Montreal Island Railway Company.—(Mr. *Desjardins*.)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 63.)
- BILL (No. 71) To grant certain powers to the St. John's and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. *Vanasse*.)
1°*, 454; 2°, 530; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i).
- BILL (No. 72) To incorporate the New York, St. Lawrence and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Wood*, *Brockville*.)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1049 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
- BILL (No. 73) Respecting the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 726 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1207 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 54.)
- BILL (No. 74) To amend the Act to incorporate the Kincardine and Teeswater Railway Company.—(Mr. *Rowand*.)
1°*, 454; 2°*, 493; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 75) To incorporate the Ottawa and Parry Sound Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ferguson*, *Kenfrew*.)
1°, 454; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- BILL (No. 76) To amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter fifty, respecting the North-West Territories.—(Sir *John A Macdonald*.)
1°, 454 (i); prop. Res., 1174; in Com., 1491; 2°*, 1473; in Com. on B., 1480; 3°*, 1547 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 77) To confirm a certain agreement made between the London and South-Eastern Railway Company and the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1°*, 85; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 647 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 60.)
- BILL (No. 78) To incorporate the Keystone Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Weldon*, *St. John*.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 978 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 97.)
- BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Tobique Gypsum Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. *Burns*.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 530; in Com. and 3°*, 790 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 80) To wind up the Bank of London in Canada.—(Mr. *Mills*, *Bothwell*.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1313 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- BILL (No. 81) To incorporate the Ontario, Manitoba and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis*.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 498 (i); withdn., 1585 (ii).
- BILL (No. 82) To incorporate the Annapolis and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Mills*, *Annapolis*.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 978 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 83) To amend the Act to incorporate the Moncton Harbor Improvements Company.—(Mr. *Wood*, *Westmoreland*.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 954 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 105.)
- BILL (No. 84) To incorporate the Thousand Islands Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor*.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1067 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 85) To incorporate the Emerson and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Watson*.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 612 (i); withdn., 1585 (ii).
- BILL (No. 86) To authorise the construction of Bridges over the Assiniboine River at Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie, for railway and passenger purposes.—(Mr. *Watson*.)
1°*, 489; 2°*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 978 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
- BILL (No. 87) To amend "The Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act," Chapter twenty-nine of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Sir *Charles Tupper*.)
Res. prop. and 1° of B., 493 (i); 2°, 89; Res. in Com., 891; conc. in, 931; B. in Com., 931, 943; 3°*, 943 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 7.)

- BILL (No. 88)** To abolish Forfeitures for Treason and Felony, and to otherwise amend the Law relating thereto.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1° 514 (i); 2°, 1147; withdn., 1629 (ii).
- BILL (No. 89)** To amend "The Dominion Elections Act," Chapter eight, Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 514 (i); 2°, 941; in Com., 944, 1138; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. Barron), 1403; neg. (Y. 59, N. 83) and 3°, 1404 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 11.)
- BILL (No. 90)** To amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter one hundred and eighty-one, respecting Punishments, Pardons and the Commutation of Sentences.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 515 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°, 942 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 91)** To amend the Law relating to Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 515 (i); 2°, 942; in Com., 943, 1002; 3°, 1005 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 92)** To amend Chapter thirty-two of the Revised Statutes respecting the Customs.—(Mr. Bewell.)
Res. prop., 499; 1°, 598 (i); 2°, 897; in Com., 898, 954, 1001; 3°, 1002; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1472 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 93)** Further to amend "The Speedy Trials Act," Chapter one hundred and seventy-five of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 598 (i); 2°, 942; in Com. and 3°, 1005 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 94)** To amend "The Railway Act."—(Mr. Cook.)
1°, 598 (i).
- BILL (No. 95)** Respecting Gaming in Stocks and Merchandise—(G) from the Senate.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 750 (i); 2°, 1195; in Com., 1404; 3°, 1412 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 42.)
- BILL (No. 96)** To incorporate the Belleville and Lake Nipissing Railway Company—(E) from the Senate.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 866; 2°, 954; in Com. and 3°, 1067 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 97)** To amend the Act to incorporate the Board of Management of the Church and Manse Building Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada for Manitoba and the North-West.—(Mr. Daly.)
1°, 711; 2°, 790 (i); in Com. and 3°, 1313 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 107.)
- BILL (No. 98)** Respecting the International Convention for the Preservation of Submarine Cables—(C) from the Senate.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 726 (i); 2°, 942; in Com. and 3°, 944 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 31)
- BILL (No. 99)** To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act.—(Mr. Foster.)
1°, 750 (i); 2°* and in Com., 1402; 3°*, 1404 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 26.)
- BILL (No. 100)** Respecting the application to Canada of the Criminal Law of England.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 825 (ii).
- BILL (No. 101)** To make further provision respecting the granting of a subsidy to the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, limited.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
Res. prop. and in Com., 896; 1°* of B., 897; 2° m., 935; agreed to (Y. 84, N. 52) 941; 3°, 943 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 4.)
- BILL (No. 102)** Respecting the Central Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. O'Brien.)
1°*, 899; 2°*, 954; in Com. and 3°*, 1148 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 76.)
- BILL (No. 103)** To provide for the examination and licensing of persons employed as engineers elsewhere than on steamboats.—(Mr. Cook.)
1°*, 899 (ii).
- BILL (No. 104)** Further to amend Chapter fifty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, "The Territories Real Property Act."—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 899; 2°*, 1195; prop. Res., 1259; in Com., 1416; in Com. on B., 1412, 1415; 3°*, 1433 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 105)** To prevent the practice of fraud by tree peddlers and commission men in the sale of nursery stock.—(Mr. Boyle.)
1°*, 899 (ii).
- BILL (No. 106)** Further to amend "The Indian Act," Chapter forty-three of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)
1°, 922; 2° (Mr. Thompson) and in Com., 1007; 3°*, 1011 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 107)** Respecting the York Farmers Colonisation Company—(A) from the Senate.—(Mr. McCulla.)
1°*, 1031; 2°*, 1067; in Com. and 3°*, 1313 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 106.)
- BILL (No. 108)** Respecting the Advertising of Counterfeit Money.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 963; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1137 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 109)** To provide for the care and reformation of children neglected or ill-treated by parents or guardians.—(Mr. O'Brien.)
1°, 963 (ii).
- BILL (No. 110)** Further to amend "The Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act," Chapter one hundred and thirty-five of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 964; Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 1402 (ii).
- BILL (No. 111)** To provide for the crossing of Railways by Street Drains and Water Mains.—(Mr. Lister.)
1°*, 964 (ii).
- BILL (112)** To amend the Revised Statutes, Chapter seventy-seven respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. Foster.)
1°, 1000; Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 1473 (ii).
- BILL (No. 113)** To amend Chapter one hundred and seventy-eight of the Revised Statutes of Canada, "The Summary Convictions Act."—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 1001; 2°*, 1402; in Com. and 3°*, 1417; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1629 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 45.)

- BILL (No. 114) To amend the several Acts relating to the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto—(D) from the Senate.—(Mr. Small.)
1°*, 1031; 2°*, 1067; in Com. and 3°*, 1313 (ii). (51 Vic. c. 99.)
- BILL (No. 115) Respecting Benevolent Societies.—(Mr. Dickinson.)
1°, 1062 (ii).
- BILL (No. 116) To amend "The Civil Service Act," Chapter seventeen of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Chapleau.)
1°, 1062; 2°* and in Com., 1433, 1468; 3°*, 1472 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 117) To amend the "Electoral Franchise Act," Chapter five of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Chapleau.)
1°, 1062; 2°, 1549; in Com., 1551; 3° m., 1586; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to recom., neg. (Y. 53, N. 74) and 3°*, 1587 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 9.)
- BILL (No. 118) To amend the "Weights and Measures Act," as respects the contents of packages of Salt.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1°, 1093; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1402 (ii) (51 Vic., c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 119) To amend the "Bank Act," Chapter one hundred and twenty of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 1135; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1402 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 27.)
- BILL (No. 120) Further to amend "The Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act," Chapter one hundred and thirty-five of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 1135; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1402; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1549 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 121) To amend Chapter thirty-three of the Revised Statutes of Canada, respecting the duties of Customs.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
1°*, 1137; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1400 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 122) To amend Chapter thirty-four of the Revised Statutes, respecting the Inland Revenue.—(Mr. Costigan.)
1°*, 1137; 2°* and in Com., 1401; 3°*, 1402 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 16.)
- BILL (No. 123) To amend "The Criminal Procedure Act," Chapter one hundred and seventy-four of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 1173; 2°* and in Com.; 1513; 3°*, 1514 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 44.)
- BILL (No. 124) To amend the "Copyright Act," Chapter sixty-two of the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 1173; withdn., 1629 (ii).
- BILL (No. 125) To amend "The North-West Territories Representation Act."—(Mr. Thompson.)
1°, 1231; 2°*, in Com., 3° m., Amt. (Mr. Watson) to recom. neg. (Y. 62, N. 89) and 3°*, 1551 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 126) To amend Chapter one hundred and twenty-four of the Revised Statutes, respecting Insurance.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
1°, 1332; 2°, 1400; M. for Com., 1416; in Com., 1417; 3°*, 1433 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 127) Relating to the Interest payable on Deposits in the Post Office and Government Savings Banks.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
1°, 1332; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1401 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 128) For the relief of Eleonora Elizabeth Tudor—(F) from the Senate.—(Mr. Small.)
1° on a div., 1345; 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1413; M. for special order for Com., 1468; 3° on a div., 1522 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 111.)
- BILL (No. 129) For the relief of Andrew Maxwell Irving—(J) from the Senate.—(Mr. Small.)
1° on a div., 1345; 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1414; M. for special order for Com., 1468; 3° on a div., 1522 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 109.)
- BILL (No. 130) For the relief of Catharine Morrison—(H) from the Senate.—(Mr. Small.)
1° on a div., 1345; 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1414; M. for special order for Com., 1468; 3° on a div., 1522 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 110.)
- BILL (No. 131) Further to amend "The Dominion Lands Act"—(L) from the Senate.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)
1°*, 1382; 2° and in Com., 1514; 3°, 1549 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 132) Respecting a certain agreement between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
Res. prop., 1001; M. for Com., 1332; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 1354; neg. (Y. 63, N. 111) 1371; Amt. (Mr. Mitchell) neg., 1371; M. for Com. agreed to (Y. 112, N. 60) 1371; in Com., 1372; 1° of B., 1382; 2°*, 1383; in Com., 1388; 3°*, 1391; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1587 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 32.)
- BILL (No. 133) To authorise the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the Public Service.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
Res. prop., 1136; M. for Com., 1259; in Com., 1278; 1°* and 2°* of B., 1387; in Com. and 3°*, 1388 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 2.)
- BILL (No. 134) To make further provision respecting the construction of the Ship Channel between Montreal and Quebec.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
Res. prop., 1031; M. for Com., 1280; in Com., 1294; 1°* and 2°* of B., in Com. and 3°*, 1391 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 135) Relating to certain Advances made to the Quebec Harbor Commissioners.—(Sir Charles Tupper.)
Res. prop., 1031; in Com., 1296; M. to conc., 1383, 1391; conc. in, 1°*, 2°* of B. and in Com., 1400; 3°*, 1404 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 6.)

- BILL (No. 136)** To amend Chapter sixteen of the Revised Statutes, respecting the High Commissioner for Canada in the United Kingdom.—(Sir *Charles Tupper*.)
Res. prop., 1502; conc. in, 1^o*, 2^o* of B. and in Com., 1505; 3^o m., 1506; 3^o, 1547 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 137)** Respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Boyle*.)
Rule suspended, 1^o*, 2^o* and in Com., 1522; 3^o*, 1524 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 79.)
- BILL (No. 138)** For the prevention and suppression of Combinations formed in restraint of trade.—(Mr. *Wallace*.)
1^o, 1544; Notice of M., B. to take effect on 22nd May, 1691 (ii).
- BILL (No. 139)** Respecting the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fisher*.)
Rule suspended, 1^o*, 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 1563 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- BILL (No. 140)** To authorise the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of Railway therein mentioned.—(Sir *Charles Tupper*.)
Res. prop., 1546; in Com., 1587; conc. in, 1^o*, 2^o* and in Com., 1595; 3^o*, 1629 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- BILL (No. 141)** For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the years ending respectively the 30th June, 1888, and the 30th June, 1889, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Sir *Charles Tupper*.)
Res. conc. in, 1^o*, 2^o* and 3^o*, 1690 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- BILL (No. 142)** To amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts, Chapter one hundred and thirty-eight of the Revised Statutes.—(Mr. *Thompson*.)
Res. prop., 1^o*, 2^o*, in Com., and 3^o*, 1690 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- BILLS ASSENTED TO**, 1196, 1692 (ii).
BILLS WITHDRAWN, 1585, 1629 (ii).
- Board of Trade.** See "Toronto."
- BOBCAYGEON, DAM AT**: in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- BONILLA POINT AND VICTORIA (B.C.) TELEGRAPH**: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
- Bottles and Vessels Protection to Owners B. No. 3** (Mr. *Denison*). 1^o*, 27; 2^o m., 759 (i).
- BOUNDARIES OF ONT.**: Remarks (Mr. *Dawson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1629 (ii).
- BOUNDARY BETWEEN ALASKA AND CAN.**: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 171 (i).
— ALASKA AND B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 498 (i).
- BOOKS ON THE MILITIA FORCE OF CAN., TRANSLATION**: Ques (Mr. *Amyot*) 85 (i).
— REMOVAL OF DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 899 (ii).
- BRANT AND HALDIMAND INDIAN RESERVE, DOCTOR**: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 647 (i).
- Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s further provision B. No. 53** (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*). 1^o*, 270; 2^o*, 497; in Com. and 3^o*, 726 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- BRESAYLOR HALF-BREEDS: Remarks** (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1514 (ii).
- BRIDGE AT CHIPPAWA VILLAGE: Ques.** (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 65 (i).
— AT QUEBEC, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1625 (ii).
- BRIDGES, OTTAWA CITY AND RIVER**: in Com. of Sup., 1571.
- BRIGADE MAJORS SALARIES, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA**:
ALASKA AND B. O. BOUNDARY COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 495 (i).
— Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 171 (i).
BARRACKS: in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).
BEARING'S SEA FISHERIES: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 778 (i).
— NAVIGATION BY CAN. VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 44 (i).
— SEIZURES, COR. RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gordon*) 966 (ii).
BONILLA POINT AND VICTORIA TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
COUNTY COURT JUDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Mara*) 66 (i).
ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1632, 1653 (ii).
IMMIGRATION AGENT, VICTORIA: in Com. of Sup., 1160 (ii).
INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 1682 (ii).
KAMLOOPS AS AN OUTPORT OF ENTRY, MR. PARMELEE'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Mara*) 498 (i).
ONDERDONK ARBITRATION, PLANT TAKEN OVER BY GOVT.: Details (Mr. *Pope*) 111 (i).
— Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 98 (i).
PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).
PUB. WORKS AGENCY: in Com. of Sup., 1633 (ii).
VICTORIA, POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 826 (ii).
— Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
- BROME CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep.** read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).
- Bronsons and Weston Lumber Co.'s incorp. B. No. 27** (Mr. *Perley, Ottawa*). 1^o*, 97; 2^o*, 220; in Com. and 3^o*, 612 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 103.)
- BRUCE, WEST, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification** (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- BYRANTON, ALBERT AND ALLAN, COR. re DAMAGES DEBBY BRANCH RY.**: M. for copy* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 866 (ii).
- Buffalo, Chippawa and Niagara Falls Steamboat and Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 67** (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*). 1^o*, 415; 2^o*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 918 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 101.)
- BUOYS IN RIVER SAGUENAY: Ques.** (Mr. *Couture*) 1433 (ii).
— ST. LAWRENCE, MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1582 (ii).
- BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE: Remarks**, 26, 125, 416, 456 (i).
— M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to change hour of meeting 1500 (ii).
— notification (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) of Prorogation 1625 (ii).
— M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to take in Thursdays, 711 (i); Wednesdays, 1061; Saturdays, 1259; Mondays, 1332 (ii).
- BUTTER-MAKING, PAMPHLET ON, FRENCH TRANSLATION: Ques.** (Mr. *Couture*) 98 (i).
— GERMAN TRANSLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 496 (i).
- CAB HIRE**: in Com. of Sup., 104 (i).
- CABLE, PELRE ISLAND AND MAINLAND: ON M. for Com. of Sup.** (Mr. *Brien*) 1011 (ii).

CABLE, PELEE ISLAND, PETITIONS, &c. : M. for copies (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 826 (i).

CABLES (SUBMARINE). See "INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION."

CADETS, MILITARY COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 123 (i).

CAMPBELL, ARCH. D., Esq., M.-P. FOR KENT, ONT : introduced, 1848 (ii).

CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ, &c., MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).

CAN. AND ANTWERP OR GERMANY MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 1679; conc., 1689 (ii).

"CANADA GAZETTE" : in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii)

Can. and Michigan Tunnel Co.'s incorp. B. No. 8 (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1°*, 51; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 392 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 93.)

Can. Southern and Erie and Niagara Ry. Co.'s B. No. 9 (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*). 1°*, 51; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 392 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 61.)

Can. Southern Ry. Co. See B. 26, and "LONDON AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO."

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 44 (i); 2° m, 978; 2° and in Com., 980; recom., 1245; 3°*, 1259 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 34.)

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. No. 10 (Mr. *Jamieson*). 1°. 52 (i); 2° m., 985; Amt. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 6 m. h., 889; neg. (Y. 44, N. 88) and 2°, 1000; in Com., 1247; 3°*, 1259 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 35.)

Deb. on M. for 2° (Mr. *Jamieson*) 985; (Mr. *Fisher*) 988; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 989; Amt., 6 m. h., 990 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 990; (Mr. *Freeman*) 992; (Mr. *Jamieson*) 994; (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 995; (Mr. *Fisher*) 998; (Mr. *Casey*) 999 (ii).

CAN. TEMP. ACT, LEGISLATION : Res. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 74; neg. (Y. 57, N. 109) 84 (i).

Deb (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 75; (Mr. *Laurier*) 75; (Mr. *Jamieson*) 76; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 76; (Mr. *Freeman*) 77; (Mr. *Seriver*) 77; (Mr. *Fisher*) 78; (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 79; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 80; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 81; (Mr. *Foster*) 82; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 83; (Mr. *Haggart*) 84 (i).

— EXPENDITURE : in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).

CANADIAN FISHING VESSELS, REPORTING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 24 (i).

C. P. R. (Bonds on Branch Lines) B. No. 44 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 206; 2°*, 322; in Com. and 3°*, 498 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 51.)

C. P. R. (Guaranteed Bonds) B. No. 132 (Sir *Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 100(i); M. for Com., 1332; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1345; neg. (Y. 63, N. 111) 1371; Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) neg., 1371; M. for Com. agreed to (Y. 112, N. 60) 1371; in Com., 1372; 1° of B., 1382; 2°*, 1383; in Com., 1388; 3°*, 1391; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1587 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 32.)

Deb. on Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1332; (Mr. *Laurier*) 1339; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1338; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1345 (ii).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1345; (Mr. *Amyot*) 1347; (Mr. *Watson*) 1348; (Mr. *Daly*) 1352; (Mr. *Dawson*) 1357 (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1358; (Mr. *Davin*) 1363; (Mr. *Armstrong*) 1366; (Mr. *Perley, Assiniboia*) 1367.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. :

CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).

LANDS LIABLE TO TAXATION : Ques. (Mr. *Perley, Assiniboia*) 494 (i).

LAND SALES IN MAN. AND N.W.T. : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 44, 496 (i).

LANDS UNSOLD, ACREAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1195 (ii).

MORTGAGE : Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1195 (ii).

— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1586 (ii).

ORDERDONK ARBITRATION, PLANT TAKEN OVER BY GOVT. : Ques.

(Mr. *Weldon, St John*) 98 (i).

— DETAILS : presented (Mr. *Pope*) 111 (i).

SECTIONS IN B. O. : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 86 (i).

CANALS :

CHAMBLY : in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).

CORNWALL : in Com. of Sup., 1452; conc., 1687 (ii).

OLBUTE : in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).

DAM AT BOBCAYGON : in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).

FARRAN'S POINT DIVISION : in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

FENELON RIVER NAVIGATION, DEPTH OF WATER : Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 97 (i).

GREENVILLE CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).

LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL OF LABORERS : in Com. of Sup., 1170, 1563 (ii).

— Ref. to in Reciprocity deb., 631 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).

— WATER POWER, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION : presented (Mr. *Pope*) 52 (i).

LAKEFIELD AND BALSAM LAKE CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).

LAKE ST. LOUIS : in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

MURRAY (TOWARDS COMPLETION) : in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

REPAIRS AND WORKING EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 1641, 1668 (ii).

RIDEAU BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 1646, 1671 (ii).

ST. ANNE'S : in Com. of Sup., 1459, 1646 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS : in Com. of Sup., 1452, 1646 (ii).

SAULT STE. MARIE : in Com. of Sup., 1446, 1644 (ii).

ST. OURS LOCKS : in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).

TAY : in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).

THEBOLD CANAL WATER POWER : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 647 (i).

TRENT RIVER NAV. : in Com. of Sup., 1454, 1460 (ii).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL COMMISSION, COR. &c : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 71 (ii).

WELLAND : in Com. of Sup., 1453, 1460, 1671; conc., 1688 (ii).

— SECTION "A" : Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 496 (i).

WILLIAMSBURG : in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).

CANADIAN VESSELS LOST ON GREAT LAKES : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 19, 752 (i).

— WRECKING VESSELS IN U.S. WATERS : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Edgar*) 665 (i).

CAPE BRETON :

IBESTER AND REID'S CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Victoria*) 1299 (ii).

— Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1067 (ii).

NORTH SYDNEY PILOTAGE RETURNS UNDER ACT OF 1873 : Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 1067 (ii).

POINT TUPPER RY. PIER, EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Victoria*) 1299 (ii).

RY. CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 1230 (ii).

SHERWOOD, A. P., AND CAPE BRETON RY. : Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 965 (ii).

SIMMS & SLATER'S SUBSIDIES : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1067 (ii).

— CONTRACTORS CAPE BRETON RY., COR. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Flynn*) 1259 (ii).

CAP CHAT AND GRAND VALLÉE FISHERIES, REPS. : M. for copies (Mr. *Joncas*) 1232 (ii).

CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOR : in Com. of Sup., 1462 (ii).

CAPITAL ACCOUNT. See "I.C.R."

- Carriers by Water Liability Act Amt. B. No. 49** (Mr. *Madill*) 1°, 238 (i).
- CARLETON (ONT.) RET. OF MEMBER ELECT**: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- CARTRIDGE FACTORY, & CO. (QUE.) WATER SUPPLY, COR.**: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1092 (ii).
- CARTRIDGES, REP. OF COMMISSION ON MANUFACTURE**: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1232 (ii).
- CASUALTIES, & CO., ON I.C.R.**: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 61 (i).
- CATTLE QUARANTINE, EXPENSES**: in Com. of Sup., 1206 (ii).
- CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS**. See "INDIANS."
- CAYUGA INDIAN LANDS**. See "INDIANS."
- CAYUGA P. O. SITE**: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 28 (i).
- CENSUS AND STATISTICS**: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (ii).
- CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION OF 1876, PAPERS, & CO, re G. J. MACDONALD**: M. for copies* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 866 (i).
- Central Ont. Ry. Co.** See "WESTERN ONTARIO."
- Central Ont. Ry. Co.'s B. No. 102** (Mr. *O'Brien*). 1°*, 899; 2°*, 954; in Com. and 3°*, 1148 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 76*)
- PETITION: M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) to ref. back to Standing Com., 750 (i).
- Central Ry. (N.B.) Co.'s (confirmation of mortgage) B. No. 69** (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*). 1°*, 454; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1067 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 83*.)
- SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1593 (ii).
- Central Trust Co. of N. Y.** See "CENTRAL RY. CO."
- CHAMBLY CANAL**: in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT**: in Com. of Sup., 88 (i).
- CHARLEVOIX, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT**: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- CHATHAM BRANCH RY. (N. B.) Co.'s. SUBSIDY**: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1594 (ii).
- Chatham Junction Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 64** (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*). 1°*, 380; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°*, 612 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 72*.)
- Chignecto Marine Transport Ry. Co.'s (Subsidy) B. No. 101** (Sir *Charles Tupper*). Res. prop. and in Com., 896; 1°* of B., 897; 2° m., 935; agreed to (Y. 84, N. 52) 941; 3°, 943 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 4*.)
- Children, care and Reformation, &c., Provision B. No. 109** (Mr. *O'Brien*). 1°, 963 (ii).
- Chinook Belt and Peace River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 16** (Mr. *Perley, Assiniboia*). 1°*, 73; 2°*, 219; in Com. and 3°*, 647 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 74*.)
- CHIPMAN, C. C., PAYMENTS TO**: in Com. of Sup., 1149, 1165.
- CHIPPAWA AND OTTAWA NATION INDIANS' CLAIMS**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 498 (i).
- CHOQUETTE, MR., M.P., PETITION AGAINST RETURN**: objection (Mr. *Laurier*) 1332, 1458 (ii).
- CHOUNARD, H. J. J. B., Esq., MEMBER ELECT FOR DORCHESTER**: introduced, 2 (ii).
- CIMON, S, Esq, MEMBER ELECT FOR CHARLEVOIX**: introduced, 1 (i).
- CINCINNATI CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION, CAN. REPRESENTATION**: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1136 (ii).
- CIVIL GOVERNMENT**: in Com. of Sup., 90 (i), 1637, 1668 (ii).
- Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 13** (Mr. *McNeill*). 1°, 62 (i).
- Civil Service Act (Chap. 17 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 116** (Mr. *Chapleau*). 1°, 1062; 2°* and in Com., 1433, 1468; 3°*, 1472 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 12*.)
- BOARD OF EXAMINERS: in Com. of Sup., 113, 128 (i).
- LIST OF CANADA: presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 172 (i).
- TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS: Ques (Mr. *Davin*) 965 (ii).
- NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 495 (i).
- CLANCEY, PATRICK, COR. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY**: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 866 (i).
- CLAYES, MR., LATE M.P.**: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on decease, 62 (i).
- CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY**: Ref. to, 93, 95 (i), 1511 (ii).
- CLOTHING AND GREAT COATS**: in Com. of Sup., 1212, 1215 (ii).
- CLOTHING FOR MILITIA, TENDERS AND CONTRACT**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bowman*) 866 (i).
- COAL SUPPLY, GOVT. TENDERS AND CONTRACTS**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Guillet*) 866 (i).
- COCHRANE, E., Esq., MEMBER ELECT FOR NORTHUMBERLAND**: introduced, 2 (i).
- COLCHESTER, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT**: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- COLLECTION OF REVENUES**: in Com. of Sup., 1619, 1632, 1667, 1684 (ii).
- Collingwood and Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 19** (Mr. *Montague*). 1°*, 73; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 496 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 70*.)
- COLLISIONS ON HIGH SEAS, LEGISLATION**: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826 (ii).
- COLMER, MR.**: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
- COLONIAL AND INDIAN EXHIBITION**: in Com. of Sup., 1638 (ii).
- COLONISATION Co.'s in MAN. AND N.W.T.**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).
- INSPECTOR, MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Watson*) 71 (i).
- M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 866 (i).
- Combinations**. See "TRADE."
- COMMERCIAL AGENCIES**: in Com. of Sup., 1615 (ii)
- COMMERCIAL RELATIONS**. See "RECIPROCIITY."
- COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS**: in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
- COMMITTEES**:
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL: M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Sel. Com. to supervise, 18 (i)
- FARMERS, FRAUDULENT PRACTICES ON: M. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sp. Com., 1244 (ii).
- KING, JAMES, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: M. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) for Sel. Com., 865 (ii).
- QUARANTINE SERVICE OF CANADA: M. (Mr. *Fiset*) for Sp. Com., 657 (i).

COMMITTEES—Continued.

- SELECT STANDING: M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 2 (i).
 — M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) for Com. to prepare Lists, 20 (i).
 — Lists presented, 25 (i)
 — M. (Sir Hector Langevin) to add names, 598 (i), 823 (ii).
 TELEGRAPH LINES, ASSUMPTION BY GOVT.: M. (Mr. Denison) for Sel. Com., 101 (i).
 TRADE COMBINATIONS: M. (Mr. Wallace) for Sel. Com., 28 (i).
 — M. (Mr. Wallace) to employ shorthand writers, 51 (i).
 — M. (Mr. Edgar) for Sel. Com., withdn, 60 (i).

**Commutation of Sentences. See "CRIMINAL LAW."
 COMPANIES. See**

- BRONSONS AND WESTON LUMBER Co.
 DOM. PLATE GLASS Co.
 EASTERN ASSURANCE Co.
 GREENVILLE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE Co.
 KEYSTONE FIRE INSURANCE Co.
 MERCHANTS MARINE INSURANCES Co.
 MONCTON HARBOR IMPROVEMENT Co.
 NOVA SCOTIA TELEPHONE Co.
 ST. JOHN'S AND BREVILLE HYDRAULIC AND MANUFACTURING Co.
 UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT Co.
 YORK FARMERS COLONISATION Co.

[See also "RAILWAYS" and "SUBSIDIES."]

- CONCURRENCE: 1685 (ii).
 CONFEDERATION, ADMISSION OF NEWFOUNDLAND: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Laurier) 664 (i).
 CONFEDERATION TERMS WITH P. E. I. See "TERMS."
 CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: M. for Ret.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 38 (i).
 CONTINGENCIES & C: in Com. of Sup., 104, 119 (i), 1218 (ii).
 Controverted Elections Act Amt. See "DOMINION."
 — See "ELECTIONS."
 Copyright Act (Chap. 62 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 124 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 1173; withdn, 1629 (ii).
 COPYRIGHT, PROP. LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 98 (i).
 COBY, HENRY, ESQ., M.P. FOR WEST HASTINGS: introduced, 270 (i).
 CORNWALL CANAL, 1452; conc., 1687 (ii).
 COST OF CANADIAN RYS: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 141, 170 (i).
 COSTS, & C., re ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBERING Co.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 20 (i).
 COUNTY COURT JUDGES (B.C.) ADDITIONAL: Ques. (Mr. Mara) 66 (i).
 — (ONT.) SALARIES: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 899 (ii).
 — SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
 Counterfeit Money. See "CRIMINAL LAW."
 COURSOL, C. J., INDEMNITY: in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
 COURT OF APPEAL, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 647 (i)
 Criminal Law (advertising counterfeit money) B. No. 108 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 963; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1137 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 40.)
 Criminal Law (cruelty to animals, Chap. 172 Rev. Statutes) further Provision B. No. 29 (Mr. Brown). 1°, 97 (i).
 Criminal Law (English) application to Canada B. No. 100 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 825 (ii).
 Criminal Law (forfeitures for treason, &c.) B. No. 88 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 514 (i); 2°, 1147; withdn, 1629 (ii).

- Criminal Law (fraudulent marks on merchandise) B. No. 91 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 515 (i); 2°, 942; in Com., 943, 1002; 3°, 1005 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 41.)
 Criminal Law (gaming in stocks and merchandise) B. No. 95 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 750 (i); 2°, 1195; in Com., 1404; 3°, 1412 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 42.)
 Criminal Law (procedure Chap. 174 Rev. Statutes) B. No. 123 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 1173; 2°* and in Com., 1513; 3°*, 1514 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 44.)
 Criminal Law (procedure in criminal cases) B. No. 48 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 238 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°, 943 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 43.)
 Criminal Law (punishments, pardons, &c., Chap. 181 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 90 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 515 (i); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 942 (ii) (51 Vic., c. 47.)
 Criminal Law (speedy trials, Chap. 175 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 93 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 598 (i); 2°, 942; in Com. and 3°*, 1005 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 46.)
 Criminal Law (summary convictions, Chap. 178 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 113 (Mr. Thompson). 1°, 1001; 2°*, 1402; in Com. and 3°*, 1417; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1629 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 45.)
 CRIMINAL LAWS, DISTRIBUTION TO JUSTICES: Ques. (Mr. Bernier) 59 (i).
 — DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS: Ques. (Mr. Choquette) 86 (i).
 CAINMILL STATISTICS: presented (Mr. Carling) 1551 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup., 1151 (ii).
 CULBERTSON, ARCHIBALD, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. Burdett) 977 (ii).
 CULBUTE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
 CULLING TIMBER: in Com. of Sup., 1619, 1667, 1684 (ii).
 CUMBERLAND, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
 Customs Act (Chap. 32 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 92 (Mr. Bowell). Res. prop., 499; 1°, 598 (i); 2°, 897; in Com., 898, 954, 1001; 3°*, 1002; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1472 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 14.)
 Customs Act (Chap. 33 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 121 (Sir Charles Tupper). 1°, 1137; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1400 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 15.)
 CUSTOMS AND EXCISE:
 BEHRING'S SEA, CLEARANCES TO VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 44 (i).
 BOOKS, REMOVAL OF DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. Landarkin) 899 (ii).
 CAN. FISHING VESSELS, REPORTING, & C.: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 24 (i).
 CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 95 (i), 1619, 1688 (ii).
 DIAMONDS, & C, SEIZED AT QUEBEC, COR. O, U.'s, & C.: M. for copies* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1068, 1092 (ii).
 DUTIES ON FLOUR, CORNMEAL, & C., Res. (Mr. Mitchell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1561 (ii).
 — DUTIES ON LOGS, & C, AMOUNT COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 86 (i).
 EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: M. for Ret. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 29 (i).
 EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 1618, 1667 (ii).
 FREE LIST AND U. S. TARIFF, REP. OF MIN. OF CUSTOMS: Ques. (Mr. Lanierkin) 847 (i).
 — O. C. PLACING CERTAIN ARTICLES ON: REMARKS (Mr. Mulock) 648 (i).
 HAY DUTIES REFUND BY U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Lavergne) 712 (i).

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE—Continued.

- INLAND REVENUE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
- INTERNATIONAL REGULATIONS *re* TRADING VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 826 (ii).
- KAMLOOPS AS AN OUTPORT OF ENTRY, MR. PARMELEE'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. Mara) 498 (i).
- LOGS, SHINGLEBOLTS, & C, DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 86 (i).
- PICTON, EXCISEMAN, REVENUE, & C: Ques. (Mr. Platt) 1432 (ii).
- RECIPROCITY WITH U. S., REDUCTION OF DUTIES: Remarks (Mr. Landerkin) 554 (i).
- RIMOUSKI CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1067 (ii).
- SALT IN BARRELS, BAGS, & C., WEIGHT: Ques. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 97 (i).
- TARIFF CHANGES AND NEWSPAPER CORRESPONDENTS: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 24 (i).
- TOBACCO, LEAF, PURCHASE AND SALE: Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 66 (i).
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMT: Ques. (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 97 (i).
- DAIRY PRACTICE. See "BUTTERMAKING."
- DALHOUSIE BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1226 (ii).
- DEBATS DU CONSEIL LEGISLATIF, QUÉBEC: in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).
- "DEBATES, OFFICIAL," DISMISSAL OF TRANSLATORS: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Laurier) 20, 128 (i).
- Papers laid on Table (Mr. Speaker) 38 (i).
- Res. (Mr. Laurier) 713 (i).
- Deb (Sir Richard Cartwright) 721, 713; (Mr. Casey) 733; (Mr. Chapleau) 716, 745; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 693; (Mr. Davin) 735; 721; (Mr. Desjardins) 744; (Mr. Edgar) 721; (Mr. Fisher) 742; (Mr. Joss) 722; (Mr. Landerkin) 738; (Mr. Langolier, Montmorency) 728; (Mr. Laurier) 747; (Sir John A. Macdonald) 720; (Mr. McNeill) 742; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 717; (Mr. Mitchell) 748; (Mr. Muloek) 725; (Mr. Platt) 746; (Mr. Sproule) 740; (Mr. Thompson) 704 (i).
- DISTRIBUTION TO PRESS: Remarks, (Sir Richard Cartwright) 750 (i).
- FRENCH TRANSLATION, DELAY: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 554 (i).
- M. (Mr. Desjardins) to conc. in 1st Rep. of Com., 25, 51 (i).
- 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. to conc. (Mr. Desjardins) 489 (i), 823; (Mr. Davin) 1298 (ii).
- 3rd Rep. of Com. (Translators) M. to conc. (Mr. Desjardins) 1501 (ii).
- RECIPROCITY DEB, DISTRIBUTION OF EXTRA COPIES: Remarks (Mr. Trow) 238 (i).
- DEBT OF THE DOM.: Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 1061 (ii).
- See "LOAN."
- Defective Letters Patent. See "LETTERS PATENT."
- DELANEY, MRS., PENSION: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
- DEPUTY ADJUTANTS GENERAL, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).
- DEBRY BRANCH RY. AND JNO. KNIGHT, & C., COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. Mitchell) 866 (i).
- Detroit River Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 31 (Mr. Ferguson, Welland). 1°*, 110; 2°*, 497 (i); in Com., 912; 3°*, 953 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 91).
- DIAMONDS, & C., SEIZED AT QUÉBEC, COR., O. C., & C.: M. for copies* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1068, 1092 (ii).

- DICKINSON, G. L., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR CABLETON (ONT.): introduced 1 (i).
- DIGBY, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT, notification: (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
- DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. RY. CHARTERS COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.: M. for copies* (Mr. Laurier) 672 (i).
- PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 1136.
- DISLOYALTY: personal explanation (Mr. Amyot) 598 (i).
- DIVISIONS:
- O. P. R.: Prop. Res (Sir Charles Tupper) 1001; 2° m., 1332; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 1345; neg. (Y. 63, N. 111) 1370; Amt. (Mr. Mitchell) neg., 1371; M. for Com. agreed to (Y. 112, N. 60) 1371 (ii).
- CAN. TEMP. ACT AMT. B. 10 (Mr. Jamieson): 2° m., 985; Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. O'Brien) 990; M. to adju. deb. (Mr. Haggart) 995; neg. (Y. 44, N. 88) 1000 (ii).
- CAN. TEMP. ACT: Res. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 57, N. 109) 94 (i).
- CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RY. Co.'s B. 101 (Sir Charles Tupper): 2° m., 935; agreed to (Y. 84, N. 52) 941 (ii).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL, DISMISSAL OF TRANSLATORS: Res. (Mr. Laurier) 716; Amt. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 722; Amt. to Amt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 747; agreed to (Y. 113, N. 61) 749 (i).
- DEBT, PUBLIC, OF THE DOM.: prop. Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Ways and Means, 1081; neg. (Y. 66, N. 117) 1120 (ii).
- DOM. ELECTIONS ACT (Chan. 8, Rev. Statutes) AMT. B. 89 (Mr. Thompson): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. Barron) to recom., 1403; neg. (Y. 59, N. 83) 1404 (ii).
- FLOUR, CORNMEAL, & C., DUTIES: Res. (Mr. Mitchell) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 44, N. 89) 1560 (ii).
- FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, ACT AMT. B. 117 (Mr. Chapleau): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to recom., neg. (Y. 53, N. 74) 1587 (ii).
- HALDIMAND (JONES, WALTER) DEP. RET. OFFICER: Res (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1524; neg. (Y. 58, N. 98) 1533 (ii).
- IRVING, ANDREW MAXWELL, RELIEF B. 129 (Mr. Small): 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1414 (ii).
- MORRISON, CATHERINE, RELIEF B. 130 (Mr. Small): 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1414 (ii).
- PATENTS OF INVENTION ACT AMT. B. 38 (Mr. Corling): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) neg. (Y. 60, N. 93) 1548 (ii).
- RY. ACT AMT. (CONSOLIDATED) B. 24 (Mr. Thompson): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. Lister) neg. on div., 1507; Amt. (Mr. Edgar) to recom., 1508; neg. (Y. 54, N. 98) 1510 (ii).
- RECIPROCITY WITH U. S.: Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 144; Amt. (Mr. Foster) 194; agreed to (Y. 124, N. 67) 646; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 257; neg. (Y. 67, N. 124) 616 (i).
- REPRESENTATION ACT (N.W.T.) AMT. B. 125 (Mr. Thompson): on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. Watson) to recom., neg. (Y. 62, N. 89) 1551 (ii).
- SOUTH-WESTERN RY. Co.'s B. 54 (Mr. Hall): on consdn. of B., Amt. (Mr. Bergin) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 57, N. 86) 953 (ii).
- TUDOR, E. E., RELIEF B. 128 (Mr. Small): 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1413 (ii).
- WRECKED VESSELS AID B. 7 (Mr. Kirkpatrick): 2° m., 770 (i), 917; neg. (Y. 61, N. 84) 921 (ii).
- DIVORCE BILLS: M. (Mr. Small) to suspend Rule 65, 1468 (ii).
- Divorce, Irving, Andrew Maxwell, Relief B. No. 129 (Mr. Small). 1° on div., 1345; 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1414; M. for special Order for Com., 1468; 3° on div., 1522 (ii) (51 Vic., c. 109)
- Divorce, Morrison, Catherine, Relief B. No. 130 (Mr. Small). 1° on div., 1345; 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1414; M. for special Order for Com., 1468; 3° on div., 1422 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 110.)

Divorce, Tudor, Eleonora Eliz., Relief R. No. 128 (Mr. *Small*). 1° on div., 1345; 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 34) 1413; M. for special Order for Com., 1468; 3° on div., 1522 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 111.)

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. *Amyot*). 1°, 18 (i).

Dom. Elections Act (*Chap. 8 Rev. Statutes*) **Amt. B. No. 89** (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 514 (i); 2°, 941; in Com., 944, 1138; 3° m. and Amt. (Mr. *Barron*) 1402; neg. (Y. 59; N. 83) and 3°, 1404 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 11.)

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 131 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 1382; 2° and in Com., 1514; 3°, 1549 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 21.)

DOM. LAND AGENTS' INSTRUCTIONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 36, 45 (i).

DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 1635, 1637 (ii).

DOM. NOTES, CONTRACT FOR PRINTING: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 649 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).

Dom. Plate Glass Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. *Holton*). 1°, 110; 2°, 322 (i); in Com., 946, 978; 3°, 978 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 95.)

DOM. SCRIP ISSUED IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 866 (i).

DORCHESTER ELECTION, DELAY IN ISSUING WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 27, 59 (i).

— **RET. OF MEMBER ELECT:** notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 1021 (i).

DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1569, 1656 (ii).

DRILL PAY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1213 (ii).

DRILL SHED, QUEBEC, WATER SUPPLY COR.: M. for copy (Mr. *Amyot*) 654 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 85 (i).

DUART POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).

DUBLIN AGENCY: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).

DUNCAN, WM. L., KILLED ON I.C.R., PROCEEDINGS OF INQUEST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 498 (i).

DUTIES ON BOOKS, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 899 (ii).

— ON FLOUR, &c. See "FLOUR."

— CORNMEAL, &c.: Res. (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1560 (ii).

— LOGS, &c., AMOUNT COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 86 (i).

DYKE, MR., IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).

Eastern Assurance Co. of Can. incorp. B. No. 22 (Mr. *McDougald*). 1°, 73; 2°, 219; in Com. and 3°, 726 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 96.)

EASTERN EXTENSION RY. AND I. C. R., TENDERS, &c., FOR FENCING: M. for copies* (Mr. *Kirk*) 866 (i).

— **CONSTRUCTION:** in Com. of Sup., 1231 (ii).

— **COR. re RIGHT OF WAY:** M. for Papers (Mr. *Kirk*) 902 (ii).

EASTER HOLIDAYS. See "ADJOURNMENT."

EDWARDS, WM. C., ESQ., M. P. FOR RUSSELL: introduced and took Seat, 1416 (ii).

EIGHT-ISLAND LAKE (N.S.) POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 86 (i).

ELECTIONS:

BEAUBARNOIS CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep., 825 (ii).

BROME CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 753 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 516 (i).

DORCHESTER, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, ISSUES OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 27 (i).

— **DELAY IN ISSUING WRIT:** Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 59 (i).

ELGIN, EAST, CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).

GLENGARRY CONTROVERTED: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 554 (i).

HALDIMAND ELECTION, CASE OF WALTER JONES: AMT. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1524; neg. (Y. 58, N. 98) 1533 (ii).

KENT, ONT., CONTROVERTED: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to ref. Judge's Rep. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 18 (i).

— **Adjnd. deb. resmd.** 20 (i).

— **M. (Mr. Weldon, Albert)** to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 380 (i).

— **ISSUE OF WRIT:** remarks (Mr. *Mills*) 270, 380, 494 (i).

— **PRINTING OF PAPERS:** Ques. (Mr. *Girouard*) 309 (i).

L'ASSOMPTION CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 73 (i).

— **ISSUE OF WRIT:** Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 110 (i).

MISSISSQUOI CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).

QUEBEC COUNTY, CONTROVERTED: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).

QUEBEC, WEST, CONTROVERTED: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).

RUSSELL CONTROVERTED: M. (Mr. *Laurier*) for Speaker to issue Writ, 416 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 455, 516, 525 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 554 (i).

SHEFFORD CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).

STANBRED CONTROVERTED: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 514 (i).

VOTERS LISTS, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 27 (i).

— **SUSPENSION OF REVISION:** Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 965 (ii).

ELECTIONS, CONTROVERTED, 1, 18, 73, 309 (i). 825 (ii).

Electoral Franchise Act. See "FRANCHISE."

ELECTRIC LIGHT, MONTREAL POST OFFICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 1625 (ii).

ELECTORAL VOTING LISTS, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 27 (i).

ELGIN, EAST, CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).

ELGIN, PETITCODIAC AND HAVELOOK RY. CO.'S (N.B.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com. 1593 (ii).

ELLIS, MR. J. V., M. P., AND ANNEXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 41 (i).

Emerson and North-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 85 (Mr. *Watson*). 1°, 4c9; 2°, 612 (i); w'hdd., 1585 (ii).

EMPEROR OF GERMANY. See "GERMANY."

Engineers, Examination and Licensing Provision B. No. 103 (Mr. *Cook*). 1°, 8c9 (ii).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (Ferry) B. No. 35 (Mr. *Baker*). 1°, 124; 2°, 220; in Com. and 3°, 498 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 89.)

- ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK**: in Com. of Sup., 1632, 1653 (ii).
- ESTIMATES, THE**: Mess. from His Ex., 50 (i).
- SUPPL., 1887-88: Mess. from His Ex., 962 (ii).
- SUPPL., 1888-89: Mess. from His Ex., 1403 (ii).
- EVEREST, GEO. M., DISMISSAL**: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 712 (i).
- EXOISE**: in Com. of Sup., 1618, 1667 (ii).
- EXPERIMENTAL FARMS**: in Com. of Sup., 1574 (ii).
- MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 495 (i).
- N. W. T., LOCATION, PAPERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 866 (i).
- PROF. SAUNDERS' REP.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).
- EXPORTS AND IMPORTS**: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 28 (i).
- FABRE, ME, SALARY, &c.**: in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).
- FARMERS, FRAUDULENT PRACTICES ON**: M. (Mr. *Brown*) for Sp. Com., 1244 (ii).
- M. (Mr. *Brown*) to empower Com. to examine witnesses on Oath, 1582 (ii).
- FARMS**. See "EXPERIMENTAL."
- FARRAN'S POINT NAVIGATION**: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
- Federal Bank of Canada B. No. 51** (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1^o*, 270; 2^o*, 497; in Com. and 3^o*, 726 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- FENELON RIVER NAVIGATION, DEPTH OF WATER**: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 97 (i).
- FENIAN RAID, PENSIONS ON ACCOUNT OF**: in Com. of Sup., 1201, 1639 (ii).
- FERGUSON, J., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR SOUTH RENFREW**: introduced, 1 (i).
- Ferries Act (Chap. 97, Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 39** (Mr. *Costigan*). 1^o, 124 (i); 2^o*, and in Com., 895; 3^o*, 896 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 23.)
- FIELD EXERCISES, FRENCH TRANSLATION, COR.**: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 655 (i).
- FINANCE**:
- AUDITOR GENERAL, APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS**: presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 18 (i).
- INCREASE OF SALARY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 498 (i).
- OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 96 (i).
- AUDITOR AND RECEIVER GENERAL (WINNIPEG)**: in Com. of Sup., 88 (i).
- CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT**: in Com. of Sup., 88 (i).
- CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES**: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 38 (i).
- DOM. NOTES, PRINTING**: in Com. of Sup., 89 (i).
- CONTRACT FOR PRINTING: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 649 (i).
- ESTIMATES, THE**: Mess. from His Ex., 50 (i).
- SUPPL., 1887-8: Mess. from His Ex., 962 (ii).
- SUPPL., 1888-9: Mess. from His Ex., 1403 (ii).
- FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD**: in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).
- GOLD, REDEMPTION OF LEGAL TENDER NOTES**: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 171 (i).
- MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION, AMOUNT ADVANCED**: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 135 (ii).
- QUEBEC HARBOR COMMISSIONERS (LEVIS GRAVING DOCK) AMOUNT ADVANCED**: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1136 (ii).
- PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**: presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 18 (i).
- RECEIVER GENERAL (HALIFAX)**: in Com. of Sup., 83 (i).
- Fisheries and Fishing, further Provision B. No. 58** (Mr. *Kirk*). 1^o, 309 (i).
- FISHERIES**:
- BEHRING'S SEA FISHERIES**: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 778 (i).
- BOUNTY CHECKS, DISTRIBUTION**: Ques. (Mr. *Flynn*) 825 (ii).
- DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 1603 (ii).
- CANADIAN FISHING VESSELS, REPORTING, &c.**: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 24.
- CAP CHAT AND GRAND VALLÉE FISHERIES, REPS.**: M. for copies (Mr. *Joncas*) 1232 (ii).
- COMMISSION (WASHINGTON) EXPENSES**: in Com. of Sup., 1662 (ii).
- DATE OF PROPOSAL *re* TRADE MATTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 112 (i).
- GOVT. POLICY RESPECTING**: Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1433 (ii).
- HUDSON BAY WHALE FISHERIES**: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826 (ii).
- LOBSTER FISHERIES**: Remarks (Mr. *Kirk*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1561 (ii).
- COMMISSION, REPS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Flynn*) 86 (i).
- QUES. (Mr. *Davies*) 139 (i).
- PROTECTION, APPOINTMENT OF MAGISTRATES**: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826.
- Remarks on Adjunt., 1403 (ii).
- COR. RESPECTING: M. for copies* (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 866.
- STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 1603 (ii).
- SALMON AND WHALE FISHERIES OF HUDSON BAY**: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826 (ii).
- FISHERIES TREATY, PAPERS RESPECTING**: Remarks, 20, 62, 74 (i).
- Message from His Ex.: presented, 86 (i).
- Papers laid on Table (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 110 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 646 (i) 1506 (ii).
- Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 93 (i).
- OMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 141 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) 238 (i) 270 (i).
- Fisheries Treaty Ratification B. No. 65** (Sir *Charles Tupper*). 1^o, 380; 2^o m., 673; deb. adjd., 711; resmd., 779 (i), 883; 2^o, 865; in Com., 867; 3^o*, 889 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- Deb. on M. for 2^o (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 673 (i); (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 693; (Mr. *Thompson*) 704; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 779; (Mr. *Kenny*) 786; (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 788; (Gen. *Laurie*) 790; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 793; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 796; (Mr. *Foster*) 813; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 820 (i); (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 833; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 841; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 844; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 849; (Mr. *Laurier*) 861; (Mr. *Joncas*) 854; (Mr. *Ellis*) 857; (Mr. *Landry*) 860; (Mr. *Edgar*) 861; (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 864 (ii).
- FISHING VESSELS**. See "CANADIAN."
- FLOODS**. See "ST. LAWRENCE RIVER."
- Forfeitures for Treason, &c.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- FLOUR, CORNMEAL, &c., DUTIES**: Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) to M. for Com. of Sup., neg. (Y. 44, N. 89) 1560 (ii).
- FORTIN, HON. MR., SESSIONAL INDEMNITY**: in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
- FORTIN, NOEL, COR. re. ACCIDENT AND DAMAGES**: M. for copy (Mr. *Fiset*) 902 (ii).
- FORT MCLEOD AND PINOCHER CREEK MAIL SERVICE**: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 712 (i).
- FRANCHISE ACT**: in Com. of Sup., 1641 (ii).
- Franchise, Electoral, Act (Chap. 5 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 117** (Mr. *Chapleau*). 1^o, 1062; 2^o, 1549; in Com., 1553; 3^o m., 1586; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to recom., neg. (Y. 53, N. 71) and 3^o*, 1587 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- FRASER, MR. JUSTICE, AND WESTMOBELAND ELECTION**: Remarks, in Com., of Sup., 115 (i).

Fraud by Tree Peddlers, &c. See "PEDDLERS."
Fraudulent Marks on Merchandise. See "CRIMINAL LAW."
FREE LIST AND U. S. TARIFF, REP. OF MIN. OF CUSTOMS:
 Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 647 (i).
 ——— O. C. PLACING CERTAIN ARTICLES ON: Remarks (Mr. Mulock) 649 (i).
FREIGHT RATES: in Com. of Sup., 1630 (ii).
Gambling in Stocks, &c. See "CRIMINAL LAW."
GAUTHIER, JOSEPH, ESQ., M.P. FOR L'ASSOMPTION: introduced, 882 (ii).
GAUVREAU, DR. EDMOND, GRANT FOR PREPARING VACCINE:
 Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 140 (i).
GENERAL BANKING ACT AMT.: Ques. (Mr. Innes) 19 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1604 (ii)
 ——— OTTAWA COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).
GERMANY, DEATH OF EMPEROR: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 110 (i).
GERMANY, CROWN PRINCE'S RUMORED DEATH: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 206 (i).
GLASGOW IMMIGRATION AGENCY: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).
GLENGARY ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. Speaker) 554 (i).
GOLD, REDEMPTION OF LEGAL TENDER NOTES: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 171 (i).
GORDON, COMMANDER, COR. re FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE: M. for copies* (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 866 (i).
GOVT. BUSINESS. See "BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE."
GOVT. MEASURES: Remarks (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 138 (i).
GOVT. OF N.W.T., EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).
GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1577 (ii).
 ——— SALARIES OF CAPTAINS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Welsh) 37
GOV. GEN.'S SECRETARY: Letter from, 1195 (ii).
 ——— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 85 (i).
GOWANLOCK, MRS., CLAIM: Remarks (Mr. Rykert) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1015 (ii).
 ——— PENSION: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 58 (i).
GRAND RIVER BRIDGES, HALDIMAND: in Com. of Sup., 1675.
G. T. R. Co.'s B. No. 36 (Mr. Curran). 1^o*, 124; 2^o*, 220; in Com., 496; 3^o*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 58.)
G. T. R. confirmation of Agreements B. No. 26 (Mr. Small). 1^o*, 85; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 647 (i). (51 Vic., c. 59.)
G. T. R. CROSSING IN TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. Denison) 59 (i).
 ——— DOUBLE TRACK, GOVT. ASSISTANCE: Ques. (Mr. Girouard) 1432 (ii).
GRAZING LANDS LEASES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Davis) 866 (i).
 ——— Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 495 (i)
GREAT BRITAIN AND COLONIES. See "TRADE RELATIONS."
Great North-West Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 25 (Mr. Daly). 1^o*, 85; 2^o m., 128; 2^o*, 220; in Com. and 3^o*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 85.)
 ——— APPLICANTS FOR CHARTER: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 141.
 ——— PAPERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Edgar) 653 (i).

Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 18 (Mr. Ferguson, Wel'and). 1^o*, 73; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 392 (i). (51 Vic., c. 56.)
GREENWAY AND MARTIN, MESSRS, VISIT re DISALLOWANCE:
 Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) 110 (i).
GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).
Grenville International Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 62 (Mr. Shanly). 1^o*, 380; 2^o*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 954 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 90.)
GRENFELL (N. W. T.) EXPERIMENTAL FARM LOCATION, PAPERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Landerkin) 866 (i).
GROSSE ISLE, &c., QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 1196 (ii).
GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE FISHERIES PROTECTION: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 826 (ii).
HADLOW COVE PIER EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 140 (i).
HALDIMAND, DEPUTY RETURNING OFFICER, AND LATE ELECTION: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 922 (ii).
 Deb on M for adjmt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 923; (Mr. Thompson) 924; (Mr. Laurier) 925; (Sir John A. Macdonald) 929; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 927; (Mr. McNeill) 928; (Mr. Desjardins) 928; (Mr. Madill) 928; (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 928; (Mr. Freeman) 929; (Mr. Thompson) 930; (Mr. Edgar) 930; (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 930; (Sir Richard Cartwright) 930; M. withdn., 931 (ii).
 ——— Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 648 (i).
 ——— CASE OF WALTER JONES: Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1524; neg. (Y. 53, N. 98) 1533 (ii).
 ——— RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
HALF-BREEDS CLAIMS COMMISSION, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1666 (ii).
HALIFAX AND ST. JOHN via YARMOUTH AND PORT MILDWAY MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
HALIFAX COTTON Co.'s (N.S.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546; in Com., 1593 (ii).
HALTON, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
"HANSAARD." See "DEBATES."
HARBORS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1462, 1561, 1655, 1673 (ii).
HARBOR COMMISSIONERS. See "MONTREAL" AND "QUEBEC."
HASTINGS, WEST, ELECTORAL DISTRICT: notification of Vacancy (Mr. Speaker) 85 (i).
 ——— Ret. of Member Elect, 238 (i).
HAWKE, J. T., CASE OF: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Davies P.E.I.) 1299 (ii).
 Deb. on M for adjmt. (Mr. Thompson) 1307; (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 1318; (Mr. Weldon, Albert) 1322; (Mr. Lister) 1324; (Mr. Davin) 1326; (Mr. Mitchell) 1327; (Mr. Casey) 1329; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1329 (ii).
HAY DUTIES, REFUND BY U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Laverigne) 712.
HEALTH STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1154 (ii).
HEATING AND ELECTRICITY IN CARS, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 1227 (ii).
HENDERSON, D., MEMBER ELECT FOR HALTON: introduced, 2 (i).
Hereford Branch Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 33 (Mr. Hall). 1^o*, 110; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 498 (i). (51 Vic., c. 81.)

- HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE** : in Com. of Sup., 105 (i), 1158, 1165 (ii).
- High Commissioner's Office (application of C. S. Act, Chap. 16 Rev. Statutes) Act Amt. B. No. 136** (Sir Charles Tupper). Res. prop., 1502; conc. in and 1°*, 2°* and in Com., 1505; 3° m., 1506; 3°, 1547 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 13.)
- HODGSON, SIR ROBT., PENSION (PAYMENT TO GOVT. OF P.E.I.)** : in Com. of Sup., 1671 (ii).
- HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS, MAN. AND N.W.T.** : M. for Ret. (Mr. Watson) 71 (i); (Mr. McMullen*) 866 (ii).
- HORSE-BREEDING IN CANADA, PAMPHLET, TRANSLATION** : Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 85 (i).
- HOT SPRINGS, BANFF, ROADS, BRIDGES, &C.** : in Com. of Sup., 1617, 1666 (ii).
- HOUSE OF COMMONS** :
- ADDRESS (FAREWELL) TO HIS EX.** : Mess. from the Senate, 1561; conc. in, 1585; presented, 1691 (ii).
- ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH** : moved (Mr. Montague) 2; sec. (Mr. Joncas) 7; agreed to, 17; His Ex.'s Reply, 172 (i).
- BILLS ASSENTED TO**, 1196, 1692 (ii).
- CLAYES, MR., LATE M.P.** : Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 62 (i).
- CHOQUETTE, MR., M.P., PETITION AGAINST RETURN** : Objection (Mr. Laurier) 1332, 1468 (ii).
- CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY** : in Com. of Sup., 90, 95 (i).
- CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS, LIST, IV (after title vol. i.)**
- CONVERTED ELECTIONS.** See "ELECTIONS."
- COURSOL, MR., INDEMNITY** : in Com. of Sup., 1670 (ii).
- DEBATES COM.** See "COMMITTEES" and "DEBATES."
- ELLIS, MR. J. V., M.P., AND ANNEXATION** : Ques. (Mr. Guillet) 44 (i)
- GOVERNMENT, LIST OF MEMBERS, III (after title vol. i.)**
- GOV. GEN'L'S SECRETARY** : Letter from, 1195 (ii).
- INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION** : Appointment by Mess., 27 (i).
- LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.** See general heading.
- MEMBERS INDEMNITY** : M. (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 1681 (ii).
— Remarks (Mr. Trow) 1586 (ii).
- MEMBERS INTRODUCED**, 1, 18, 25, 270, 390, 665 (i); 882, 1416, 1548.
- MESSAGES FROM HIS EX.**, 24, 27, 50, 86, 172 (i); 982, 1231, 1403 (ii).
- NEW MEMBERS**, 1, 238, 309, 646 (i); 836, 1414, 1544 (ii)
- OPENING OF PARLIAMENT**, 1 (i).
- PAIRS DURING SESSION, LIST, VII (after title vol. i.)**
- PRIVATE BILLS, PETITIONS, EXTENSION OF TIME** : M. (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 50 (i).
— **REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE** : M. (Sir Hector Langevin) to extend time, 514 (i), 1031 (ii).
- PROVOCATION, NOTIFICATION OF** (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1625, 1693 (ii).
— (Mr. Speaker) 1686 (ii); Mess. from His Ex., by Black Rod, 1692 (ii).
- ROBERTSON, ALEX., LATE M.P.** : Remarks (Sir Hector Langevin) 1 (i).
- SALARIES, &C.** : in Com. of Sup., 1025, 1668 (ii).
- SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.** See "COMMITTEES."
- SENATE, SUMMONED TO BY MESS.** : 1 (i), 1196, 1692 (ii).
- SESSIONAL CLERKS, NUMBER AND AMOUNTS PAID** : Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 1299 (ii).
— in Com. of Sup., 1025, 1668 (ii).
- SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE**, 2 (i), 1693 (ii).
- VACANCIES, NOTIFICATION** (Mr. Speaker) 1, 85, 124 (i)
- VENTILATION OF HOUSE** : Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 171 (i).
- WHITE, HON. THOMAS, DEGRASS OF** : Remarks (Sir Hector Langevin) 962 (ii).
- [See "ELECTIONS."]
- HUDSON BAY SALMON FISHERIES** : Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 826 (ii).
- **WHALE FISHERIES** : Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 826 (ii).
- ICE BREAKERS, COUNTY OF BERTHIER** : Ques. (Mr. Beausoleil) 45 (i).
- IMMIGRATION** : in Com. of Sup., 1155; conc. 1686 (ii).
— See "AGRICULTURE," &C.
- IMPERIAL FEDERATION.** See "TRADE RELATIONS."
- IMPORTS AND EXPORTS** : M. for Ret. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 28 (i).
- Indian Act (Chap. 43 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 106** (Mr. White, Cardwell). 1°, 922; 2° (Mr. Thompson) and in Com., 1907; 3°*, 1011 (i.) (51 Vic., c. 22.)
- INDIANS** :
- BRANT AND HALDIMAND, DOCTOR ON RESERVE** : Ques. (Mr. Landerkin) 647 (i).
- BRENTON HALF-BREEDS** : Remarks (Mr. Edgar) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1514 (ii).
- CAUGHNAWAGA, ELECTION OF CHIEFS** : M. (Mr. Doyon) for copies of Cor., 899 (ii).
— **RESERVE** : Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 1680 (ii).
— **SURVEY** : Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 495 (i).
- CAYUGA INDIAN LANDS COMMISSIONERS** : Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 27 (i).
- CHIPPAWA AND OTTAWA NATION INDIANS' CLAIMS** : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 498 (i).
- HALF BREEDS CLAIMS COMMISSION, EXPENSES** : in Com. of Sup., 1666 (ii).
- IN COM. OF SUP.**, 1605; Dept., 1637 (ii).
- MISSISSAUGA INDIANS, CLAIMS TO UNCEDED LANDS, COR.** : M. for copy* (Mr. Madill) 366 (i).
- MOHAWK INDIANS, COR. re DISMISSAL OF COUNCILLOR OULBERTSON** : M. for copies (Mr. Burdett) 977 (ii).
- MOULIN, REV. FATHER, COR. re RESERVE AT BATOCHÉ** : M. for copy (Mr. Searth) 866 (ii).
- PRACE RIVER AND ATHABASCA INDIAN TREATIES** : Ques. (Mr. Barron) 825 (ii)
- SIX NATION INDIANS, CLAIM FOR FLOODING LANDS, COR.** : M. for copies* (Mr. Somerville) 672 (i).
- STONE POINT AND KETTLE RESERVES, COMPLAINT AGAINST INDIANS** : M. for copies* (Mr. Lister) 1259 (ii).
- SUPPLIES, CONTRACTS FOR FURNISHING** : Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) in Com. of Sup., 94 (i).
- [See "SUPPLY," &C.]
- INDIANTOWN BRANCH, I.C.R.** : in Com. of Sup., 1646 (ii).
- INDEMNITIES.** See "MEMBERS"
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS, INDIAN** : in Com. of Sup., 1681 (ii).
- INGOLDSBY STATION, POST OFFICE, PETITION, &C.** : M. for Ret. (Mr. Barron) 1243 (ii).
- INLAND REVENUE.** See "CUSTOMS AND EXCISE"
- Inland Revenue Act (Chap. 34 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 122** (Mr. Costigan). 1°, 1137; 2°* and in Com., 1401; 3°*, 1402 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 16.)
- Insurance Act (Chap. 124 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 126** (Sir Charles Tupper). 1°, 1332; 2°, 1400; M. for Com., 1416; in Com., 1417; 3°*, 1433 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 28.)
- INSURANCE COMPANIES, ABSTRACT** : presented (Sir Charles Tupper) 1207 (ii).
- INSURANCE, FIRE RISKS, PETITIONS, &C.** : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bowman) 866 (ii).
- INSURANCE, GENERAL VOTE** : in Com., of Sup., 1604 (ii).

INSOLVENCY, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 495 (i).

INSTRUCTIONS TO DOM. LAND AGENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 36, 45 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:

CAPITAL ACCOUNT, AMOUNT CHARGED: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 59 (i).

— EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 103 (i).

CASUALTIES, &c., AND OFFICIALS DISMISSED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 61 (i).

FORTIN, NOEL, COR. *re* ACCIDENT AND DAMAGES: M. for copy (Mr. *Fiset*) 902 (ii).

FREIGHT RATES: in Com. of Sup., 1850 (ii).

HEATING AND ELECTRICITY IN CARS: in Com. of Sup., 1227 (ii).

INDIANTOWN BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 1646 (ii).

DALHOUSIE BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 1226 (ii).

DUNCAN, WM. L., KILLED ON I.O.R., PROCEEDINGS AT INQUEST: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 498 (i).

MACCAN STATION, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1225 (ii).

MATANE, SUBSIDY TO BRANCH LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1199 (ii).

MONCTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).

PICTOU TOWN BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 1226, 1645 (ii).

PION & CO., CLAIM FOR GOODS DAMAGED: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1092 (ii).

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 27 (i).

— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 65, 112 (i).

ROLLING STOCK, PURCHASE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 61 (i).
— in Com. of Sup., 1645 (ii).

ST. CHARLES BRANCH, EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 97 (i).

— in Com. of Sup., 1225, 1645 (ii).

ST. JOHN, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1224 (ii).

SALE TO SYNDICATE: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) in Com. of Sup., 1621 (ii).

SNOW SHEDS: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (ii).

SPRING HILL, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1225 (ii).

WORKING EXPENSES AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1620, 1650, 1688 (ii).

Interest (Chap. 127 *Rev. Statutes*) Act Amt. B. No. 12 (Mr. *Landry*) 1^o*, 62 (i).

INTERIOR:

ALASKA AND B. C. BOUNDARY COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 495 (i).
— Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 171 (i)

BOUNDARIES OF ONT.: Remarks (Mr. *Dawson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1629 (ii).

COLONISATION CO.'S IN MAN AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).

— INSPECTOR IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 866 (ii).

— MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Watson*) 71 (i).

DOM. LAND AGENTS' INSTRUCTIONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 36, 45 (ii).

DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 1635, 1637 (ii).

DOM. SCRIP ISSUED IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 866 (i).

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 1604 (ii).

— OTTAWA COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Wright*) 495 (i).

GOVT. OF N.W.T. EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).

GRAZING LANDS, LEASES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davis*) 866 (i).

— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 495 (i).

HALF-BREEDS' CLAIMS COMMISSION, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).

HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Watson*) 71 (i); (Mr. *McMullen*) 866 (ii).

INTERIOR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 93 (i).

INTERIOR DEPT. REP.: presented (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 18 (i).

LAND SALES IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 44 (i).

LEASEHOLDERS IN ALBERTA DISTRICT, N.W.T., CATTLE, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 498 (i).

INTERIOR—Continued.

LEASES, OLD UNOCCUPIED LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 825 (ii).

LEGISLATION FOR N. W. T.: Mess. from His Ex., 1231 (ii).

MOUNTED POLICE, COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 1612.

— HEADQUARTERS, EDMONTON: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 965 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 93 (i), 1610, 1658, 1683 (ii).

— REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 499 (i).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: in Com. of Sup., 1655, 1672 (ii).

RANCHES, DUTIES OF INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 965 (ii).

REBELLION IN N. W. T., REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: presented (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 97 (i).

— LOSSES COMMISSION, REPS., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 73 (i).

SCRIP ISSUED IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 866 (ii).

SQUATTERS CLAIM IN N. W. T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 856 (i).

SURVEY (GEOLOGICAL) OTTAWA COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. *Wright*) 495 (i).

YOUNG, CAPT., COR., &c., RESPECTING CLAIM: M. for copy* (Mr. *Scarth*) 866 (i).

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: appointment by Mess., 27.

International Convention for Preservation of Submarine Cables B. No 98 (Mr. *Thompson*).

1^o*, 726 (i); 2^o*, 942; in Com. and 3^o*, 944 (ii).
(51 *Vic., c. 31.*)

INTERNATIONAL REGULATIONS *re* TRADING VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826 (ii).

INTOXICATING LIQUORS, ANALYSIS UNDER FOOD ADULTERATION ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Cnrran*) 965 (ii).

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1232 (ii).

Irving, Andrew Maxwell. See "DIVORCE."

ISBESTER AND REID'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1067.

— Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Victoria*) 1299 (ii).

ISLE-AU-NOIX WHARF EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 965 (ii).

JACKSON, COL.: in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).

JAMAICA. See "WEST INDIES."

JOHNSON, GEO.: in Com. of Sup., 1664 (ii).

JONES, H. L., Esq., MEMBER ELECT FOR DIGBY: introduced, 2 (ii).

JONES, WALTER, APPOINTMENT: Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1524 (ii).

JUDGES OF SUPERIOR COURT RETIRED, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Small*) 62 (i).

JUDGES' SALARIES (ONT.) INCREASE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 899 (ii).

Judges' Salaries. See "PROVINCIAL COURTS."

JUDICIARY, QUEBEC: conc., 1685 (ii).

JURY, MR., AND PAUPER IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 1597 (ii).

JUSTICE:

COLLISIONS ON THE HIGH SEAS, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826.

COURT OF APPEAL QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 647 (i).

COUNTY COURT JUDGES (B. C.) ADDITIONAL: Ques. (Mr. *Mora*) 66 (i).

— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).

— ONTARIO, SALARIES: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 899 (ii).

CRIMINAL LAWS, DISTRIBUTION TO JUSTICES: Ques. (Mr. *Bernier*) 59.

— DISTRIBUTION TO MEMBERS: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 86 (i).

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1151 (ii).

"DAVID J. ADAMS," COST OF LITIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).

FRASER, MR. JUSTICE, WESTMORELAND ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 115 (i).

JUSTICE—Continued.

HAWK, J. T., CASE OF: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1299 (ii).
 JUSTICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).
 INSOLVENCY, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 495 (i).
 LIBEL LAW, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Innes*) 141 (i).
 MONTREAL DISTRICT, SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 647 (i).
 MUSKOKA AND PARRY SOUND JUDICIAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1232 (ii).
 PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 91 (i), 1021 (ii).
 ——— REP.: presented (Mr. *Thompson*) 18 (i).
 PRESBOTT AND RUSSELL JUDICIAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Labrosse*) 27.
 QUEBEC JUDICIARY: conc., 1685 (ii).
 SAILORS' PROTECTION, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 966 (ii).
 SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES RETIRED, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Small*) 62 (i).
 TRADE UNIONS, COPIES OF RULES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 46 (i).
 ——— REGULATIONS re REGISTRY, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 50 (i).
 ——— UNDER 35 VIC., CAP. 30, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Amyot*) 50.
 TRAVIS, EX-JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 114 (i).
 STENOGRAPHER, SUPREME COURT: in Com. of Sup., 119 (i).
 [See "CRIMINAL LAW."]
 KAMLOOPS AS AN OUTPOST OF ENTRY, MR. PARMELEE'S REP.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Mara*) 498 (i).
 KENT (N.B.) NORTHERN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1593 (ii).
 KENT (ONT) CONTROVERTED ELECTION: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) to ref. Judge's Rep. to Com. on Priv. and Elec., 18; adjd. deb. resmd., 20 (i).
 ——— ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 270, 380, 494 (i).
 ——— notification of Return of Member (Mr. *Speaker*) 1544 (ii).
 ——— PRINTING OF PAPERS: Ques. (Mr. *Girouard*) 309 (i).
 ——— M. (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Priv. and Elec., 380 (i).
 KETTLE AND STONEY POINT RESERVES, COMPLAINTS AGAINST INDIANS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 1259 (i).
 Keystone Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 78 (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*). 1^o*, 459; 2^o*, 498 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 978 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 97.*)
 Kincardine and Teeswater Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 74 (Mr. *Rowand*). 1^o*, 454; 2^o*, 493; in Com. and 3^o*, 7.6 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 77.*)
 Kincardine Harbor Tolls authorisation B. No. 30 (Mr. *Rowand*). 1^o*, 97; 2^o, 220 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 1049 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 104.*)
 KING, JAMES, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: M. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) for Sel. Com., 865 (ii).
 ——— M. to substitute name on Com. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1245 (ii).
 KINGSTON, DEP. POSTMASTER'S IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 899 (ii).
 ——— GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1671 (ii).
 ——— PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).
 ——— POST OFFICE DEFALCATIONS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright, &c*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1012 (ii).
 ——— Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1017 (ii).

KIT ALLOWANCE, YORK-SIMCOE BATT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 66 (i).
 KNIGHT, JNO. AND ALLAN, COB. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 866 (ii).
 KNIGHTS OF LABOUR. See "JURY, MR."
 La Banque Nationale, Capital Stock Reduction B. No. 23 (Mr. *Bryson*). 1^o*, 73; 2^o*, 123; in Com. and 3^o*, 726 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 48.*)
 LABOR COMMISSION, CERTIFIED COPIES OF DEPOSITIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 171 (i).
 ——— COMPLAINTS AGAINST CHAIRMAN: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 171 (i).
 ——— COST: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 494 (i).
 ——— INSTRUCTIONS, &c: M. for copies* (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 672 (i).
 ——— NUMBER AND SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1468 (ii).
 ——— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 98 (i).
 LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL OF LABORERS: in Com. of Sup., 1170, 1563, 1647 (ii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1452 (ii).
 ——— WATER POWER, ROYAL COMMISSION: Rep. presented (Mr. *Pope*) 52 (i).
 LAKEFIELD AND BALSAM LAKE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).
 Lake Nipissing and James' Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 37 (Mr. *Cockburn*). 1^o*, 124; 2^o*, 220; in Com. and 3^o*, 498 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 80.*)
 LAKES HURON AND SUPERIOR MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
 LAKE ST. LOUIS: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
 LAKE ST PETER IMPROVEMENT, EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 71 (i).
 LAKES SUPERIOR AND HURON SURVEYS: conc., 1689 (ii).
 LAND AGENTS INSTRUCTIONS IN MAN AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 36, 45 (i).
 LAND SALES IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 44 (i).
 LAND VILLA POST OFFICE, PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Choquette*) 102 (i).
 LARD, RENDERED, MANUFACTURE AND SALE: prop. Res. (Mr. *Taylor*) 59 (i).
 L'ASSOMPTION CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 73 (i).
 ——— ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 110 (i).
 LAURIE, GEN. J. W.: introduced, 18 (i).
 LEAF TOBACCO. See "TOBACCO."
 LEASEHOLDERS IN ALBERTA DISTRICT, N.W.T., CATTLE, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 498 (i).
 LEASES (GRAZING) N.W.T.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 495 (i).
 ——— OLD UNOCCUPIED LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 825 (ii).
 LEDUC, CHAS., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Dessaint*) 140 (i).
 LEGAL TENDER AND GOLD: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 171 (i).

LEGER, CAPT., REP. *re* ST. LAWRENCE RIVER FLOODS: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 899 (ii).

LEGISLATION FOR N.W.T.: Mess. from His Ex., 1231 (ii).

LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).

Letters Patent, Defective, &c., B. No. 4 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 44; 2°, 761 (i); in Com. and 3°, 916 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 36.)

LEVI, DAVID, SEIZURE OF DIAMONDS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1092 (ii).

LEVIS GRAVING DOCK. See "QUEBEC HARBOR COMMISSIONERS."

LIBEL LAW, LEGISLATION: Ques (Mr. *Innes*) 141 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, REP. OF JOINT LIBRARIANS: presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

—— PRINTING AMERICAN CATALOGUE: in Com. of Sup., 1630 (ii).

—— WORKS ON AMERICA: in Com. of Sup., 1030 (ii).

—— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 1030, 1638 (ii).

Licensing Engineers. See "ENGINEERS."

LIFE-SAVING AND LIFE-BOAT SERVICE: Remarks, 1577 (ii).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1581 (ii).

LITIGATION (COST) *re* "DAVID J. ADAMS": in Com. of Sup., 1656 (ii).

LIVERPOOL IMMIGRATION AGENCY: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).

LIVES LOST THROUGH WRECKS ON GREAT LAKES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 19 (i).

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, TOTAL AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 498 (i).

Loan for Public Service, authorisation B. No 133 (Sir *Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 1136; M. for Com., 1259; in Com., 1278; 1°* and 2°* of B, 1387; in Com. and 3°*, 1388 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 2)

LOBSTER COMMISSION, REPS., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Flynn*) 86 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 139 (i).

—— FISHERIES: Remarks (Mr. *Kirk &c.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1551 (ii).

LOGS, SHINGLE BOLTS, &c., DUTIES COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 86 (i).

London and Port Stanley Ry. Co. See B. 26.

London and South-Eastern Ry. Co. and Can. Southern (confirmation of Agreement) B. No. 77 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 85; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 647. (51 *Vic.*, c. 60.)

LONDON (ENG) IMMIGRATION AGENCY: in Com. of Sup., 1166 (ii).

LONDON *Free Press*, PAYMENTS TO: in Com. of Sup., 1160.

LOTBINIÈRE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 98 (i).

LOVITT, J., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR YARMOUTH: introduced, 2 (i).

MACCAN STATION, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1225 (ii).

MCCUAIG, A. F., APPOINTMENT AND SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 1432.

MACDONALD, GEO. J., PAPERS, &c., *re* CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION: M. for copies* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 866 (ii).

McDONALD, JOHN A., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR VICTORIA (N. S.): introduced, 2 (i).

MOEACHRAN, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 1200 (ii).

MOLELAN, HON. A. W., MEMBER ELECT FOR COLCHESTER: introduced, 1 (i).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).

MAIL SERVICE IN P.E.I.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 47, 52 (i).

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).

Manitoba, application of certain Laws B. No. 41 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 139 (i); 2°*, 941; in Com. and 3°*, 1402 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 33.)

Manitoba and North-Western Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 46 (Mr. *Scarth*). 1°*, 238; 2°*, 497; in Com., 612 (i); recom. and 3°*, 953 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 86.)

MANITOBA:

AUDITOR AND RECEIVER GENERAL, WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 88.

COLONISATION Co.'s IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).

DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. RY. CHARTERS, COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Laurier*) 672 (i).

—— PAPERS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1136 (ii)

EXPERIMENTAL FARM: QUES. (Mr. *Watson*) 495 (i)

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY., APPLICANTS FOR CHARTER: QUES. (Mr. *Edgar*) 141 (i).

—— PAPERS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Edgar*) 653 (i).

GREENWAY AND MARTIN, MESSRS., VISIT *re* DISALLOWANCE: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 110 (i).

HOMESTEAD AND COLONISATION INSPECTORS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Watson*) 71 (i); (Mr. *McMullen**) 868 (ii).

IMMIGRANTS FROM DAKOTA FOR MAN., PAYMENTS TO: QUES. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 495 (i).

INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 1507, 1681 (ii)

LAND AGENTS INSTRUCTIONS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 36, 45 (i).

MAN. AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO., PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 653 (i).

PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 1021; conc., 1686 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1542 (ii).

RAILWAY LEGISLATION, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Watson*) 1403 (ii).

SCRIP ISSUED IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 866 (i).

SOURIS AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN RY. CO., PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 653 (i).

[See DEPARTMENTS, "N.W.T.," &c.]

MARINE:

"ALBERT," COR. RESPECTING CONDITION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Welsh*) 827 (i).

ALLEN, WARREN, CLAIM FOR ICE-BOAT: M. for Papers, Ret., &c. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 833 (i).

ATLANTIC OCEAN, OBSTRUCTIONS TO SHIPPING: Ques. (Gen. *Laurie*) 1433 (ii).

BEHRING'S SEA, NAVIGATION BY CANADIAN VESSELS: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 44 (i).

—— SEIZURES, COR. RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gordon*) 966.

BUOYS IN RIVER SAQUEMAY: QUES. (Mr. *Oouture*) 1433 (ii).

OAN. WRECKING VESSELS IN U. S. WATERS: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Edgar*) 665 (i).

COLLISIONS OF THE HIGH SEAS, LEGISLATION: QUES. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826.

LITIGATION (COST) *re* "DAVID J. ADAMS": in Com. of Sup., 1656.

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 1577.

MARINE—Continued.

- GOVT. STEAMERS, SALARIES OF CAPTAINS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Walsk*) 37.
 INTERNATIONAL REGULATION *re* TRADING VESSELS : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826 (ii).
 LIFE-SAVING AND LIFE-BOAT SERVICE : Remarks, 1577 (ii)
 LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 1581 (ii).
 MARINE AND FISHERIES REP. : presented (Mr. *Foster*) 138 (i).
 MONTREAL AND QUEBEC RIVER POLICE : in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
 P.E.I. NAVIGATION AT NAUFRAGE, REP. OF ENGINEER : M. for copy (Mr. *McIntyre*) 70 (i).
 "NORTHERN LIGHT." See general heading.
 NORTH SWIDNEY PILOTAGE RETURNS, UNDER ACT OF 1873 : Ques. (Mr. *Davis*, P. E. I.) 1067 (ii).
 OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE RIVERS : in Com. of Sup., 1581 (ii).
 OMAN AND RIVER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 1577.
 "ORIENTAL," LOSS OF BARGE, REP. OF INSPECTOR : Ques (Mr. *Edgar*) 966 (ii).
 SIGNAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 1582, 1633 (ii).
 STAG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RIVER ST. CLAIR, COR. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 1259 (ii).
 STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH P. E. I. See "P. E. I."
 SURVEYS, LAKES SUPERIOR AND HURON : in Com. of Sup., 1688 (ii).
 TRAVERSE RIVER, LOWER : in Com. of Sup., 1691 (ii).
 UNITED STATES WRECKING VESSELS IN CAN. WATERS, COR. : M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 665 (i).
 VESSELS, OVERLOADING, LEGISLATION : Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 140 (i).
 WRECK, &C., INVESTIGATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (ii).
 WRECKING VESSELS (CANADIAN) IN U. S. WATERS, COR. : M. for copies (Mr. *Platt*) 868 (ii).
 WRECKS ON GREAT LAKES AND LOSS OF LIFE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 19, 782 (i).
Maritime Court of Ontario (extension of Jurisdiction) B. No. 40 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 244 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1549 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 39.)
MARTIN, J. A., COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, RIMOUSKI : Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1067 (ii).
MASSAWIPPI VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546 (ii).
Maskinongé and Nipissing Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 52 (Mr. *Coulombe*). 1°*, 270; 2°*, 497; in Com. and 3°*, 647 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 82)
MATANE AND RIVER BLANCHE WHARVES, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1067 (ii).
MECHANICS' INSTITUTE BOOKS, REMOVAL OF DUTIES : Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 899 (ii).
MEDICAL INSPECTION, QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
MEGANTIC COUNTY MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Turcot*) 823, 1232 (ii).
MEIGS, DAVID B., ESQ., M. P. : introduced, 665 (i).
MEMBERS' INDEMNITY : Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 158; (ii).
 — M. (Mr. *Patterson*, *Essex*) 168; (ii).
MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 1, 18, 25, 270, 380, 665 (i), 882, 1416, 1543 (ii).
MEMBERS, LIST OF, [IV.]
Merchandise (fraudulent marks). See "CRIMINAL LAW."
Merchants Marine Insurance Co. of Canada winding-up B. No. 11 (Mr. *Curran*). 1°*, 62; 2°*, 322; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 93.)
MERRICK, RICHARD, EMPLOYMENT BY GOV'T. : Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 647 (i).

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY :

- ADDRESS, JUBILEE : Dispatch from Colonial Secretary conveying Her Majesty's Thanks, 24 (ii).
 ADDRESS, THE : His Excellency's Reply, 172 (i).
 ESTIMATES, THE, 50 (i), 962, 1403 (ii).
 FISHERIES TREATY BETWEEN GREAT BRITAIN AND U.S., 86 (i).
 INTERNAL ECONOMY (HOUSE OF COMMONS) COMMISSION, 27 (i).
 LEGISLATION FOR N.W.T., NEW METHOD, 1231 (ii).
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE : conc., 1688 (ii).
MIDLAND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, COR. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Cook*) 1259 (ii).
MIDLAND, ORILLIA, &C., PUBLIC WORKS : Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 647 (i).
MIDDLESEX, WEST : Ret. of Member Elect, 309 (i).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE :
 AMMUNITION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1211 (ii).
 ARTILLERY PRACTICE ON ISLAND OF ORLEANS : M. for copies of Pets, &c.* (Mr. *Langelier*, *Montmorency*) 672 (i).
 AUBRY, REV. M., SERVICES AS MILITARY CHAPLAIN : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Amyot*) 654 (i).
 AUDIT, LT.-COL., AND FRENCH TRANSLATION OF FIELD EXERCISES : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Amyot*) 655 (i).
 AYLMER, COL. : in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
 BARRACKS, B.O. : in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).
 BOOKS ON THE MILITIA FORCE OF CANADA, TRANSLATION : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 85 (i).
 BRIGADE MAJORS, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
 CADETS, MILITARY COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 128 (i).
 CARTRIDGE FACTORY, &C. (QUEBEC) WATER SUPPLY, COR. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier*, *Quebec*) 1092 (ii).
 CARTRIDGES, REP. OF COMMISSION ON MANUFACTURE : Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 1232 (ii).
 CLOTHING AND GREAT-COATS : in Com. of Sup., 1212, 1215 (ii).
 CLOTHING FOR MILITIA, TENDERS AND CONTRACT : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bowman*) 866 (ii).
 DEPUTY ADJUTANTS GENERAL, RETIRING ALLOWANCES : in Com. of Sup., 1644 (ii).
 DRILL PAY, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1213 (ii).
 DRILL SHED, QUEBEC, WATER SUPPLY, COR. : M. for copy (Mr. *Amyot*) 654 (i), 1092 (ii).
 — Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 85 (i).
 FIELD EXERCISES, FRENCH TRANSLATION, COR. : M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 655 (i).
 JACKSON, COL. : in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
 KIT ALLOWANCE, YORK-SIMCOE BATT. : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 66 (i).
 MILITARY BRANCH AND DISTRICT STAFF, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 1209 (i).
 MILITARY PROPERTIES : in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
 MILITARY SCHOOL, ST. JOHN, QUE., SERVICE OF CHAPLAIN, COR. : M. for copies (Mr. *Amyot*) 654 (i).
 MILITIA AND DEFENCE, DEPTL. REP. : presented (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 18 (i).
 — DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
 NEELY, PRIVATE THOS., DEATH OF, COR. *re* COMPENSATION TO FAMILY : M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 649 (i).
 PERMANENT FORCES : in Com. of Sup., 1219 (ii).
 REBELLION OF 1885, CLAIMS OF SCOUTS, &C. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 1242 (ii).
 — LOSSES COMMISSION, REP. : M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 73 (i).
 — MILITIAMEN, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 1202, 1612 (ii).
 — COST : Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 171 (i).
 — TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 498 (i).
 ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE : in Com. of Sup., 1218; conc., 1687 (ii).
 STRANGE, GEN., REP. *re* REBELLION : Ques (Mr. *Amyot*) 98 (i).
 — or M. for Com. of Sup., 1600 (ii).
 — COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF PENSION : Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 140 (i).
 STRAUBENZEL, COL. : in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
 VALIQUETTE, SERGEANT, SUPERANNUATION : Ques. (Mr. *Jones*, *Halifax*) 1506 (ii).

MILITIA AND DEFENCE—Continued.

- VETERANS OF 1866-70, MEDALS: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 965 (ii).
 — OF 1837, PENSIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Puresk*) 85 (i).
 — OF 1812: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 YORK-SIMCOH BATT. KIT ALLOWANCE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 66 (i).
 YOUNG, CAPT., COR., & C., RESPECTING CLAIM: M. for copy* (Mr. *Scarth*) 866 (i).
MISSIONARY INDIANS CLAIMS, UNCEDED LANDS, COR.: M. for copy* (Mr. *Madill*) 866 (i).
MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 1611, 1663 (ii).
MISSISQUOI CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's. Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).
 — ELECTORAL DISTRICT: notification of vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 124 (i).
 — Ret. of Member Elect, 616 (i).
MOHAWK INDIANS COR. re DISMISSAL OF COUNCILLOR CULBERTSON: M. for copies (Mr. *Burdett*) 977 (ii).
MONCK, RICHARD, EMPLOYMENT BY GOV'T.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 712 (i), 899 (ii).
Moncton Harbor Improvement Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 83 (Mr. *Wood, Westmoreland*). 1^o*, 489; 2^o*, 493 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 954. (51 *Vic.*, c. 105.)
MONCTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (ii).
Money, Counterfeit. See "CRIMINAL LAW."
MONTAGUE, W. H., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR HALDIMAND introduced, 2 (i).
MONTMAGNY CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).
 — PETITION re RETURN OF MEMBER: Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 1332, 1468 (ii).
MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. Co.'s SUB-IDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1589 (ii).
MONTREAL AND QUEBEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE BY GOV'T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 71 (i).
MONTREAL AND QUEBEC RIVER POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
MONTREAL DISTRICT, SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 647 (i).
MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSION, AMOUNT ADVANCED: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1135 (ii).
MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSIONERS RELIEF: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 27 (i).
Montreal Harbor Commissioners Release B. No. 134 (Sir *Charles Tupper*). Res. prop., 1031; M. for Com., 1280; in Com., 1294; 1^o*, 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 1391 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 5.)
 Deb on Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1269; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1283; (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1283; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1284, 1290; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1285; (Mr. *Girouard*) 1288; (Mr. *Amyot*) 1288; (Mr. *Curran*) 1289; (Mr. *Wellon, St. John*) 1290; (Mr. *Desjardins*) 1292; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1292; (Mr. *Casey*) 1291 (ii).
MONTREAL Herald AND MR. CURRAN, M. P.: in Com. of Sup., 1170 (ii).
Montreal Island Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 70 (Mr. *Desjardins*). 1^o*, 454; 2^o*, 498; in Com. and 3^o*, 726 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 63.)

- MONTREAL POST OFFICE ELECTRIC LIGHT CONTRACT: Ques.** (Mr. *Edgar*) 625 (ii).
MORGAN, H. J.: in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
MORIN, DR. J. A., CLAIM FOR MEDICAL SERVICES: M. for copy (Mr. *Amyot*) 655 (i).
Morrison, Catherine. See "DIVORCE."
MOULIN, REV. FATHER, COR. re RESERVE AT BATOUCHE: M. for copy (Mr. *Scarth*) 866. (ii).
MOUNTED POLICE, COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: in Com. of Sup., 1612 (ii).
 — in Com. of Sup. 93 (i), 1610, 1658, 1683 (ii).
 — HEADQUARTERS, EDMONTON: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 965 (i).
 — REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 499 (i).
MOYLAN, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).
MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1453 (ii).
MUSKOKA AND PARRY SOUND JUDICIAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 1232 (ii).
Nationale. See "LA BANQUE."
NAUFRAGE, P.E.I., NAVIGATION, REP. OF ENGINEER: M. for copies (Mr. *McIntyre*) 70 (i).
NAVIGATION OF THE HIGH SEAS. See "COLLISIONS."
NEELY, PRIVATE THOS., DEATH OF, COR., re COMPENSATION TO FAMILY: M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 649 (i).
NEW BRUNSWICK:
ALBERT RY. Co.'s LOAN ACCOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 826 (ii).
 — (N.B.) SUB-IDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1516; in Com., 1594 (ii).
ATLANTIC OCEAN, OBSTRUCTIONS TO SHIPPING: Ques. (Gen. *Laurie*) 1423 (ii).
CENTRAL RY. Co.'s (N.B.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1593 (ii).
CHATHAM BRANCH RY. (N.B.) Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1594 (ii).
ELGIN, PETITCOLLIAC AND HAVILOCK RY. (N.B.) Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1593 (ii).
FRASER, MR. JUSTICE, AND re WESTMORELAND ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 115 (i).
HAWKE, J. T., CASE OF: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1299.
INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 1607 (ii).
NORTHUMBERLAND MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1391 (ii).
 — Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
NEWCASTLE POST OFFICE IRREGULARITIES: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1468 (ii).
QUEEN'S: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
ST. JOHN HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, REP. OF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 86 (i).
TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) in Com., 1626 (ii).
 [See DEPARTMENTS, "I.C.R.," "SUPPLY," &c.]
NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION, COR.: M for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 664 (i).
 — Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 111 (i).
NEW MEMBERS, 1, 238, 309, 646 (i), 866, 1414, 1544 (ii).
New York, St Lawrence and Ottawa Ry. Co's incorp B. No. 72 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*). 1^o*, 454; 2^o*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 1049 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
NEW YORK, WADDINGTON AND OTTAWA RY.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Hickey*) 778 (i).

Nisbet Academy of Prince Albert incorp. B. No.

15 (Mr *Macdowall*). 1°*, 62; 2°*, 219 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 954 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 108.*)

"NORTHERN LIGHT", CAPT. FINLAYSON'S SALARY: Remarks (Mr. *Welsh*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1558 (ii).

— CAPTAIN'S PAY AND EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Welsh*) 37 (i).

— CONDITION: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Welsh*) 827 (i).

— NUMBER OF TRIPS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Perry*) 61 (i).

— TRIPS MADE AND PASSENGERS CARRIED (WINTER 1887-88): M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Perry*) 672 (i).

— PAPERS *re* EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 416, 456 (i); 1001 (ii).

— WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: Ques (Mr. *Davies*) 140 (i).

NORTH SYDNEY PILOTAGE RETURNS UNDER ACT OF 1873: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1067 (ii).

NORTHUMBERLAND (N. B) MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1392 (ii).

— RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

— STRAITS SUBWAY, REP. OF ENGINEERS, &c.: M. for copy (Mr. *Perry*) 661 (i).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES: in Com. of Sup., 1155 (ii).

BRENTAYLOR HALF-BREEDS: Remarks (Mr. *Edgar*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1514 (ii).

COLONISATION INSPECTOR: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 866 (ii).

EXPERIMENTAL FARM, LOCATION, PAPERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 866 (ii).

— PROF. SAUNDERS' REP.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).

FORT McLEOD AND PLOCHER CREEK MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 712 (i).

GOVT. OF N. W. T. EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).

GRAZING LANDS, LEASES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davis*) 866 (ii).

— Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 495 (i).

— ALBERTA DISTRICT: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 498 (i).

IMMIGRANTS, ACCOMMODATION AT REGINA: Ques (Mr. *Davin*) 712 (i).

LEASES, OLD AND UNOCCUPIED LANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 825 (ii).

LEGISLATION FOR N. W. T.: Mess. from His Ex., 1231 (ii).

MOUNTED POLICE HEADQUARTERS, EDMONTON: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 865 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 93 (i), 1610, 1658, 1683 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1672 (ii).

QU'APPELLE IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 1161, 1169 (ii).

RANCHES, DUTIES OF INSPECTOR: Ques (Mr. *Davis*) 865 (ii).

REBELLION OF 1885. See "MILITIA AND DEFENCE."

REGINA GAOL: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).

SQUATTERS' CLAIMS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 656 (i).

STRANGE, GENL., REP. *re* REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 98 (i).

TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 1633 (ii).

TRAVIS, EX-JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 114 (i).

[See DEPARTMENTS, "MANITOBA," &c.]

NORTH-WEST CENTRAL. See "GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL" N. W. T. (Council) Act Amt (Chap. 50, Rev. Statutes)

B. No. 76 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 454 (i); prop. Res., 1174; in Com., 1491; 2°, 1473; in Com. 1480; 3°*, 1547 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 19.*)

Nova Scotia Telephone Co.'s B. No 59 (Mr. *Tupper, Pictou*). 1°*, 344; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 954 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 100.*)

NOVA SCOTIA:

"CAPE BRETON" DREDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Tupper, Pictou*) 1432 (ii).

COLCHESTER: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

CUMBERLAND: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

DIGBY: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

EASTERN EXTENSION RY., COR *re* RIGHT OF WAY: M. for Papers (Mr. *Kirk*) 902 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 1231 (ii)

EIGHT-ISLAND LAKE POST OFFICE: Ques (Mr. *Kirk*) 86 (i).

HALIFAX COTTON Co.'s (N.S.) SUBSIDY: prop Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1593 (ii).

HARBORS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1561, 1673 (ii).

INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1232 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1588 (ii).

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY. (CONSTRUCTION): in Com. of Sup., 1230 (ii).

RECEIVER GENERAL (HALIFAX): in Com. of Sup., 88 (i).

SHELburne: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

STEEL Co. OF CANADA (N.S.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1594 (ii).

VICTORIA: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

YARMOUTH: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

[See DEPARTMENTS, "SUPPLY," &c.]

Oaths of Office. See "ADMINISTRATION."

OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1581.

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 1577 (ii).

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND COR.: M. for copies (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1007 (ii).

O'DONOGHUE, W. F., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 899 (ii).

— in Com. of Sup., 1163 (ii).

OLIVIER, GEO, DISMISSAL, COR RESPECTING: M. for copy (Mr. *Rinfret*) 654 (i).

ONDERDONK ARBITRATION, PLANT TAKEN OVER BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 93 (i).

— DETAILS: presented (Mr. *Pope*) 111 (i).

ONTARIO:

ARKONA POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 712 (i).

— on M. for Com. of Sup., 1018 (ii).

BAY OF QUINTE, BRIDGE AT BELLEVILLE: M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. *Platt*) 922 (ii).

BEXLEY POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 58 (i).

BOUNDARIES OF ONT.: Remarks (Mr. *Dawson*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1629 (ii).

BRUCE, WEST: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

CARLETON: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

CAYUGA POST OFFICE SITE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 28 (i).

CENTRAL RAILWAY Co.'s PETITION: M. (Mr. *O'Brien*) to ref back to Standing Com., 7:0 (i).

CHIPPAWA VILLAGE BRIDGE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 65 (i).

CULBERTSON, ARCHIBALD, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Burdett*) 977 (ii).

DUART POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).

EVEREST, GEO. M., DISMISSAL AS POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 712 (i).

GRAND RIVER BRIDGES, HALDIMAND: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (ii).

G. T. R. CROSSING IN TORONTO: Ques. (Mr. *Denison*) 59 (i).

HALDIMAND: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).

— DEP. RETURNING OFFICER: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 648 (i); Remarks, 922.

HALTON: Ret. of Member-Elect, 1 (i).

HASTINGS, WEST, ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Vacancy, 85 (i).

— Ret. of Member Elect, 238 (i).

ONTARIO—Continued.

- INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 1805 (ii)
- INGOLDSBY STATION, POST OFFICE, PETITION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barron*) 1243 (ii).
- JONES, WALTER, APPOINTMENT: Res (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup, 1524; neg. (Y. 58, N. 98) 1533 (ii).
- KENT (ONT.) ELECTION: Ret. of Member Elect, 1514 (ii).
- KINGSTON GRAVING DOCK: in Com. of Sup, 1871 (ii).
- DEPUTY POSTMASTER'S IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 899, 985 (ii).
- Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1012 (ii).
- MIDDLESEX, WEST: Ret. of Member Elect, 309 (i).
- MIDLAND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Cook*) 1259 (i).
- MIDLAND, ORILLIA, &c., PUBLIC WORKS: QUES. (Mr. *Cook*) 647 (i).
- MERRICK, RICHARD, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. *Trow*) 617 (i).
- MONCK, RICHARD, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. *Lister*) 712 (i), 899 (ii).
- ONTARIO AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY.: QUES. (Mr. *Elgar*) 1432 (ii).
- PÉLÉE ISLAND CABLE, PETITIONS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Patterson*, *Essex*) 826 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Brien*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1011 (ii).
- PENETANGUISHENE, MIDLAND, &c., PUBLIC WORKS: QUES. (Mr. *Cook*) 647 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Cook*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).
- PICTON, EXECUTION AT, REVENUE, &c.: QUES. (Mr. *Platt*) 1432 (ii).
- HARBOR, COR., &c., re DREDGING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Platt*) 866 (ii).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COR., &c., re CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Platt*) 866 (ii).
- PLATTSVILLE POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. *Somerville*) on M. for Com. of Sup, 1018 (ii).
- PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY: Certificate of Return of Member Elect, 380 (i).
- PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1537, 1541, 1855, 1872 (ii).
- QUES. (Mr. *Platt*) 1432 (ii).
- RENFREW, SOUTH: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
- RUSSELL ELECTION: Ret. of Member on certificate of Returning Officer, 1415 (ii).
- Official notification of Ret., 1522 (ii).
- ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBERING Co., COSTS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 20 (i).
- ST. CLAIR RY. BRIDGE AND TUNNEL Co., GOVT. ASSISTANCE: QUES. (Mr. *Patterson*, *Essex*) 1432 (ii).
- SARNIA AND PORT HURON TUNNEL: QUES. (Mr. *Patterson*, *Essex*) 1432 (ii).
- SMYTH, HENRY, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. *Lister*) 495 (i)
- QUES. (Mr. *McMullen*) 847 (i).
- AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 866.
- SNETSINGER, MR., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. *Barron*) 825 (ii).
- STAG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RIVER ST. CLAIR, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 1259 (ii).
- STRATHROY POST OFFICE AND CUSTOM HOUSE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).
- SITE: QUES., 1174 (ii).
- TELEPHONE, WOLF ISLAND (ONT.) AND MAINLAND: in Com. of Sup, 1877 (ii).
- THOROLD CANAL WATER POWER: QUES. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 647 (i).
- VICTORIA COUNTY MAIL SERVICE: QUES. (Mr. *Barron*) 825 (ii).
- WELLAND RIVER, BRIDGE AT CHIPPAWA: QUES. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 65 (i).
- WELLINGTON HARBOR OF REFUGE, COR., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Platt*) 866 (ii)
- WINKLER, MRS. BARBARA, PAYMENT FOR LOSS OF REGISTERED LETTER: QUES. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 750 (i).
- YORK-SIMCOE BATT., KIT ALLOWANCES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 68.

[See DEPARTMENTS, "SUPPLY," "SUBSIDIES," &c.]

Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. No. 45 (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 206; 2°*, 530 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1207 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 53.)

Ontario, Manitoba and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 81 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 489; 2°*, 498 (i); withdn., 1585 (ii).

ORDERS IN COUNCIL, &c., COLLECTING: in Com. of Sup., 1618, 1663 (ii)

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE:

ORDER;

OHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RY.: Member's Vote on 2° of B. challenged by Mr. *Trow*: being questioned by Mr. *Speaker* and member within the entrance vote allowed to stand, 941 (ii).

CLERK OF CROWN IN CHANCERY, LATE: Objection taken by Mr. *McNeill* to discussion on M. for 2 of B. respecting Patents of Invention, 1372 (ii).

CONTRADICTION OF STATEMENT: Explanation (Mr. *McMullan*, *Huron*) ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) Member not having the floor cannot make a speech, 345 (i).

DEBATE, DIGNITY AND DECORUM: Member requested by Mr. *Speaker* to desist from throwing papers, 611 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL, DISMISSAL OF TRANSLATORS: Member checked by Mr. *Deputy Speaker*, remarks being irrelevant to Res. before the House, 719, 721 (i).

DIgression FROM DEBATE: Ruled (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) personal charges against a member should be avoided, unless followed up by some distinct proceeding, 443 (i).

— Member requested by Mr. *Deputy Speaker* to confine himself to question under Debate, 450, 480 (i).

DUTIES (REDUCTION) ON CERTAIN ARTICLES: M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to adjourn House; Ruled out of order (Mr. *Speaker*) Orders of the Day having been called, 554 (i).

ELLIS, MR., M.P., AND ANNEXATION: Objection taken by Mr. *Lister* to QUES., same containing an avowal of facts: Rule relating to QUES. read by Mr. *Speaker* and QUES. declared out of order, as it reflected on a Member of the House, 45 (i).

FISHERIES TREATY, PAPERS RESPECTING: Member's attention drawn by Mr. *Speaker* to the fact of there being no question before the House, and that a debate cannot arise on the non-production of certain papers, 143, 239 (i)

IMPROVING CONDUCT OF JUDGES: Member's attention called by Mr. *Speaker* to the Rule prevailing here and in England respecting charges against Judges, and ruling of Mr. *Speaker Brand* read, 1301 (ii)

IMPUTATION OF MOTIVES: Objection (Mr. *Charlton*): Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 523 (i).

LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL OF LABORERS: In Com. of Sup., discussion objected to by Sir *Hector Langevin*, subject not being relevant to question before the Chair; objection sustained by Mr. *Chairman*, but Member allowed to proceed in order to save time, 1564 (ii).

— Reference to in Com. of Sup. declared irregular (Mr. *Chairman*) 1173 (ii).

— Members called to order by Mr. *Chairman* for using strong language, 1848 (ii).

LOYALTY AND DISLOYALTY OF MEMBERS: Member requested by Mr. *Speaker* to withdraw objectionable phraseology and apologise to House, 524 (i).

MISREPRESENTATION: Explanation (Mr. *Paterson*, *Brint*) allowed, by Mr. *Speaker*; interruptions in Debate should be avoided, 421 (i).

PROHIBITION: Reference to previous debate checked by Mr. *Speaker*, 867 (ii).

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS: Reading and laying same on Table: Ruled not applicable to ordinary Members, but only to Members of the Government, 1495 (ii).

READING SPEECHES: Objection taken by Mr. *Mulock*; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) that Rule does not apply, 1101 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Continued.

ORDER—Continued.

REBELLION, CLAIM OF SCOUTS, &c. : prop. Res. (Mr. Davin) objected to by Mr. Mackenzie, same involving a public charge; Ruled (Mr. Deputy Speaker) not objectionable, 1243 (ii).

REBELLION MEDALS: in Com. of Sup., no question being before the Chair, M. that Com. rise ruled in order (Mr. Chairman) and Member allowed to proceed with remarks, 1208 (ii).

RECIPROCIITY WITH U. S. : Explanation in deb. ruled out of order (Mr. Speaker), Member must wait his turn for reply, 283 (i).

RELEVANCY OF DEB. : Mr. Chairman's attention drawn to remarks of Member; Ruled not in order, 1639 (ii).

SPEAKER, DEPUTY, RULING: Deb. on, objected to by Mr. Ives, 721 (i).

UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE: Objection (Sir John A. Macdonald), 491 (i).

PRIVILEGE :

DISLOYALTY, ALLEGED: Personal explanation (Mr. Amyot) 598 (i).

FARM LANDS IN HURON COUNTY: Personal explanation (Mr. Moncrieff) 392 (i).

"FLIES ON THE WHEEL": Member's veracity questioned and explanation by Mr. Davin checked and ruled out of order by Mr. Speaker, 1093 (ii).

GOLDWIN SMITH: Personal explanation (Mr. Davin) and denial of statement in *Toronto Telegram*, 270 (i).

GREENWAY AND MARTIN, VISIT *re* DISALLOWANCE: Attention of Govt. drawn by Mr. Mitchell to rumored interview with Governor General, 110 (i).

HAWKS, JNO. T., AND WESTMORELAND ELECTION: Remarks (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1299 (ii).

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION: Attention of House drawn by Mr. Mitchell to Official Correspondence appearing in a newspaper, 111 (i).

NEW YORK, WASHINGTON AND OTTAWA RY. : Contradiction of statement in *Evening Journal* (Mr. Hickey) 778 (i).

PAIRING OF MEMBERS: Personal explanation (Mr. Marshall) 1403 (ii).

PROHIBITION DEB. : Member asked by Mr. Speaker to state Ques. of Priv., deb. on same not allowed, 867 (ii).

RECIPROCIITY WITH U. S. : Personal explanation (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 289 (i).

PROCEDURE :

CAN. TEMPERANCE ACT AMT.: In Com. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) to repeal a certain section, cannot properly be entertained by the Chair, but it is competent for a Member to bring it up at some other stage, or by Order of House to refer back to Com. (Mr. Chairman) 1254 (ii).

SOUTH-WESTERN RY. Co.'s B. : Amt. to M. for 3° (Mr. Curran) objected to by Mr. Baker and declared out of order by Mr. Speaker, 954 (ii).

UPPER OTTAWA IMPROVEMENT Co.'s B. : Mr. Deputy Speaker being present, objection was taken by Mr. Mills (Bothwell) to a private Member being called upon to act as Chairman of Committee; Mr. Mills also objected to Deputy Speaker reporting B. to himself from Committee, 1148 (ii).

"ORIENTAL," LOSS OF BARGE, REP. OF INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 966 (ii).

ORILLIA, MIDLAND, &c., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Cook) 647 (i).

OTTAWA, ADDITIONAL DEPTL. BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).

Ottawa and Parry Sound Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 75 (Mr. Ferguson, Renfrew). 1°*, 454; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i). (51 Vic., c. 65.)

— — — SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546; in Com., 1587 (ii).

OTTAWA CITY AND RIVER BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 1571, 1677 (ii).

OTTAWA COUNTY, GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).

Ottawa, Morrisburg and New York Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 50 (Mr. Hickey). 1°*, 270; 2°*, 493 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 954 (ii).

OTTAWA RIVER WORKS AND IMPROVEMENTS, TOTAL COST, &c. : M. for Stmt. (Mr. Amyot) 827 (i).

Ottawa (Upper) Improvement Co.'s B. No. 20 (Mr. White, Renfrew). 1°*, 73; 2° m., 322; 2°, 496 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1148 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 102.)

OVERLOADING VESSELS, LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. Guillet) 140 (i).

OVERSEERS AND WARDENS (SALARIES): in Com. of Sup., 1583 (ii).

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY. (CONSTRUCTION): in Com. of Sup., 1230 (ii).

PAMPHLETS, IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 1158, 1165 (ii).

— — — TRANSLATION: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 85 (i).

PAPINEAUVILLE HARBOR, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).

PARLT. HOUSE, QUEBEC, RENT OF OLD SITE: in Com. of Sup., 1655 (ii).

PARLIAMENT, 6TH, SECOND SESSION, 1888, 51 VICTORIA: Opening, 1 (i); closing, 1693 (ii).

PARMELEE, MR., REP. *re* KAMLOOPS AS AN OUTPORT OF ENTRY: M. for copy* (Mr. Mara) 498 (i).

PATENTS, APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER: in Com. of Sup., 95 (i).

Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. No. 38 (Mr. Carling). 1°, 124; prop. Res., 125 (i); conc. in, 1513; 2°* and in Com., 15:1; 3° m., 1547; Amt. (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) neg. (Y. 60, N 93) and 3°, 1548 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 18.)

"PATENT RECORD" EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1150 (ii).

PAUPER IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 1155, 1168 (ii).

— — — Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 964 (ii).

— — — Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1595 (ii).

PEACE RIVER AND ATHABASCA INDIAN TREATIES: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 825 (ii).

Peddlers and Commission men (Nursery Stock) prevention of Fraud B. No. 105 (Mr. Boyle). 1°*, 899 (ii).

PELÉE ISLAND CABLE, PETITIONS, &c. : M. for copies (Mr. Patterson, Essex) 826 (i).

— — — Remarks (Mr. Brien) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1011.

PENETANGUISHENE CUSTOM HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. Cook) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).

— — — MIDLAND, &c., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Cook) 647 (i).

PENITENTIARIES:

BRITISH COLUMBIA: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).

DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 91 (i).

DORCHESTER: in Com. of Sup., 1021 (ii).

KINGSTON: in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).

MANITOBA: in Com. of Sup., 1021; conc., 1666 (ii).

REGINA GAOL: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).

REP. : presented (Mr. Thompson) 18 (i).

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL: in Com. of Sup., 136 (i); conc., 1666 (ii).

PENSIONS:

DELANEY, MRS.: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 FENIAN RAID, ON ACCOUNT OF: in Com. of Sup., 1201, 1639 (ii).
 GOWANLOCK, MRS.: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 58 (i).
 ——— Remarks (Mr. Rykert, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1015 (ii).
 HODGSON, SIR ROBT. (PAYMENT TO GOVT. OF P.E.I.): in Com. of Sup., 1671 (ii).
 VETERANS OF 1812: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
 ——— of 1837: Ques. (Mr. Purcell) 85 (i).
 PERLEY, H. F., REP. re ST. JOHN HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 86 (i).
 PERMANENT FORCES: in Com. of Sup., 1219 (ii).
 PICTON EXCISEMAN, REVENUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Platt) 1432.
 ——— HARBOR, COR., &c., re DREDGING; M. for Ret.* (Mr. Platt) 866 (i).
 ——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COR., &c., re CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Platt) 866 (i).
 PICTOU TOWN BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1226, 1645.
 PINETTE HARBOR, DREDGING OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 140 (i).
 PION & Co., CLAIM FOR GOODS DAMAGED ON I.C.R.: M. for copies* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1092 (ii).
 PLATT, JOHN MILTON, ESQ., M.P. FOR P.E. COUNTY: introduced, 380 (i).
 PLATTSVILLE, POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. Somerville) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1018 (ii).
 PLAYTEB, FR., SUBSIDY TO "HEALTH JOURNAL": in Com. of Sup., 1193 (ii).
 PLUMB, HON. J. B., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir John A. Macdonald) 124 (i).
 POINT TUPPER, CAPE BRETON, EXTENSION OF RY. PIER: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald, Victoria) 1299 (ii).
 Pontiac and Renfrew Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 42 (Mr. Bryson). 1°*, 206; 2°*, 322; in Com. and 3°*, 611 (i). (51 Vic., c. 66.)
 ——— SUBSIDY: prop Res (Sir Charles Tupper) 154; in Com., 1589 (ii).
 Port Arthur, Duluth and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 21 (Mr. Dawson). 1°*, 73; 2°*, 128; in Com. and 3°*, 392 (i). (51 Vic., c. 84.)
 ——— SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546; in Com., 1591 (ii).
 PORT ARTHUR HARBOR AND KAMINISTIQUA: in Com. of Sup., 1461 (ii).
POST OFFICE:
 AUDETTE, ANTOINE, NORTH STUKELY, POSTMASTER: M. for copies of O.C.'s, &c.* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1091 (ii).
 AKBONA POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. Lister) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1018 (ii).
 ——— DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 712 (i).
 BEXLEY POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 58 (i).
 DUART POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).
 EIGHT-ISLAND LAKE (N.S.) POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 86 (i).
 FORT MCLEOD AND PINCHER CREEK MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 712 (i).
 INGOLDSBY STATION POST OFFICE, PETITION, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Barron) 1243 (ii).
 KINGSTON DEP. POSTMASTER'S IRREGULARITIES: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 899, 965 (ii).
 KINGSTON POST OFFICE DEFOCATIONS: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright, &c.) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1042 (ii).
 ——— Remarks (Mr. Laurier) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1017 (ii).

POST OFFICE—Continued.

LAND VILLA POST OFFICE, PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Chiquette) 102 (i).
 LOTBINIERE MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 98 (i).
 MAIL SERVICE IN P.E.I.: M. for Pat. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 47, 52 (i).
 MAIL SUBSIDIES AND STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1678.
 MEGANTIC CO. MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Turcott) 825, 1232 (i).
 NEWCASTLE, POST OFFICE IRREGULARITIES: Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1020 (ii).
 NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.) MAIL SERVICE: Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) 1392 (ii).
 OCEAN MAIL SERVICE, TENNESSEE AND COR.: M. for copies (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1067 (ii).
 PLATTSVILLE, POSTMASTER: Remarks (Mr. Somerville) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1018 (ii).
 POSTMASTER GENL.'S DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 92 (i).
 ——— REP.: presented (Mr. McLelan) 20 (i).
 POST OFFICE AND FINANCE DEPTS.: in Com. of Sup., 112 (ii).
 QUEBEC AND DEQUEN MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Couture) 98 (i).
 REGISTERED LETTERS, PAYMENT FOR LOSS: Ques. (Mr. Lanierkin) 750 (i).
 ST. AGAPIT POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, COR.: M. for copy (Mr. Rinfret) 854 (i).
 SHANNON, WM., DEFOCATIONS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 935 (ii).
 STUKELY (NORTH) POSTMASTERSHIP, &c., PAPERS, O.C.'s: M. for copies* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1092 (ii).
 VICTORIA (B.C.) POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 826 (ii).
 VICTORIA (ONT.) COUNTY, MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Barron) 826 (i).
Post Office and Govt. Savings Banks (Interest on Deposits) B. No. 127 (Sir Charles Tupper). 1°, 1332; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1401 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 8.)
 PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY: Certificate of Return of Member Elect, 390 (i).
 ——— PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. Platt) 1432 (ii).
PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
 ALBERTON HARBOR, DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 712 (i).
 ALLEN, WARREN, CLAIM FOR ICE-BOAT: M. for Papers, &c (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 923 (i).
 "ALERT," COR. RESPECTING CONDITION: M. for Ret. (Mr. Welsh) 827.
 BAY FORTUNE BREAKWATER, REP. OF ENGINEER: M. for copy (Mr. McIntyre) 636 (i).
 MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 47, 52 (i).
 "NORTHERN LIGHT." See general heading.
 NAUFRAGE NAVIGATION, REP. OF ENGINEER: M. for copies (Mr. McIntyre) 70 (i).
 NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS SUBWAY, REP. OF ENGINEERS, &c.: M. for copy (Mr. Perry) 661 (i).
 PINETTE HARBOR, DREDGING OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 140 (i).
 TERMS OF CONFEDERATION: M. for copies* (Mr. Perry) 61 (i).
 ——— COMPENSATION FOR NON-FULFILMENT: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 86.
 ——— Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 140 (i).
 TIGNISH AND MICHINGASH BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 86, 712.
 STRAM COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 28, 712 (i).
 ——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Perry) 61 (i).
 ——— Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 140 (i).
 WHARVES AND PIERS, CARE OF: Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 965 (ii).
 WOOD ISLAND HARBOR, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. Welsh) 140 (i).
Printing and Stationery (Public) Act (Chap. 27, Rev. Statutes) Amt B. No. 60 (Mr. Chypleau) 1°*, 344 (i); 2° and in Com., 1005; 3°*, 1137 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 17.)
 PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 92 (i), 1541 (ii).
 ——— PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1617; conc., 1689.
 ——— MISCELLANEOUS: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (ii).

PRINTING PAPERS: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (ii).
 ——— **REP. OF JOINT COM.:** M. (Mr. *Bergin*) to conc., 454.
PRIOR, E. G., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR VICTORIA, B. C.: introduced, 2 (ii).
PRIVATE BILLS, PETITIONS, EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 50 (i).
 ——— **REPS. FROM COM.:** M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to extend time, 514 (i), 1031 (ii).
PRIVILEGE. See "ORDER," &c.
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 90 (i).
Presbyterian Church and Manse Building Fund for Man. and N. W. incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 97 (Mr. *Daly*). 1°*, 711; 2°*, 790 (i); in Com and 3°*, 1313 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 107.*)
PRESOTT AND RUSSELL JUDICIAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Labrosse*) 27 (i).
PRESS, LIBERTY OF AND ACTION OF THE BENCH: Remarks, in Com. of Sup., 115 (i).
Procedure in Criminal Cases See "CRIMINAL LAW."
PROCEDURE. See "ORDER" &c.
PROHIBITION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Jamieson*) 827 (ii).
PROPERTIES, MILITARY: in Com. of Sup., 1221 (ii).
PROROGATION, notification: (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1625, 1693 (ii).
 ——— (Mr. *Speaker* 1686 (ii)).
 ——— **Mess. from His Ex by Black Rod,** 1692 (ii).
PROTECTION STEAMERS, FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 1603.
Provincial Courts (Judges' Salaries) Act Amt. B. 142 (Mr. *Thompson*). Ref. prop., 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 1690 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 38*)
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: presented (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 18 (i).
PUBLIC SERVICE, NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 495 (i).
Public Service See "LOAN" and "SUPPLY B. 14."
PUBLIC WORKS:
AGENCY, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1633 (ii).
ALBERTON HARBOR, P. E. I., DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 712 (i).
BAY FORTUNE, P. E. I., BREAKWATER, REP. OF ENGINEER: M. for copy (Mr. *McIntyre*) 650 (i).
BONILLA POINT AND VICTORIA (B. C.) TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
BRIDGE AT BELLEVILLE: M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. *Platt*) 922 (ii).
 ——— **AT CHIPPAWA VILLAGE:** Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 65 (i).
 ——— **AT QUEBEC, GOVT. AID:** Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1625
BRIDGES, OTTAWA CITY AND RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1571, 1677 (ii).
CABLE TO PELÉES ISLAND, PETITIONS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 826 (i).
 ——— **on M. for Com. of Sup.** (Mr. *Brien*) 1011 (ii).
CAYUGA POST OFFICE SITE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 28 (i).
COAL SUPPLY, GOVT. TENDERS AND CONTRACTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Guillet*) 826 (i).
ELECTRIC LIGHT, MONTREAL POST OFFICE, CONTRACT: Ques (Mr. *Edgar*) 1625 (ii).
FRENCH RIVER NAVIGATION, DEPTH OF WATER: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 97 (i).
HADLOW COVE PIER, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Gusy*) 140 (i).
HARBOR COMMISSIONERS. See "MONTREAL" and "QUEBEC."
ICE-BREAKERS, COUNTY OF BERTHIER: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 45 (i).
ISLE-AUX-NOIX WHARF EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 935 (ii).
LAKE ST. PETER IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 71 (i).
LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK. See "QUEBEC HARBOR COMMISSIONERS."

PUBLIC WORKS—Continued.

MATANE AND RIVER BLANCHE WHARVES, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1367 (ii)
MIDLAND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Cook*) 1259 (ii).
MIDLAND, ORILLIA, &c., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 647 (i)
NAUFRAGE (P. E. I.) NAVIGATION, REP. OF ENGINEER: M. for copies (Mr. *McIntyre*) 70 (i).
NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS SUBWAY, REP. OF ENGINEERS, &c.: M. for copy (Mr. *Perry*) 661 (i).
OTTAWA RIVER WORKS AND IMPROVEMENTS, TOTAL COST, &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Amyot*) 827 (i).
PAPINEAUVILLE HARBOR, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Wright*) 495 (i).
PENETANGUISHENE, MIDLAND, &c., PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 647 (i).
PICTON HARBOR, COR., &c., re DREDGING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Platt*) 866 (ii)
PICTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COR., &c., re CONSTRUCTION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Platt*) 866 (i).
PINETTE HARBOR, DREDGING OF BAR: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 140 (i).
PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY, PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 1432 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS REP.: presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 18 (i).
RIMOUSKI PUBLIC WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 1067 (ii).
STE. ANNE DES MONTS WHARF, PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Joncas*) 1233 (ii).
ST. HYACINTHE PUBLIC BUILDINGS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dupont*) 651 (i)
ST. JOHN HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, REP. OF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 86 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER CHANNEL, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, COR.: M. for copies* (Sir *Donald Smith*) 922 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT ADVANCED: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1135 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER NAVIGATION, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 71 (i).
SAGUENAY RIVER BUOYS, CONTRACT FOR PLACING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1433 (ii).
SARNIA AND PORT HURON TUNNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 1432 (ii).
STRATHROY POST OFFICE AND CUSTOM HOUSE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).
 ——— **PUBLIC BUILDINGS, SITE:** Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 96 (i)
TELEGRAPH LINES, ASSUMPTION BY GOVT.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Denison*) 101 (i)
TIGNISH AND MIMINGASH (P.E.I.) BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 86, 712 (i).
VENTILATION OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright, &c.*) 171 (i).
WELLINGTON HARBOR OF REFUGE, COR., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Platt*) 866 (i).
WHARVES AND PIERS IN P. E. I., CARE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 965 (ii).
WOOD ISLAND HARBOR, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 140 (i).
 [See "PROVINCES," "SUPPLY" &c.]
Punishments, Pardons, &c. See "CRIMINAL LAW."
QU'APPELLE IMMIGRATION AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 1161, 1169 (ii).
QUARANTINE SERVICE OF CANADA: M. (Mr. *Fiset*) for Sel. Com., 657 (i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
QUEBEC:
BRIDGE AT QUEBEC, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1625 (ii).
BUOYS IN RIVER SAGUENAY: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1433 (ii).
CARTRIAGE FACTORY, &c. QUEBEC WATER SUPPLY, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1092 (ii).
CHARLEVOIX: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
COURT OF APPEAL: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 617 (i).
DORCHESTER: Ret. of Member Elect, 1 (i).
DRILL SHED, QUEBEC, WATER SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 85 (i).

QUEBEC—Continued.

- DRILL SHED, COR. : M. (Mr. Amyot) for copy, 854 (i).
 ELECTRIC LIGHT, MONTREAL POST OFFICE, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 1815 (ii).
 GAUVREAU, DR. EDMOND, GRANT FOR PREPARING VACCINE : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 140 (i).
 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, OTTAWA COUNTY : Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).
 GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE, FISHERIES PROTECTION : Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 826 (ii).
 HADLEY COVE PIER, EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. Guay) 140 (i).
 ICE BREAKERS, COUNTY OF BERTHIER : Ques. (Mr. Beausoleil) 45 (i).
 ISLE-AUX-NOIX WHARF, EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. Bourassa) 965 (ii).
 LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL OF LABORERS : in Com. of Sup., 1170, 1568, 1647 (ii).
 LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY, TRANSFER : Ques. (Mr. Couture) 1432 (ii).
 LAKE ST. PETER IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE : M. for Ret (Mr. Amyot) 71 (i).
 LAND VILLA POST OFFICE, PAPERS, &c. : M. for copies (Mr. Choquette) 102 (i).
 LEDUC, CHAS., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVERNMENT : Ques. (Mr. Dessaint) 140 (i).
 LOTBINIÈRE MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. Rinfret) 98 (i).
 MASSAWIPPI VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546 (i).
 MATANE AND RIVER BLANCHE WHARVES, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1067 (ii).
 MEDICAL INSPECTION, QUEBEC : in Com. of Sup., 1195 (ii).
 MEGANTIC MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. Turcott) 825, 1232
 MISSISSQUOI ELECTORAL DISTRICT : Vacancy, 124 (i).
 ——— Return of Member Elect, 646 (i).
 MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546 ; in Com., 1589 (ii).
 MONTREAL AND QUEBEC RIVER POLICE : in Com. of Sup., 1579 (ii).
 MONTREAL HARBOR COMMISSIONERS' RELIEF : Ques. (Mr. Curran) 27
 ——— AMOUNT ADVANCED : Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1135 (ii).
 ——— *Herald* and Mr. CURRAN : Com. of Sup., 1170 (ii).
 MORIN, DR. J. A., CLAIM FOR MEDICAL SERVICES : M. for copy (Mr. Amyot) 655 (i).
 OLIVIER, GEO., DISMISSAL, COR. RESPECTING : M. for copy (Mr. Rinfret) 654 (i).
 OTTAWA COUNTY GEOLOGICAL SURVEY : Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).
 PAPINEAUVILLE HARBOR, DREDGING : Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).
 PORTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546 ; in Com., 1589 (ii).
 QUEBEC AND DEQUEN MAIL SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. Couture) 98 (i).
 ——— AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : Ques. (Mr. Couture) 1432 (ii).
 ——— prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546 ; in Com., 1593 (ii).
 ——— HARBOR COMMISSIONERS (LÉVIS GRAVING DOCK) AMOUNT ADVANCED : Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1136, 1232 (ii).
 QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546 ; in Com., 1593 (ii).
 RIMOUSKI CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1067 (ii).
 ST. AGAPIT, POSTMASTER'S DISMISSAL, COR. : M. for copy (Mr. Rinfret) 654 (i).
 ST. ANNE DES MONT'S WHARF, PAPERS, &c. : M. for copies (Mr. Jones) 1233 (ii).
 ST. HYACINTHE PUBLIC BUILDINGS : M. for Ret. (Mr. Dupont) 651 (i).
 ST. LAWRENCE RIVER CHANNEL, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, COR. : M. for copies* (Sir Donald Smith) 922 (ii).
 ——— NAVIGATION, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, EXPENDITURE : M. for Ret. (Mr. Amyot) 71 (i).
 ——— IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT ADVANCED : Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1135 (ii).
 ——— FLOODS, MONTREAL AND VICINITY, EXAMINATION : in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
 ——— COR., REPS., &c. : M. for copies (Mr. Beausoleil) 60 (i).
 ——— LESGER, CAPT., REPORT *re* FLOODS : Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 899 (ii).

QUEBEC—Continued.

- ST. PIERRE, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, PETITIONS *re* ARTILLERY PRACTICE : M. for copies* (Mr. Langelier, Montmorency) 672 (i).
 SAGUENAY RIVER BUOYS, CONTRACT FOR PLACING, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Couvure) 1433 (ii).
 STUKELY, NORTH, POSTMASTERSHIP, &c., PAPERS, O.C.'s : M. for copies* (Mr. Langelier, Quebec) 1092 (ii).
 SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, MONTREAL DISTRICT : Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 647 (i).
 TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY : prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546 ; in Com., 1593 (ii).
 [See DEPARTMENTS, "SUPPLY," &c.]
 QUEBEC COUNTY CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. Speaker) 309 (i).
 Quebec Harbor Commissioners (Lévis Graving Dock) B. No. 135 (Sir Charles Tupper). Res. prop., 1031 ; in Com., 1296 ; M. to conc., 1383, 1491 ; conc. in, 1^o*, 2^o* and in Com., 1400 ; 3^o*, 1404 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 6.)
 Deb. on 2^o (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 1391 ; (Mr. Kenny) 1395 ; (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 1396 ; (Mr. Ellis) 1397 ; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 1398 ; (Mr. Welsh) 1399 ; (Mr. Gillmor) 1399 (ii).
 Quebec Judiciary. See "PROVINCIAL COURTS."
 QUEBEC WEST, CONTROVERTED ELECTION : Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. Speaker) 309 (i).
 QUEEN'S, N. B., RET. OF MEMBER ELECT. : notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
 RAILWAYS. See
 ALBERTA RY. AND COAL CO.
 ALBERT (N.B.) RY. CO.
 ANNAPOLIS AND ATLANTIC RY. CO.
 BELLEVILLE AND LAKE NIPISSING RY. CO.
 BRANTFORD, WATERLOO AND LAKE ERIN RY. CO.
 BUFFALO, CHIPPAWA AND NIAGARA FALLS STEAMBOAT AND TRAMWAY CO.
 CANADA AND MICHIGAN TUNNEL CO.
 CANADA SOUTHERN AND ERIE AND NIAGARA RY. CO.
 CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. (BRANCH LINES).
 CAPE BRETON RYS.
 CENTRAL ONTARIO RY. CO.
 CENTRAL RY. OF NEW BRUNSWICK.
 CHATHAM JUNCTION RY. CO.
 CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RY. CO.
 CHINOOK BELT AND PRAIRIE RIVER RY. CO.
 COLLINGWOOD AND BAY OF QUINTE RY. CO.
 DERBY BRANCH RY.
 DETROIT RIVER RY. AND BRIDGE CO.
 EASTERN EXTENSION RY.
 EMERSON AND NORTH WESTERN RY. CO.
 ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RY. CO.
 GRAND TRUNK RY. CO.
 GRAND TRUNK, CANADA SOUTHERN, LONDON AND PORT STANLEY, &c.
 GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.
 GREAT WESTERN AND LAKE ONTARIO SHORE JUNCTION RY. CO.
 HEREFORD BRANCH RY. CO.
 INTERCOLONIAL RY.
 INVERNESS AND RICHMOND RY. CO.
 KINGARDINE AND TERNSWATER RY. CO.
 LAKE NIPISSING AND JAMES' BAY RY. CO.
 LONDON AND SOUTH-EASTERN RY. CO.
 MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
 MASKINONGÉ AND NIPISSING RY. CO.
 MONTREAL ISLAND RY. CO.
 NEW YORK, ST. LAWRENCE AND OTTAWA RY. CO.
 ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RY. CO.

RAILWAYS—Continued.

ONTARIO, MANITOBA AND WESTERN RY. CO.
OTTAWA AND PARRY SOUND RY. CO.
ONTARIO AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.
OTTAWA, MORRISBURG AND NEW YORK RY. AND BRIDGE CO.
OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY.
PONTIAC AND RENFREW RY. CO.
PORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. CO.
ST. CATHARINES AND NIAGARA CENTRAL RY. CO.
ST. CLAIR RIVER RY. BRIDGE AND TUNNEL CO.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ADIRONDACK RY. CO.
SHUSWAP AND OKANAGON RY. CO.
SOUTH NORFOLK RY. CO.
SOUTH-WESTERN RY. CO.
SOURIS AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN RY. CO.
STANSTEAD, SHEFFORD AND CHAMBLY RY. CO.
THOUSAND ISLAND RY. CO.
TOBIQUE GYPSUM AND COLONISATION RY. CO.
WESTERN ONTARIO RY. CO.
WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RY. CO.

[See "SUBSIDIES."]

RY ACCIDENTS REPORTED TO GOVT. AND ACTIONS PENDING:
M. for Ret.* (Mr. Denison) 62 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 24 (Mr. Pope). 1^o, 73 (i);
2^o*, 941; in Com., 1175, 1417, 1492; 3^o m. and M. to
recom., 1507; Amt. (Mr. Edgar) 1508; (neg. Y. 54; N.
98) 1510; 3^o*, 1511(ii). (51 Vic., c. 29.)

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 94 (Mr. Cook). 1^o, 598.

RY. COMMISSION, COST: Ques. (Mr. Weldon, St. John) 494 (i).

— REP.: presented (Mr. Pope) 26 (i).

— REP. AND EVIDENCE: Ques. (Mr. Holton) 778 (i),
867 (ii).

— Ques. (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 646 (i).

Ry. Crossing by Streets, &c., Provision B. No.
111 (Mr. Lister). 1^o*, 964 (ii).

Ry. Employés Protection B. No. 5 (Mr. McCarthy).

1^o, 44; 2^om., 762; deb. adjnd., 770 (i); rsmnd., 916; 2^o,
917; Order desohgd. and ref. to Com. on B. 21, 1247 (ii).

Deb. on M. for 2^o (Mr. Denison) 762; (Mr. Cook) 762; (Mr. Jones,
Halifax) 762; (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 762; (Mr. Shanty) 764; (Mr.
Lister) 765; (Mr. Tisdale) 767; (Mr. Barron) 768; (Mr. Temple)
768; (Mr. Armstrong) 769; (Mr. Sproule) 769; (Sir Charles Tupper)
769 (i); (Mr. McCarthy) 916; (Sir Charles Tupper) 917; (Mr.
Laurier) 917 (ii).

RY. LEGISLATION, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. Watson)
1403 (ii).

— M. (Mr. Small) to authorise Ry. Com. to divide a
Bill, 415 (i).

RY. AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 96 (i), 1221, 1460, 1620,
1657, 1644, 1650, 1668 (ii).

— DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. Pope) 73 (i).

RY., CAN., COST: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 141, 170 (i).

RANCHES, DUTIES OF INSPECTOR: Ques. (Mr. Davis) 965 (ii).

Real Property Act. See "TERRITORIES."

REBELLION IN N.W.T., COST: Ques. (Mr. Mulock) 171 (i).

— REP. OF GEN. STRANGE: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 98 (i)

— REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: presented (Mr. White,
Cardwell) 97 (i).

— TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Mulock)
498 (i).

— LOSSES COMMISSION, REPS., &c.: M. for copy (Mr.
Laurier) 63 (i).

REBELLION IN N.W.T., CLAIMS OF SCOUTS, &c.: prop. Res.
(Mr. Davin) 1242 (ii).

— PENSIONS, MILITIAMEN, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1202,
1642 (ii).

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, CONSOLIDATED FUND: M. for
Ret.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 38 (i).

RECEIVER GENERAL (HALIFAX): in Com. of Sup., 88 (i).

RECIPROCITY WITH U. S.: prop. Res. (Sir Richard
Cartwright) 141; neg., 646 (i).

Deb. (Mr. White, Cardwell) 161; (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 172; (Mr. Foster)
183, (Amt) 194 (i).

Deb. on Amt. (Mr. Charlton) 206; (Mr. Davin) 228; (Mr. Dessain)
203; (Mr. Lavergne) 234; (Mr. McMillan, Huron) 194; (Mr.
McNeil) 240; (Mr. Porter) 199; agreed to (Y. 124, N. 67) 646 (i)

Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Jones, Halifax) 257; deb. (Mr. Amyot) 532; (Mr.
Baird) 345; (Mr. Barron) 303; (Mr. Beausoleil) 392; (Mr. Béchard)
463; (Mr. Borden) 358; (Mr. Bowman) 543; (Mr. Brien) 598;

(Mr. Brown) 288; (Mr. Cameron) 610; (Mr. Chapleau) 565; (Mr.
Choquette) 204; (Mr. Cockburn) 322; (Mr. Curran) 310; (Mr.
Dupont) 398; (Mr. Ellis) 335; (Mr. Ferguson, Welland) 458;

(Mr. Fiast) 612; (Mr. Flynn) 571; (Mr. Freeman) 499; (Mr. Gi-
gault) 714; (Mr. Gillmor) 635; (Mr. Haggart) 527; (Mr. Hesson)
583; (Mr. Hickey) 493; (Mr. Huispeth) 467; (Mr. Jones, Digby)

605; (Mr. Kenny) 381; (Mr. Kirk) 593; (Mr. Landerkin) 476;
(Gen. Laurie) 371; (Mr. Laurier) 554; (Mr. Macdonald, Huron)

276; (Mr. McIntyre) 487; (Mr. McKewen) 547; (Mr. Mc-
Mullen) 444; (Mr. Masson) 539; (Mr. Mills, Annapolis) 328;

(Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 603; (Mr. Monroff) 351; (Mr. Mulock) 626;
(Mr. O'Brien) 525; (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 401; (Mr. Perly,
Ottawa) 632; (Mr. Platt) 605; (Mr. Préfontaine) 642; (Mr. Bin-

fret) 271; (Mr. Robertson) 377; (Mr. Rykert) 416; (Mr. Semple)
578; (Mr. Skinner) 355; (Mr. Somerville) 618; (Mr. Sproule) 362;

(Mr. Taylor) 438; (Mr. Tupper, Pictou) 257; (Mr. Weldon, Albert)
576; (Mr. Welsh) 317; (Mr. White, Renfrew) 624; (Mr. Wilson,
Argenteuil) 613; (Mr. Wilson, Elgin) 588; (Mr. Wilson, Lennox)

511; (Mr. Wood, Westmoreland) 298; neg. (Y. 67, N. 124) 646 (i).

RECIPROCITY WITH U. S. AND RETALIATORY BILL: Remarks
(Sir Richard Cartwright, &c.) 516 (i).

— REDUCTION OF DUTIES: Remarks (Mr. Landerkin)
554 (i).

— M. to make Res. First Order of the Day (Sir Richard
Cartwright) 43 (i).

REGINA GOAL: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (ii).

REGISTERED LETTER, PAYMENT FOR LOSS: Ques. (Mr. Lander-
kin) 750 (i).

REGULATIONS re REGISTRY OF TRADES UNIONS: M. for copies*
(Mr. Amyot) 50 (i).

RENDERED LARD. See "LARD."

RENFREW, SOUTH, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification
(Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

RIDEAU HALL, REPAIRS, FURNITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup.,
1542; concd., 1688 (ii).

REPORTS PRESENTED, &c.:

AGRICULTURE (Mr. Carling) 455 (i).

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP. (Sir Charles Tupper) 18 (i).

CIVIL SERVICE LIST OF CANADA (Mr. Chapleau) 172 (i).

CRIMINAL STATISTICS (Mr. Carling) 1551 (ii).

INLAND REVENUE (Mr. Costigan) 18 (i).

INSURANCE COMPANIES, ABSTRACT (Sir Charles Tupper) 1207 (ii).

INTERIOR (Mr. White, Cardwell) 18 (i).

LACHINE CANAL WATER POWER, ROYAL COMMISSION (Mr. Pope) 52 (i).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Foster) 138 (i).

REPORTS, &c.—Continued.

MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 18 (i).
 NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 499 (i).
 PENITENTIARIES (Mr. *Thompson*) 18 (i).
 POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. *McLelan*) 20 (i).
 PRINTING AND STATIONERY, PUBLIC (Mr. *Chapleau*) 138 (i).
 PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 18 (i).
 PUBLIC WORKS (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 18 (i).
 RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. *Pope*) 73 (i).
 RAILWAYS, ROYAL COMMISSION (Mr. *Pope*) 26 (i).
 REBELLION IN THE N. W. T., ROYAL COMMISSION (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 97 (i).

SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. *Chapleau*) 20 (i).

TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS (Mr. *Bowell*) 18 (i).

Representation Act (B.C.) Amt. B. No. 55 (Mr. *Baker*). 1°, 309 (i).

Representation Act (House of Commons) B. No. 56 (Mr. *Baker*). 1°, 309 (ii).

Representation (N.W.T.) Act Amt. B. No. 125 (Mr. *Thompson*). 1°, 1231; 2°*, in Com. and 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Watson*) to recom., neg. (Y. 62, N. 89) and 3°*, 1551 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 10.)

RETALIATORY BILL: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 516.

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c., MOTIONS FOR:

ACCIDENTS, RY., REPORTED TO GOVT., AND ACTIONS PENDING*: Mr. *Denison*, 62 (i).
 "ALERT," COR. RESPECTING CONDITION: Mr. *Welsh*, 827 (ii).
 ALLEN, WARREN, CLAIM FOR ICE-BOAT, PAPERS, &c.: Mr. *Davis* (*P.E.I.*) 833 (ii).
 ARTILLERY PRACTICE ON ISLAND OF ORLWANS, PETITIONS, &c.*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Montmorency*) 672 (i).
 AUBREY, REV. M., SERVICES AS MILITARY CHAPLAIN, COR.: Mr. *Amyot*, 654 (i).
 AUDET, LIEUT. COL., AND FRENCH TRANSLATION OF FIELD EXERCISES, COR.: Mr. *Amyot*, 655 (i).
 AUDETTE, ANTOINE, NORTH STUKELY POSTMASTER, O.O.'s, &c.*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*) 1092 (ii).
 BAY FORTUNE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER, REP. OF ENGINEER: Mr. *McIntyre*, 656 (i).
 BAY OF QUINTE, BRIDGE AT BELLEVILLE, COR.*: Mr. *Platt*, 922 (ii).
 BEHRING'S SEA SEIZURES, COR. RESPECTING: Mr. *Gordon*, 966 (ii).
 BRYANTON, ALBERT, AND ALLAN, COR. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY.*: Mr. *Mitchell*, 866 (ii).
 CABLE TO PELÉE ISLAND, PETITIONS, &c.: Mr. *Patterson* (*Essex*) 826 (ii).
 C. P. R. See general heading.
 CANADIAN VESSELS LOST ON GREAT LAKES: Mr. *Dawson*, 19, 752 (i).
 CANADIAN WRECKING VESSELS IN U. S. WATERS, COR.: Mr. *Edgar*, 665 (i).
 CAPITAL ACCOUNT, I.C.R., EXPENDITURE: Mr. *Jones* (*Halifax*) 103.
 CAP CHAT AND GRAND VALLÉE FISHERIES, REPS.: Mr. *Joncas*, 1232 (ii).
 CAPE BRETON RY., EASTERN SECTION, COR.*: Mr. *Flynn*, 1259 (ii).
 CARTRIDGE FACTORY, &c. (QUEBEC) WATER SUPPLY, COR.*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*) 1092 (ii).
 CASUALTIES, &c., ON I.C.R.: Mr. *Weldon* (*St. John*) 61 (i).
 CAUGHNAWAGA INDIANS, ELECTION OF CHIEFS, COR.: Mr. *Doyon*, 899 (ii).
 CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION OF 1876, PAPERS, &c., re G. J. MACDONALD*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 866 (ii).
 CHIPPAWA AND OTTAWA NATION INDIANS' CLAIMS*: Mr. *Patterson* (*Essex*) 498 (i).
 CLANCY, PATRICK, COR. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY.*: Mr. *Mitchell*, 866 (ii).
 CLOTHING FOR MILITIA, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS*: Mr. *Bowman*, 866 (ii).
 COAL SUPPLY, GOVT., TENDERS AND CONTRACTS*: Mr. *Guillet*, 866
 COLONISATION INSPECTOR, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *Watson*, 71 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

COLONISATION INSPECTORS IN N.W.T.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 866 (ii).
 COLONISATION CO.'S IN MAN. AND N.W.T.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 498 (i).
 CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 38 (i).
 CONFEDERATION TERMS WITH P.E.I.*: Mr. *Perry*, 61 (i).
 CONFEDERATION, ADMISSION OF NEWFOUNDLAND, COR.: Mr. *Laurier*, 664 (i).
 COSTS, &c., re ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBERING CO.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 20 (i).
 CULBERTSON, ARCHIBALD, DISMISSAL: Mr. *Burdett*, 977 (ii).
 CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT QUEBEC, COR., O.O.'s, &c.: Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*) 1068 (ii).
 DERBY BRANCH RY. AND JOHN KNIGHT, &c., COR.*: Mr. *Mitchell*, 866.
 DIAMONDS, &c., SEIZED AT QUEBEC, COR., O.O.'s, &c.: Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*) 1068, 1092 (ii).
 DISALLOWANCE OF MAN. RY. CHARTERS, COR. WITH IMP. GOVT.*: Mr. *Laurier*, 672 (i).
 DOM. LANDS AGENTS' INSTRUCTIONS: Mr. *McMullen*, 36, 45 (i).
 DOM. NOTES, CONTRACT FOR PRINTING: Mr. *Edgar*, 649 (i).
 DOM. SCRIP ISSUED IN MAN. AND N.W.T.*: Mr. *Wilson* (*Elgin*) 866.
 DRILL SHED, QUEBEC, WATER SUPPLY, COR.: Mr. *Amyot*, 654 (i).
 DUNCAN, WM. L., KILLED ON I.O.R., PROCEEDINGS AT INQUEST*: Mr. *Weldon* (*St. John*) 498 (i).
 EASTERN EXTENSION RY., COR. re RIGHT OF WAY: Mr. *Kirk*, 802 (ii).
 EASTERN EXTENSION RY. AND I.C.R. TENDERS, &c., FOR FENCING*: Mr. *Kirk*, 866 (ii).
 EXPORTS AND IMPORTS: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 28 (i).
 EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN N.W., PROF. SAUNDERS' REP.*: Mr. *McMullen*, 498 (i).
 EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN N.W.T., LOCATION, PAPERS, &c.*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 866 (ii).
 FIELD EXERCISES, FRENCH TRANSLATION, COR.: Mr. *Amyot*, 655 (i).
 FIRE INSURANCE RISKS, POLICIES, &c.*: Mr. *Bowman*, 866 (ii).
 FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE, COR. RESPECTING*: Mr. *Davis* (*P.E.I.*) 866 (ii).
 FLOODS ON RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, COR., REPS., &c.: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 60 (i).
 FORTIN, NOEL, COR. re ACCIDENT AND DAMAGES: Mr. *Fiset*, 902 (ii).
 GORDON, COMMANDER, COR. re FISHERIES PROTECTION SERVICE*: Mr. *Davis* (*P.E.I.*) 866 (ii).
 GOVERNMENT STEAMERS, SALARIES OF CAPTAINS: Mr. *Welsh*, 37 (i).
 GRAZING LANDS, LESSEES*: Mr. *Davis*, 866 (ii).
 GRENFELL (N.W.T.) EXPERIMENTAL FARM, LOCATION, PAPERS*: Mr. *Landerkin*, 866 (ii).
 GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO., PAPERS, &c.: Mr. *Edgar*, 653 (i).
 HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *Watson*, 71 (i); Mr. *McMullen**, 866 (ii).
 I.C.R. See general heading.
 INSTRUCTIONS TO DOM. LAND AGENTS: Mr. *McMullen*, 36, 45 (i).
 INGOLDSBY STATION POST OFFICE, PETITIONS, &c.: Mr. *Barron*, 1243 (ii).
 IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 28 (i).
 JAMAICA, COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH, COR.: Gen. *Laurie*, 903 (ii).
 JUDGES OF SUPERIOR COURT, RETIRED, NAMES, &c.*: Mr. *Small*, 62 (i).
 KAMLOOPS AS AN OUTPOST OF ENTRY, MR. PARMÉE'S REP.*: Mr. *Mara*, 498 (i).
 KETTLE AND STONY POINT RESERVES, COMPLAINTS AGAINST INDIANS*: Mr. *Lister*, 1259 (ii).
 KIT ALLOWANCE YORK-SIMCOE BATT.: Mr. *Mulock*, 66 (i).
 KNIGHT, JNO. AND ALLAN, COR. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY.*: Mr. *Mitchell*, 866 (ii).
 LABOR COMMISSION, INSTRUCTIONS, &c.*: Mr. *Beausoleil*, 872 (i).
 LAKE ST. PETER IMPROVEMENTS, EXPENDITURE: Mr. *Amyot*, 71 (i).
 LAND AGENTS INSTRUCTIONS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Mr. *McMullen*, 36, 45 (i).
 LAND VILLA POST OFFICE, PAPERS, &c.: Mr. *Choquette*, 102 (i).
 LEASEHOLDERS IN ALBERTA DISTRICT, N.W.T., CATTLE, &c.*: Sir *Richard Cartwright*, 498 (i).
 LEVI, DAVID, SEIZURE OF DIAMONDS, &c.*: Mr. *Langelier* (*Quebec*) 1092 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, TOTAL AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.* : Mr. Mulock, 498 (i).
- LIVES LOST THROUGH WRECKS ON GREAT LAKES : Mr. Dawson, 19 (i).
- LOBSTER COMMISSION, REPS., &c. : Mr. Flynn, 86 (i).
- MACDONALD, GEO. J., PAPERS, &c, re CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION* : Mr. Landerkin, 866 (ii).
- MAIL SERVICE IN P.E.I., Mr. Davies (P.E.I.) 47, 52 (i).
- MAN. AND N.W.T. HOMESTEAD AND COLONISATION INSPECTORS : Mr. Watson, 71 (i).
- MAN. AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO., PAPERS, &c. : Mr. Edgar, 653 (i).
- MIDLAND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, COR.* : Mr. Cook, 1259 (ii).
- MILITARY SCHOOL, ST. JOHN, QUE., SERVICES OF CHAPLAIN, COR. : Mr. Amyot, 654 (i).
- MILITIA CLOTHING, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS* : Mr. Bowman, 866 (ii).
- MISSISSAUGA INDIANS' CLAIM (UNCEDED LANDS) COR.* : Mr. Madill, 866 (ii).
- MOHAWK INDIANS, COR. re DISMISSAL OF COUNCILLOR CULBERTSON : Mr. Burdett, 977 (ii).
- MORIN, DR. J. A., CLAIM FOR MEDICAL SERVICES : Mr. Amyot, 655 (i).
- MOULIN, REV. FATHER, COR. re RESCUE AT BATOCHÉ* : Mr. Searth, 866 (ii).
- N.W.T. REBELLION LOSSES COMMISSION, REPS., &c. : Mr. Laurier, 73.
- NAUFRAGE, P.E.I., NAVIGATION, REP. OF ENGINEER : Mr. McIntyre, 70.
- NEELY, PRIVATE THOS., DEATH OF, COR. re COMPENSATION TO FAMILY : Mr. Mulock, 649 (i).
- NEWFOUNDLAND CONFEDERATION, COR. : Mr. Laurier, 664 (i).
- "NORTHERN LIGHT." See general heading.
- NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS SUBWAY, REP. OF ENGINEERS, &c. : Mr. Perry, 661 (i).
- OCEAN MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND COR. : Mr. Langelier (Quebec) 1067 (ii).
- OLIVIER, GEO., DISMISSAL, COR. RESPECTING : Mr. Rinfret, 654 (i).
- OTTAWA RIVER WORKS AND IMPROVEMENTS, TOTAL COST, &c. : Mr. Amyot, 827 (ii).
- PARMELEE, MR., REP. re KAMLOOPS AS AN OUTPORT OF ENTRY* : Mr. Mara, 498 (i).
- PELÉE ISLAND CABLE, PETITIONS, &c. : Mr. Patterson (Essex) 826.
- PICTON HARBOR, COR., &c. re DREDGING* : Mr. Platt, 866 (ii).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COR., &c re CONSTRUCTION* : Mr. Platt, 866 (ii).
- PION & CO., CLAIM FOR GOODS DAMAGED ON I. C. R.* : Mr. Langelier (Quebec) 1092 (ii).
- POST OFFICE. See general heading.
- P. E. I. MAIL SERVICE : Mr. Davies (P. E. I.) 47, 52 (i).
- NAVIGATION AT NAUFRAGE, REP. OF ENGINEER : Mr. McIntyre, 70 (i).
- RY. ACCIDENTS REPORTED TO GOVT. AND ACTIONS PENDING* : Mr. Denison, 62 (i).
- REBELLION, N.W., LOSSES COMMISSION, REPS., &c. : Mr. Laurier, 73.
- REBELLION IN N.W.T., TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS* : Mr. Mulock, 498 (i).
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE, CONSOLIDATED FUND* : Sir Richard Cartwright, 38 (i).
- REGULATIONS re REGISTRY OF TRADES UNIONS* : Mr. Amyot, 50 (i).
- ROLLING STOCK PURCHASED FOR I. C. R. : Mr. Weldon (St. John) 61.
- ROYAL LABOR COMMISSION, INSTRUCTIONS, &c* : Mr. Beauvoil, 672.
- RUSSELL, SAMUEL, COR. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY.* : Mr. Mitchell, 866 (ii).
- ST. AGAPIT POSTMASTER'S DISMISSAL, COR. : Mr. Rinfret, 654 (i).
- ST. CATHERINES MILLING AND LUMBERING CO, COSTS, &c.* : Mr. McMullen, 20 (i).
- ST. HYACINTHE PUBLIC BUILDINGS : Mr. Dupont, 651 (i).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER FLOODS, COR., REPS., &c. : Mr. Beauvoil, 60 (i).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER NAVIGATION, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, EXPENDITURE : Mr. Amyot, 71 (i).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER CHANNEL, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, COR.* : Sir Donald Smith, 922 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- ST. LAWRENCE FISHERIES, CAP CHAT AND GRAND VALLÉE, REPS. : Mr. Joncas, 1232 (ii).
- ST. PIERRE, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, PETITIONS re ARTILLERY PRACTICE* : Mr. Langelier (Montmorency) 672 (i).
- STE. ANNE DES MONTS WHARF, PAPERS, &c. : Mr. Joncas, 1233 (ii).
- STE. FLAVIE, INQUEST ON BODY OF W. L. DUNCAN* : Mr. Weldon, St. John, 498 (i).
- SAUNDERS, PROF., REP. ON EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN N.W. : Mr. McMullen, 498 (i).
- SCHOOL OF INFANTRY ("C" COMPANY) COR. re DEATH OF PRIVATE NEELY : Mr. Mulock, 649 (i).
- SCRIP ISSUED IN MAN. AND N.W.T.* : Mr. Wilson (Elgin) 866 (ii).
- SEIZURES IN BEHRING'S SEA, COR. RESPECTING : Mr. Gordon, 966 (ii).
- SIMS & SLATER, CONTRACTORS CAPE BRETON RY., COR.* : Mr. Flynn, 1259 (ii).
- SIX NATION INDIANS, CLAIM FOR FLOODING LANDS, COR.* : Mr. Somerville, 672 (i).
- SMYTH, HENRY, EMPLOYMENT AND AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.* : Mr. McMullen, 866 (ii).
- SOURIS AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN RY. CO., PAPERS, &c. : Mr. Edgar, 653 (i).
- SQUATTERS CLAIMS IN N.W.T. : Mr. McMullen, 656 (i).
- STAG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RIVER ST. CLAIR, COR.* : Mr. Lister, 1259 (ii).
- STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.* : Mr. Perry, 61 (i).
- STONEY POINT AND KETTLE RESERVES, COMPLAINTS AGAINST INDIANS* : Mr. Lister, 1259 (ii).
- STRATHROY POST OFFICE AND CUSTOM HOUSE* : Mr. McMullen, 498 (i).
- STUKELY (NORTH) POSTMASTERSHIP, O.C.'s, &c.* : Mr. Langelier (Quebec) 1092 (ii).
- SUBSIDIES TO RYS., AMOUNT VOTED SINCE 1880* : Mr. Semple, 110 (i).
- SUBWAY, NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, REP. OF ENGINEERS, &c. : Mr. Perry, 661 (i).
- SULTE, BENJ., FRENCH TRANSLATION OF FIELD EXERCISES, COR. : Mr. Amyot, 655 (i).
- SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES RETIRED, NAMES, &c.* : Mr. Small, 61 (i).
- TRADES UNIONS, COPIES OF RULES : Mr. Amyot, 46 (i).
- UNDER 35 VIC., CAP. 30, &c.* : Mr. Amyot, 50 (i).
- REGULATIONS re REGISTRY, &c.* : Mr. Amyot, 50 (i).
- TERMS OF CONFEDERATION WITH P. E. I.* : Mr. Perry, 61 (i).
- TRENT VALLEY CANAL COMMISSION, COR., &c. : Mr. Barron, 71 (i).
- UNITED STATES WRECKING VESSELS IN CAN. WATERS, COR. : Mr. Edgar, 665 (i).
- VALLÉBAND, F. O., CUSTOMS SEIZURES ON, COR., O. C.'s, &c. : Mr. Langelier (Quebec) 1068 (ii).
- WATER SUPPLY TO CARTRIDGE FACTORY AND DRILL HALL, QUEBEC, COR.* : Mr. Langelier (Quebec) 1092 (ii).
- WELLINGTON HARBOR OF REFUGE, COR., &c.* : Mr. Platt, 866 (i).
- WRECK ON GREAT LAKES AND LOSS OF LIFE : Mr. Dawson, 19, 752 (i).
- WRECKING VESSELS (CAN.) IN U. S. WATERS, COR. : Mr. Edgar, 665 (i).
- YORK-SIMCOE BATT. KIT ALLOWANCE : Mr. Mulock, 66 (i).
- YOUNG, CAPT., COR., &c., RESPECTING CLAIM* : Mr. Searth, 866 (i).
- RETURNS, &c, BRINGING DOWN : Remarks (Mr. Laurier, &c.) 1136, 1433, 1506 (ii).
- PREPARATION, &c. : in Com of Sup., 1615; conc., 1688 (ii).
- Revenue and Audit Act (Chap. 29 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 87 (Sir Charles Tupper).** Res. prop. and 1^o of B., 498 (i); 2^o, 889; Res. in Com., 891; conc. in, 931; B. in Com., 931, 943; 3^o*, 943 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 7.)
- RIDEAU CANAL BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 1646, 1671 (ii).
- RIMOUSKI CUSTOMS COLLECTOR : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1067 (ii).
- PUBLIC WORKS : Ques. (Mr. Fiset) 1067 (ii).
- ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 1571, 1675 (ii).

- ROBERTSON, ALEXANDER, LATE M.P.: Remarks (Sir *Hector Langevin*) on decease, 61 (i).
- ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (ii).
- PURCHASE, I.C.R.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 61 (i).
- ROOME, W. F., ESQ., MEMBER-ELECT FOR WEST MIDDLESEX: introduced, 380 (i).
- ROWAND, J., ESQ., MEMBER ELECT FOR WEST BRUCE: introduced, 2 (i).
- ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 1196, 1692 (ii).
- ROYAL LABOR COMMISSION. See "LABOR."
- ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 1218; conc., 1687 (ii).
- RUSSELL ELECTION, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 554 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 455, 516, 525 (i).
- Ret. of Member on certificate of Returning Officer, 1415 (ii).
- notification of Return (Mr. *Speaker*) 1522 (ii).
- M. (Mr. *Laurier*) for Speaker to Issue Writ, 416 (i).
- RUSSELL, SAMUEL, COR. re DAMAGES DERBY BRANCH RY.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 866 (ii).
- STE. ANNE'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1459, 1646 (ii).
- STE. ANNE DES MONTS WHARF, PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Joncas*) 1233 (ii).
- ST. AGAPIT POSTMASTER'S DISMISSAL, COR.: M. for copy (Mr. *Rinfret*) 654 (i).
- St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 61 (Mr. *Rykert*). 1°*, 380; 2°*, 530 (i): in Com. and 3°*, 1049; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1345 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 78*.)
- St. Catharines and Niagara Central Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 137 (Mr. *Boyle*). Rule suspended, 1°*, 2°* and in Com., 1522; 3°*, 1524 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 79*.)
- ST. CATHARINES MILLING AND LUMBERING Co.'s COSTS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 20 (i).
- ST. CHARLES BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1225, 1645 (ii).
- St. Clair River Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 17 (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*). 1°*, 73; 2°*, 219; in Com. and 3°*, 498 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 94*.)
- GOVT. ASSISTANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 1432 (ii).
- STE. FLAVIE, INQUEST ON BODY OF W. L. DUNCAN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 498 (i).
- ST. HYACINTHE PUBLIC BUILDINGS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dupont*) 651 (i).
- St. John's and Iberville Hydraulic and Manufacturing Co.'s B. No. 71 (Mr. *Vanasse*). 1°*, 454; 2°, 530; in Com. and 3°*, 726 (i).
- ST. JOHN, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1224 (ii).
- ST. JOHN HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, REP. OF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 86 (i).
- St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 66 (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1°*, 380; 2°*, 498; in Com. and 3°*, 612 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 64*.)
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 1453, 1646 (ii).
- CHANNEL, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, COR.: M. for copies* (Sir *Donald Smith*) 922 (ii).
- FISHERIES (CAP CHAT AND GRAND VALLEE) REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. *Joncas*) 1232 (ii).
- FLOODS, COR., REPS., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 60 (ii).
- EXAMINATION: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (ii).
- LEGER, CAPT., REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 899 (ii).
- IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT ADVANCED: Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 1135 (ii).
- ST. LAWRENCE RIVER NAVIGATION, MONTREAL AND QUEBEC, EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 71 (i).
- St. Lawrence River Navigation Repeal B. No. 28 (Mr. *Guay*). 1°*, 97 (i).
- ST. OURS LOCKS: in Com. of Sup., 1460 (ii).
- ST. PIERRE, ISLAND OF ORLEANS, PETITIONS re ARTILLERY PRACTICE: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Montmorency*) 672 (i).
- ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 136 (i); conc., 1686 (ii).
- SAGUENAY RIVER BUOYS, CONTRACT FOR PLACING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Couture*) 1433 (ii).
- SAILORS PROTECTION, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Elgar*) 966 (ii).
- SALARIES, &c. (HOUSE OF COMMONS): in Com. of Sup., 1025, 1668 (i).
- SALMON FISHERIES, HUDSON BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826 (ii).
- SALT IN BARRELS, BAGS, &c., WEIGHT: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan, Huron*) 97 (i).
- Salt Packages. See "WEIGHTS AND MEASURES."
- SARNIA AND PORT HURON TUNNEL: Ques. (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*) 1432 (ii).
- SAULT ST. MARIE CANAL: in Com. of Sup. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1442, 1624 (ii).
- Deb. (Mr. *Dawson*) 1442; (Mr. *Lister*) 1443; (Mr. *Davies, P.E.I.*) 1444; (Mr. *Purcell*) 1445; (Mr. *Cook*) 1446; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1446; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1446; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1447; (Mr. *Hesson*) 1449; (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1450; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1450; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1451 (ii).
- SAUNDERS, PROFESSOR, REP. ON EXPERIMENTAL FARM IN N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).
- SCHOOL OF INFANTRY ("C" COMPANY) COR. re DEATH OF PRIVATE NEELY: M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 649 (i).
- SCOWS, &c., CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 1646 (ii).
- SCRIP ISSUED IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson, Elgin*) 866 (ii).
- SECRETARY OF STATE:
- CIVIL SERVICE LIST OF CANADA: presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 172 (i).
- NUMBER OF EMPLOYÉS: Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 495 (i).
- TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 985 (ii).
- COPYRIGHT, PROP. LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 98 (i).
- FRANCHISE ACT: in Com. of Sup., 1641 (ii).

SECRETARY OF STATE—Continued.

- LABOR COMMISSION, REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 98 (i).
- CERTIFIED COPIES OF DEPOSITIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 171 (i).
- COMPLAINTS AGAINST CHAIRMAN, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 171 (i).
- COST: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 494 (i).
- INSTRUCTIONS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 672 (i).
- NUMBER AND SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 1468 (ii).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, TOTAL AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 493 (i).
- NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION, COR.: M. for copies (Mr. *Laurier*) 864 (i).
- Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Mitchell*) 111 (i).
- PRINTING AND STATIONERY, PUBLIC, REP.: presented (Mr. *Chap'ean*) 138 (i).
- RAILWAY COMMISSION, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 494 (i).
- REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 646 (i).
- RETURNS: Enquiry for (Mr. *Laurier, &c.*) 1136, 1433, 1506 (ii).
- SECRETARY OF STATE'S REP.: presented (Mr. *Chap'ean*) 20 (i).
- VOTERS' LIST, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 27 (i).
- SUSPENSION OF REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 965 (ii).
- [See "ELECTIONS," "SUPPLY," &c.]
- Securities to the Crown.** See "LETTERS PATENT."
- SEIZURES IN BEHRING'S SEA, COR. RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gordon*) 966 (ii).
- SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES. See "COMMITTEES."
- SESSIONAL CLERKS: in Com of Sup., 1025, 1668 (ii).
- NUMBER AND AMOUNTS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1299 (ii).
- SHANNON, WM., DEFALCATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 965.
- SHEFFORD CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 309 (i).
- SHELburne, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- SHERWOOD, A. P., AND CAPE BRETON RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Cook*) 965 (ii).
- SHIPPING OBSTRUCTIONS. See "ATLANTIC OCEAN."
- Ship Channel.** See "MONTREAL."
- Ships Safety Act** (*Chap. 77 Rev. Statutes*) Amt. B. No. 112 (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 1000; Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 1473 (ii).
- Shushwap and Okanagon Ry. Co.'s incorp. Act** Amt. B. No. 43 (Mr. *Mara*). 1°, 206; 2°, 222; in Com. and 3°, 493 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 88.*)
- SIMMS & SLATER, CONTRACTORS, CAPE BRETON RY., COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Flynn*) 1259 (ii).
- SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron*) 1067 (ii).
- SIGNAL SERVICE: in Com of Sup., 1582, 1633 (ii).
- SIX NATION INDIANS, CLAIM FOR FLOODING LANDS, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Somerville*) 672 (i).
- SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 1620, 1632, 1684 (ii).
- SMYTH, HENRY, EMPLOYMENT AND AMOUNTS PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 866 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 495 (i).
- Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 647 (i).
- SNETSINGER, MR., EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 825 (ii).
- SNOW SHEDS, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 1645 (ii).

- South Norfolk Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34** (Mr. *Tisdale*). 1°, 110; 2°, 128; in Com. and 3°, 496 (i). (51 *Vic., c. 57.*)
- South-Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54** (Mr. *Hall*). 1°, 270; 2°, 498 (i); in Com. and 3° m., 912; Amt. (Mr. *Bergin*) 6 m. h., neg. (Y. 57; N. 86) 953; 3°, 954 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 52.*)
- SOURIS AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN RY. CO., PAPERS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 653 (i).
- SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE, 2 (i), 1693 (ii).
- Speedy Trials.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- SPRING HILL, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 1225 (ii).
- SQUATTERS CLAIMS IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 656 (i).
- STAG ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, RIVER ST. CLAIR, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 1259 (ii).
- STANSTEAD CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 514 (i).
- Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Ry. Co.'s B. No. 72** (Mr. *Fisher*). 1°, 454; 2°, 726 (i); in Com. and 3°, 1207 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 54.*)
- Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 139** (Mr. *Fisher*). Rule suspended, 1°, 2°, in Com. and 3°, 1563 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 55.*)
- STATISTICAL DIAGRAMS, LITHOGRAPHING: in Com. of Sup., 1663 (ii).
- Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 99** (Mr. *Foster*). 1°, 750 (i); 2° and in Com., 1402; 3°, 1404 (ii). (51 *Vic., c. 26.*)
- STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH P. E. I. See "NORTHERN LIGHT," and "P. E. I."
- STEEL CO. OF CANADA (N.S.) SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1546; in Com., 1594 (ii).
- Stocks and Merchandise (gambling).** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- STONE POINT AND KETTLE RESERVES, COMPLAINT AGAINST INDIANS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Lister*) 1259 (ii).
- STRANGE, GEN., COMPENSATION FOR LOSS OF PENSION: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 140 (i).
- REP. re REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 98 (i).
- Remarks (Mr. *Amyot*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1600 (ii).
- STRATHROY POST OFFICE AND CUSTOMS HOUSE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 498 (i).
- PUBLIC BUILDINGS, SITE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 66 (i).
- STRAUBENZIE, COL.: in Com. of Sup., 1209 (ii).
- STUKELY (NORTH) POSTMASTERSHIP, &c., PAPERS, O.C.'s.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1092 (ii).
- Submarine Cables.** See "INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION."
- SUBSIDIES. See
- ALBERT RY. CO. (N.B.)
- CENTRAL RY. CO. (N.B.)
- CHATHAM BRANCH RY. (N.B.)
- HALIFAX COTTON CO. (N.S.)
- ELGIN, PETITCODIAC AND HAYLOCK RY. CO.

SUBSIDIES—Continued.

KENT NORTHERN RY. Co.
 MASSAWIPPI VALLEY RY. Co.
 MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. Co.
 NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RY. Co.
 OTTAWA AND PARRY SOUND RY. Co.
 PONTIAC PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. Co.
 PORT ARTHUR, DULUTH AND WESTERN RY. Co.
 QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. Co.
 QUEBEC CENTRAL RY. Co.
 TEMISCOUATA RY. Co.
 STEEL Co. OF CANADA (N.S.)
 TOBIQUE VALLEY RY. Co.

Subsidies to Rys. authorisation B. No. 140 (Sir Charles Tupper). Res. prop., 1546; in Com., 1587; conc. in and 1^o*, 2^o* and in Com., 1595; 3^o*, 1629 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 3.)

SUBWAY, NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS, REP. OF ENGINEERS, &c.: M. for copy (Mr. Perry) 661 (i).

SUBSIDIES TO RYS., AMOUNT VOTED SINCE 1850: M for Ret.* (Mr. Semple) 110 (i).

SULTE, BENJ., FRENCH TRANSLATION OF FIELD EXERCISES, COR.: M. for copy (Mr. Amyot) 655 (i).

Summary Convictions. See "CRIMINAL LAW."

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (Chap. 135 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. 57 (Mr. Baker). 1^o, 309 (i).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (Chap. 135 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 110 (Mr. Thompson). 1^o, 964; Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 1402 (ii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (Chap. 135 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 120 (Mr. Thompson). 1^o, 1135; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 1402; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1549 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 37.)

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES, MONTREAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. Préfontaine) 647 (i).

— RETIRED, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Small) 62 (i).

SUPERVISION OF BANKS. See "BANKS."

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. OR REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Amt. (Mr. Mills) Canada Temperance Act, 74 (i); Remarks (Mr. Brien) Cable to Pelée Island, 1011; Remarks (Mr. Rykert) Mrs. Gowanlock's Claim, 1015; Remarks (Mr. Laurier) Kingston Post Office Irregularities, 1017; Remarks (Mr. Edgar) Bresaylor Half-Breeds, 1515; Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) Walter Jones' Appointment, 1524; Remarks (Mr. Kirk) Lobster Fisheries, 1551; Amt. (Mr. Mitchell) Duties on Flour, Cornmeal, &c., 1564; Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright and others) Pauper Immigration, &c., 1595; Remarks (Mr. Dawson) Boundaries of Ontario, 1629 (ii).

CONCURRENCE, 1686 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX., transmitting Estimates for 1888-89, 50 (i); Suppl. for 1887-88, 962; Suppl. for 1888-89, 1403 (ii).

MS. FOR COM., 17, 74, 88, 104, 112, 128 (i), 1011, 1148, 1446, 1514, 1524, 1551, 1595, 1629, 1681 (ii).

RES. (Mr. Bowell for Sir Charles Tupper) for Com., 17; in Com., 85, 88, 104, 112, 128 (i), 1021, 1148, 1446, 1533, 1561, 1601, 1629, 1681 (ii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. See "Justice."

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:

Archives, care of, 1149 (ii).

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—Continued.

Agricultural Societies in N.W.T., 1155 (ii).

Census and Statistics, 1155 (ii).

Chipman, C. C., Services, 1149 (ii).

Colonial and Indian Exhibition, 1638 (ii).

Criminal Statistics, 1151 (ii).

Experimental Farms, 1154 (ii).

General Vote, 1148 (ii).

Health Statistics, 1151 (ii).

Patent Record, Expenses, 1150 (ii).

Canals. See "Railways" and "Collection of Revenues."

Charges of Management:

Auditor and Receiver General, Winnipeg, 88 (i).

Dominion Notes, Printing, 89 (i).

Receiver General, Halifax, 88 (i).

Civil Government:

Agriculture, Dept. of, 95 (i).

Auditor General's Office, 95 (i).

Civil Service Board of Examiners, 113, 128 (i).

Contingencies, Departmental:

General Vote, 104 (i).

High Commissioner, 105 (i).

Post Office and Finance Depts., 112 (i).

Finance and Treasury Board, 95 (i).

Fisheries, Dept. of, 96 (i).

Governor General's Secretary's Office, 85 (i).

Indian Affairs, Dept. of, 95 (i), 1637 (ii).

Inland Revenue, Dept. of, 95 (i).

Interior, Dept. of, 93 (i).

Justice, Dept. of, 91 (i).

Penitentiaries Branch, 91 (i).

Militia and Defence, Dept. of, 92 (i).

North-West Mounted Police, 93 (i).

Postmaster General's Dept., 1638 (ii).

Printing and Stationery, Dept. of, 92 (i).

Privy Council Office, 90 (i).

Public Works, Dept. of, 96 (i).

Railways and Canals, Dept. of, 96 (i), 1637 (ii).

Secretary of State, Dept. of, 92 (i), 1640, 1668 (ii).

Collection of Revenues:

Adulteration of Food, 1619 (ii).

Canals:

Repairs and Working Expenses, 1624, 1668 (ii).

Culling Timber, 1619, 1667, 1684 (ii).

Customs, 1629, 1666 (ii).

Dominion Lands, 1635, 1637 (ii).

Excise, 1618, 1667 (ii).

Post Office, 1633, 1684 (ii).

Public Works:

Agency, B.C., 1633 (ii).

Esquimalt Graving Dock, 1632 (ii).

Signal Service, 1633 (ii).

Slides and booms, 1620, 1632, 1684 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, N.W.T., and B.C., 1633 (ii).

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Collection of Revenues—Continued.

Railways :

Intercolonial Ry. (Repairs and Working Expenses) 1620, 1668 (ii).

Culling Timber. See "Collection of Revenues."

Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."

Dominion Lands. See "Collection of Revenues."

Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."

Fisheries :

Fishing Bounty, distribution, &c., 1603 (ii).

General Vote, 1583 (ii).

Litigation (cost) *re David J. Adams*, 1656. (ii).

New Brunswick, 1601 (ii).

Overseers and Wardens, salaries, &c., 1583 (ii).

Protection Steamers, 1603 (ii).

Geological Survey :

General Vote, 1604 (ii).

Government Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."

Immigration :

Agents' Travelling Expenses, 1167 (ii).

Belfast, gratuity to late agent, 1638 (ii).

Dublin Agency, 1166 (ii).

General Vote, 1155; conc., 1686 (ii).

Glasgow Agency, 1166 (ii).

High Commissioner's Office, 1158, 1165 (ii).

Liverpool Agency, 1166 (ii).

London (Eng.) Agency, 1168 (ii).

London *Free Press*, payments to, 1160 (ii).

Pamphlets, &c., payments for, 1158, 1165 (ii).

Pauper Immigration, 1155 (ii).

Qu'Appelle Agent (Mr. Baker) 1161, 1169 (ii).

Quebec Agency, 1160 (ii).

Victoria, B. C., Agent, 1160 (ii).

Indians :

British Columbia, 1682 (ii).

Man. and N.W.T., 1607 (ii).

Man. (Industrial Schools) 1681 (ii).

New Brunswick, 1607 (ii).

Ontario and Quebec, 1605 (ii).

Insurance :

General Vote, 1604 (ii).

Justice, Administration of :

Clerk, Stenographer, Supreme Court, 119 (i).

Contingencies and Disbursements, 119 (i).

Miscellaneous, including N. W. T., 114 (i).

Quebec Judiciary, conc., 1685 (ii).

Legislation :

House of Commons :

Coursol, Mr., Indemnity, 1670 (ii).

Salaries, &c., 1025, 1668 (ii).

Sessional Clerks, 1668 (ii).

Miscellaneous :

American History, printing catalogue, 1030 (ii).

Franchise Act, 1641 (ii).

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Legislation—Continued.

Library, salaries, &c., 1030, 1638 (ii).

Printing, Paper, &c., 1031 (ii).

Works on America, purchase, 1030 (ii).

Senate :

Fortin, Hon. Mr. Indemnity, 1670 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service :

Buoys, &c., St. Lawrence (maintenance) 1582 (ii).

Construction and completion, 1582 (ii).

General vote, 1581 (ii).

Lower Traverse River, 1681 (ii).

Signal Service, 1582 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions :

Campbellton and Gaspé, &c., 1678 (ii).

Canada and Antwerp or Germany, 1679; conc.,

Halifax and St. John *via* Yarmouth and Port Medway, 1678 (ii).

Lakes Huron and Superior, 1678 (ii).

Magdalen Islands, 1678 (ii).

1689 (ii).

Meteorological Service : See "Scientific Institutions."

Militia :

Ammunition, &c., 1211 (ii).

Barracks, B. C., 1644 (ii).

Brigade Majors, salaries, &c., 1209 (ii).

Clothing and Great Coats, 1212, 1215 (ii).

Contingencies, 1218 (ii).

Deputy Adjutants General retiring allowance, 1644 (ii).

Drill Pay, &c., 1213 (ii).

Military Branch and District Staff, salaries, 1209 (ii).

Military Properties, 1221 (ii).

Permanent Forces, 1219 (ii).

Royal Military College, 1218; conc., 1687 (ii).

Miscellaneous :

Canada Gazette, 1611 (ii).

Canada Temperance Act, expenditure, 1612 (ii).

Commercial Agencies, 1615 (ii).

Débats du Conseil Législatif, Québec, 1663 (ii).

Fabre, Mr., salary, &c., 1612 (ii).

Fishery Commission (Washington) expenses, 1662.

Govt. of N. W. T., Expenses, 1611 (ii).

Halfbreeds Claims Commission, expenses, 1666.

Hot Springs, Banff, Roads, Bridges, &c., 1617, 1666.

Mounted Police, compensation for Injuries, 1612.

Orders in Council, &c., collecting, 1618, 1663 (ii).

Printing Bureau, Plant, &c., 1617; conc., 1689 (ii).

Printing, Miscellaneous, 1611 (ii).

Returns, preparation, &c., 1615; conc., 1688 (ii).

Statistical Diagrams, Lithographing, 1663 (ii).

Surveys, Lakes Superior and Huron, conc., 1688.

Mounted Police :

General Vote, 1610; suppl., 1658, 1683 (ii).

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Ocean and River Service :

- General Vote, 1577 (ii).
- Govt. Steamers, maintenance and repairs, 1577.
- Life-saving and Life-boat service (rewards) 1577.
- Montreal and Quebec River Police, 1579 (ii).
- Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, 1581 (ii).
- Wrecks, &c., Investigations, 1578 (ii).

Penitentiaries :

- British Columbia, 1025 (ii).
- Dorchester, 1021 (ii).
- Kingston, 122 (i).
- Manitoba, 1021; conc., 1686 (ii).
- Regina Gaol, 1025 (ii).
- St. Vincent de Paul, 136; conc., 1686 (ii).

Pensions :

- Delaney, Mrs., 1201 (ii).
- Fenian Raid, on account of, 1201, 1639 (ii).
- Hodgson, Sir Robt. (payment to Govt. of P. E. I.) 1671 (ii).
- Rebellion of 1885 (N.W.T.), militiamen, &c., 1202, 1642 (ii).
- Veterans of 1812, 1201 (ii).

*Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."**Public Works—Capital :**Buildings :*

- Ottawa, additional Deptl. Block, 1461 (ii).
- Esquimalt Graving Dock, 1653 (ii).
- Harbors and Rivers :
 - Port Arthur Harbor and Kaministiquia, 1462 (ii).
 - Cape Tormentine Harbor, 1462 (ii).
 - Kingston Graving Dock, 1671 (ii).

Public Works—Income :**Buildings :*

- Manitoba, 1542 (ii).
- New Brunswick, 1468 (ii).
- North-West Territories, 1672 (ii).
- Ontario, 1537, 1655, 1672 (ii).
- Govt. Printing Bureau, 1541 (ii).
- Quebec, 1533, 1654 (ii).

Dredging :

- Harbors and Rivers generally, 1569 (ii).
- Manitoba, 1656 (ii).

Experimental Farms :

- Buildings, Fencing, &c., 1574 (ii).

Harbors and Rivers :

- New Brunswick, 1673 (ii).
- North-West Territories, 1655 (ii).
- Nova Scotia, 1561, 1673 (ii).
- Ontario, 1566, 1655, 1674 (ii).
- Prince Edward Island, 1561 (ii).
- Quebec, 1563, 1673 (ii).

Miscellaneous :

- Floods, Montreal and Vicinity, Examination, 1678.

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

*Public Works—Income—Continued.**Repairs, Furniture, &c. :*

- Rideau Hall, 1542; conc., 1688 (ii).
- Site (rent) old Parl. House, Quebec, 1655 (ii).

Roads and Bridges :

- Grand River Bridges, Haldimand 1675 (ii).
- Ottawa City and River Bridges, 1571, 1677 (ii).

Telegraphs :

- Bonilla Point and Victoria (B.C.) 1678 (ii).
- Telephone (Wolf Island, Ont., and Mainland) 1677 (ii).

Quarantine :

- Cattle Quarantine, Expenses, 1200 (ii).
- Grosse Isle, &c., 1196 (ii).
- Medical Inspection, Quebec, 1195 (ii).

Railways and Canals—Capital :**Canals :*

- Cornwall, 1452; conc., 1687 (ii).
- Culbute, 1460 (ii).
- Grenville, 1459 (ii).
- Lachine, 1452 (ii).
- Lake St. Louis, 1453 (ii).
- Murray, towards completion, 1453, 1646 (ii).
- St. Anne's, 1453, 1646 (ii).
- St. Lawrence River and Canals, 1453, 1646 (ii).
- Sault Ste. Marie, 1446, 1624 (ii).
- Tay, 1459 (ii).
- Trent River Navigation, 1454 (ii).
- Williamsburg, Farran's Point division, 1453.
- Welland, 1453; conc., 1688 (ii).

Railways :

- Canadian Pacific Ry. (construction) 1221 (ii).
- Cape Breton Ry. (construction) 1230 (ii).
- Eastern Extension Ry. (construction) 1231 (ii).
- Intercolonial Ry. :
 - Dalhousie Branch, 1226 (ii).
 - Freight Rates, 1650 (ii).
 - General Vote, 1224; suppl., 1644, 1650 (ii).
 - Heating and Electricity in Cars, 1227 (ii).
 - Indiantown Branch, 1646 (ii).
 - Maccan Station, increased accommodation, 1225 (ii).
 - Moncton, increased accommodation, 1225 (ii).
 - Pictou Town Branch, 1226, 1645 (ii).
 - Rolling Stock, 1645 (ii).
 - St. Charles Branch, 1225, 1645 (ii).
 - St. John, increased accommodation, 1224 (ii).
 - Spring Hill, increased accommodation, 1224.
 - Snow Sheds, 1645 (ii).
 - Working Expenses, 1650 (ii).
- Oxford and New Glasgow Ry. (construction) 1230 (ii).

*For Repairs and Working Expenses see "Collection of Revenues."

*For Repairs and Working Expenses see "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Railways and Canals—Income :

Canals :

- Chambly, 1460 (ii).
- Calbute, 1460 (ii).
- Dam at Bobcaygeon, 1460 (ii).
- Lakefield and Balsam Lake Channel, 1461 (ii).
- Miscellaneous, Scows, &c., 1646 (ii).
- Rideau Bridges, 1646, 1671 (ii).
- St. Ours' Lock, 1460 (ii).
- Trent River Nav., R. Stephenson's Claim, 1460.
- Welland, 1460, 1671 (ii).

Railways :

- Surveys and Inspections, 1460 (ii).

Scientific Institutions :

- Meteorological Service, conc., 1688 (ii).

Steamship Subventions. See "Mail Subsidies"

CONCURRENCE :

- Administration of Justice, 1685 (ii).
- Cornwall Canal, 1687 (ii).
- Immigration, 1686 (ii).
- Lakes Superior and Huron Surveys, conc., 1688 (ii).
- Meteorological Service, 1688 (ii).
- Mail Subsidy, Can., Antwerp or Germany, 1689 (ii).
- Manitoba Penitentiary, 1686 (ii).
- Printing Bureau, Plant, &c., 1689 (ii).
- Royal Military College, 1687 (ii).
- Returns, Preparation Extra Clerks, conc., 1688 (ii).
- Repairs, Furniture, &c., 1688 (ii).
- St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, 1686 (ii).
- Welland Canal, 1688 (ii).

Supply Bill No. 141 (Sir Charles Tupper). Res., conc. in, 1^o*, 2^o*, and 3^o*, 1690 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 1)

SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS, RYS.: in Com. of Sup., 1460.

— CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. Doyon) 495 (i).

— (GEOLOGICAL) OTTAWA COUNTY: Ques. (Mr. Wright) 495 (i).

— LAKES SUPERIOR AND HURON: conc., 1688 (ii).

TARIFF CHANGES AND NEWSPAPER CORRESPONDENTS: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 24 (i).

TAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 1459 (ii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, ASSUMPTION BY GOVT.: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. Denison) 101 (i).

— N. W. T. AND B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1633, 1677 (ii).

TELEPHONE (WOLF ISLAND, ONT. AND MAINLAND): in Com. of Sup., 1677 (ii).

TEMISCOUATA RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Sir Charles Tupper) 1546; in Com., 1593 (ii).

TERMS OF CONFEDERATION WITH P.E.I.: M. for copies* (Mr. Perry) 61 (i).

— COMPENSATION FOR NON-FULFILMENT: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 86 (i).

— Ques. (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.) 140 (i).

TERRITORIES REAL PROPERTY ACT (Chap. 51 Rev. Statutes) Amt. B. No. 104 (Mr. Thompson). 1^o, 899; 2^o*, 1195; prop. Res., 1259; in Com., 1416; in Com. on B., 1412, 1415; 3^o*, 1433 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 20.)

THOUSAND ISLAND RY. CO.'S INCORP. B. NO. 84 (Mr. Taylor). 1^o*, 489; 2^o*, 612 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 1067 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 75.)

THOROLD CANAL WATER POWER: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 647 (i).

TIGNISH AND MIMINIGASH BREAKWATERS: Ques. (Mr. Perry) 86, 712 (i).

TOBACCO LEAF, PURCHASE AND SALE: Ques. (Mr. Thérien) 66 (i).

Tobique Gypsum and Colonisation Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 79 (Mr. Burns). 1^o*, 489; 2^o*, 530; in Com. and 3^o*, 790 (i). (51 Vic., c. 71.)

TOBIQUE, VALLEY RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: Res. prop. (Sir Charles Tupper) and in Com., 1626 (ii).

Toronto Board of Trade Acts Amt. B. No. 114 (Mr. Small). 1^o*, 1031; 2^o*, 1067; in Com. and 3^o*, 1313 (ii). (51 Vic., c. 99.)

TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS: presented (Mr. Bowell) 18 (i).

TRADE COMBINATIONS: M. (Mr. Wallace) for Sel. Com., 28 (i).

— M. (Mr. Wallace) to employ shorthand writer, 51 (i).

— M. (Mr. Edgar) for Sel. Com. withdn., 60 (i).

Trade Combinations prevention, B. No. 138 (Mr. Wallace). 1^o, 1544; Notice of Motion (Bill to take effect 22nd May) 1691 (ii).

— Remarks on adjnmt. (Mr. Mitchell) 24 (i).

TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN G. B. AND COLONIES: prop. Res. (Mr. Marshall) 1069 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. McCarthy) 1069; (Mr. Casey) 1078; (Mr. Fisher) 108; (Mr. Tupper, Pictou) 1086; (Mr. Mills, Bothwell) 1088; (Gen. Laurte) 1091; (Mr. Davin) 1091 (ii).

TRADES UNIONS, COPIES OF RULES: M. for Rot. (Mr. Amyot) 46 (i).

— REGULATIONS re REGISTRY, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Amyot) 50 (i).

— UNDER 35 VIC., CAP. 30, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. Amyot) 50 (i).

TRANSLATION OF BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 85 (i).

TRANSLATORS. See "DEBATES."

TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 1167 (ii).

— Remarks (Mr. McMullen) in Com. of Sup., 104 (i).

TRAVERSE RIVER, LOWER: in Com. of Sup., 1681 (ii).

TRAVIS, EX JUSTICE: Remarks, in Com. of Sup., 114 (i).

Treason and Felony (forfeitures). See "CRIMINAL LAW."

Treaty between Her Majesty and President of U. S. See "FISHERIES."

Tree Peddlers. See "PEDDLERS."

TRENT RIVER NAV.: in Com. of Sup., 1454 (ii).

— (R. STEPHENSON'S CLAIM): in Com. of Sup., 1460.

TRENT VALLY CANAL COMMISSION, COR, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Barron) 71 (i).

- Tudor, Eleonora Elizabeth.** See "DIVORCE."
- TUPPER, SIR CHARLES, MEMBER ELECT FOR CUMBERLAND:** introduced, 18 (i).
- UNITED STATES WRECKING VESSELS IN CAN. WATERS, COR.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Edgar*) 665 (i).
- VACANCIES:** notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1, 85, 124 (i).
- VACCINE, GRANT FOR PREPARING:** Ques. (Mr. *Fiset*) 140 (i).
- VALIQUETTE, SERGEANT, SUPERRANNUATION:** Ques. (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 1506 (ii).
- VALLERAND, F. O., CUSTOMS SEIZURES ON, COR., O.C.'s &c.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1068 (ii).
- VENTILATION OF HOUSE OF COMMONS:** Remarks (Sir *Richard, Cartwright &c.*) 171 (i).
- VESSELS, OVERLOADING, LEGISLATION:** Ques. (Mr. *Gullet*) 140 (i).
- VETERANS OF 1812:** in Com. of Sup., 1201 (ii).
- OF 1837, PENSIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Furcell*) 85 (i).
- OF 1866-70, MEDALS: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 965 (ii).
- VICTORIA, B.C., IMMIGRATION AGENT:** in Com. of Sup., 1100.
- POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 826 (ii).
- RET. OF MEMBER ELECT: notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- VICTORIA COUNTY (ONT) MAIL SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. *Barron*) 825 (ii).
- VICTORIA (N.S.) RET. OF MEMBER-ELECT:** notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- VOTERS' LISTS, COST:** Ques. (Mr. *Choquette*) 27 (i).
- SUSPENSION OF REVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon, St. John*) 965 (ii).
- WALLACE, ROBERT, LATE POSTMASTER, B.C.:** Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 826 (ii).
- WASHINGTON TREATY.** See "FISHERIES TREATY."
- WATERET, P., FOREIGN EMIGRATION AGENT, EMPLOYMENT BY GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 966 (ii).
- WATER SUPPLY TO CARTRIDGE FACTORY AND DRILL HALL, QUEBEC, COR.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Langelier, Quebec*) 1092 (ii).
- WAYS AND MEANS:** Res. for Com. (Mr. *Bowell*) 18 (i).
- THE BUDGET: (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1031; reply (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1049; Amt., 1061 (ii).
- Deb. on Amt. to M. for Com. (Mr. *McLelan*) 1093; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1101; (Mr. *Hesson*) 1113; (Mr. *Trow*) 1114; (Mr. *Mulock*) 1114; (Mr. *Cook*) 1114; neg. (Y. 66, N. 117) 1120 (ii).
- in Com., 1121 (ii).
- Weights and Measures Act (salt packages)**
- Amt. B. No. 118** (Mr. *Costigan*). 1^o, 1093; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 1402 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 25.)
- WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMT.:** Ques. (Mr. *McMillan Huron*) 97 (i).
- WELLAND CANAL:** in Com. of Sup., 1453, 1460, 1671; conc., 1688 (ii).
- SECTION "A": Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 496 (i).
- WELLAND RIVER, BRIDGE AT CHIPPAWA:** Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 65 (i).
- WELLINGTON HARBOR OF REFUGE, COR. &c.:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Platt*) 866 (i).
- WEST INDIES, COMMERCIAL RELATIONS:** M. for Cor. (Gen. *Laurie*) 903 (ii).
- Deb. (Mr. *Brown*) 904; (Mr. *Skinner*) 904; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 905; (Mr. *Jones, Halifax*) 905; (Mr. *McNeill*) 906; (Mr. *Ellis*) 906; (Mr. *Kenny*) 907; (Mr. *Eisenhauer*) 908; (Mr. *Welsh*) 908; (Mr. *Weldon, Albert*) 909; (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 909; (Mr. *Mills, Annapolis*) 910; (Mr. *Mills, Bothwell*) 911; (Gen. *Laurie*) 911; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 912; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 912 (ii).
- Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 14** (Mr. *Ward*). 1^o*, 62; 2^o*, 128; in Com. and 3^o*, 496 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- WHALE FISHERIES, HUDSON'S BAY:** Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 826 (ii).
- WHARVES AND PIERS IN P. E. I., CARE OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Davies, P. E. I.*) 965 (ii).
- WHITE, H. N. THOMAS, DECEASE OF:** Remarks (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 962 (ii).
- WILLIAMSBURG CANAL:** in Com. Sup., 1453 (ii).
- WINKLER, MRS BARBARA, PAYMENT FOR LOSS OF REGISTERED LETTER:** Ques. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 750 (i).
- WINTER NAVIGATION, P. E. I. AND N. B.:** Ques. (Mr. *Perry*) 712 (i).
- WOOD ISLAND HARBOR, DREDGING:** Ques. (Mr. *Welsh*) 140.
- Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 63** (Mr. *Perley, Assiniboia*). 1^o*, 380; 2^o*, 498; in Com. and 3^o*, 612 (i). (51 *Vic.*, c. 87.)
- WORKING EXPENSES, I. C. R.:** in Com. of Sup., 1650 (ii).
- WORKS ON AMERICA, PURCHASE:** in Com. of Sup., 1030.
- Wrecked Vessels Aid B. No. 7** (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*). 1^o, 44; 2^o m., 770; deb. adjnd., 778 (i); resmd., 917, 2^o neg. (Y. 61, N. 84) 921 (ii).
- Deb. on 2^o (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 770; (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 770; (Mr. *Shanly*) 772; (Mr. *Charlton*) 772; (Mr. *O'Brien*) 777; (Mr. *Casey*) 777; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 778; (Mr. *Tupper*) 778 (i); (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 917; (Mr. *Laurier*) 917; (Mr. *Kirkpatrick*) 918; (Mr. *Edgar*) 918; (Mr. *Bowell*) 919; (Mr. *Paterson, Essex*) 920; (Mr. *Curran*) 921 (ii).
- WRECKING VESSELS (CANADIAN) IN U. S. WATERS, COR.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Platt*) 866 (ii).
- WRECKS ON GREAT LAKES AND LOSS OF LIFE:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 19, 752 (i).
- INVESTIGATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 1578 (ii).
- WRITS ISSUED.** See "ELECTIONS."
- YARMOUTH, RET. OF MEMBER ELECT.:** notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- York Farmers Colonisation Co.'s B. No. 107** (Mr. *McCulla*). 1^o* 1031; 2^o*, 1067; in Com. and 3^o*, 1313 (ii). (51 *Vic.*, c. 106.)
- YORK-SIMCOE BATT. KIT ALLOWANCE:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mulock*) 66 (i).
- YOUNG, CAPT., COR., &c., RESPECTING CLAIM:** M. for copy* (Mr. *Scarth*) 866 (ii).
- YOUNG, CHAS., DEP. RETURNING OFFICER FOR HALDIMAND:** Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 648 (i).